

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future

Solihull Local Plan Review

Draft Local Plan –Summary of Individual Representations by Question

July 2017

Question 1 - Challenges	4
Question 2 - Vision.....	32
Question 3 – Spatial Strategy.....	60
Question 4 – Policy P1 UK Central Hub Area	119
Question 5 – Key Objectives of Policy P1.....	135
Question 6 – Policy P1A Blythe Valley Park	142
Question 7 – Policy P2 Maintain Strong Competitive Town Centres.....	149
Question 8 – Scale and Location of Development (Town Centres)	166
Question 9 – Policy P3 Provision of Land for General Business and Premises	172
Question 10 – Scale and Location of Development (General Business).....	185
Question 11 – Policy P4 Meeting Housing Needs.....	203
Question 12 – Level of Affordable Housing	231
Question 13 – Self and Custom Build Housing.....	247
Question 14 – Number of New Homes.....	255
Question 15 – Location of New Homes (General)	297
Question 15/01 Barratt’s Farm	392
Question 15/02 Frog Lane, Balsall Common.....	446
Question 15/03 Windmill Lane, Balsall Common	488
Question 15/04 Land West of Dickens Heath.....	576
Question 15/05 Chester Road/Moorend Avenue, Fordbridge	641
Question 15/06 Meriden Road, Hampton in Arden	647
Question 15/07 Kingshurst Village Centre.....	649
Question 15/08 Hampton Road, Knowle	650
Question 15/09 Land South of Knowle	676
Question 15/10 West of Meriden.....	737
Question 15/11 TRW/The Green	740
Question 15/12 Land South of Dog Kennel Lane	770
Question 15/13 Land South of Shirley	812

Question 15/14 Arran Way, Smith’s Wood	939
Question 15/15 Jenson House, Auckland Drive, Smith’s Wood	940
Question 15/16 East of Solihull.....	945
Question 15/17 Moat Lane/Vulcan Road	960
Question 15/18 Sharmans Croass Road.....	962
Question 15/19 Land at HS2 Interchange.....	1089
Question 15/20 Land at Damson Parkway.....	1093
Question 15/alts Alternative Sites (Where a Call for Sites Submission Already Made)	1096
Question 15/new Alternative Sites (New Suggestions)	1174
Question 16 Infrastructure Requirements.....	1211
Question 17 Policy P6 Provision of Sites for Gypsies and Travellers	1429
Question 18 Improving Accessibility and Encouraging Sustainable Travel.....	1432
Question 19 Protecting the Environment.....	1461
Question 20 Quality of Place	1482
Question 21 Health & Supporting Local Communities	1507
Question 22 Policy P21 Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Provision	1526
Question 23 General Comments.....	1539

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 1 - Challenges				
Alan Dick [3322]			Q01	Appreciates the challenges which the borough is facing and commends the presentation and content of the DLP
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q01	There is nothing about sustaining or promoting architectural excellence. The quality of the built environment will become ever more important as the volume of it increases. The plan shows that landmark buildings (e.g. the TRW building) will be demolished - there is nothing to suggest that architectural merit will be a consideration in any form for its replacement. The Parkgate development suggests that Solihull is happy to promote profit at the expense of any kind of distinctive architecture.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q01	support the approach taken by the council.
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q01	<p>The allocation of Arden Cross can significantly contribute to meeting the majority of challenges in the Borough.</p> <p>Suggest bullet point two of Challenge M should be altered to better reflect the Arden Cross Vision of a mixed use urban quarter that maximises the benefits of the site's current and planned connectivity. This should include the most efficient use of the site for a range of complementary uses that capitalise on the opportunity for investment stimulated by HS2. The "garden village" concept is inappropriate in this context since it would not enable the full potential benefits of HS2 to be captured.</p>
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q01	<p>But we feel a major additional challenge is infrastructure.</p> <p>Solihull MBC must ensure improved infrastructure addresses the increasing requirements of development and population growth in Balsall Common and Berkswell. In addition to the proposed massive increase in housing the area will be adversely affected by HS2 cutting the community in two.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q01	<p>Support challenges H and N as critical for Balsall Common. Due to the implications of HS2 construction traffic on Balsall Common, suggest that the haul route for HS2 construction traffic is progressed within the Solihull Local Plan to meet challenges H and N. This could double as a future relief road.</p> <p>It is not clear that the need for school provision is recognised sufficiently in the challenges. Suggest a specific objective that sufficient school provision is made for increased population of new housing.</p>
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q01	<p>Challenge B - second bullet point under Objectives should be amended to;</p> <p>"To ensure that provision is made for an appropriate provision of HMA shortfall in new housing land. This will be delivered based upon achieving formal agreement with the HMA authorities and based upon unique position of the Borough to assist in delivering new homes and economic growth as recommended in the GBSLEP SHNS."</p>
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q01	<p>objectives under Challenge D should be amended with a new bullet to state;</p> <p>"Maximise the opportunity for reducing congestion on motorways, the strategic rail network and rail through delivery of an appropriate level of new housing to meet the shortfall across the HMA within the Borough, where this can be achieved to deliver sustainable development."</p>
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q01	<p>Challenge E - objective should be amended to state;</p> <p>"Justification for the release of land from the Green Belt to meet the need to new development should be focused on those sites which perform least well against the functions of Green Belt and outcomes from the Borough's Green Belt Assessment."</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q01	<p>Amend text under Challenge/Objective B second bullet to give greater certainty of approach regarding the need to satisfy the "duty to co-operate" test with other HMA authorities in making provision for the shortfall in new housing land</p> <p>as recommended in the GBSLEP SHNS.</p> <p>Add new point under objectives for Challenge D to maximise the opportunity for reducing congestion on motorways, the strategic rail network and rail through delivery of an appropriate level of new housing.</p> <p>Amend objective for Challenge E to ensure justification for green belt releases is based on green belt functions and outcomes from the Green Belt Assessment.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q01	<p>In general yes, but they are not addressed in an appropriate manner in terms of the location and quantum of new housing against the need to protect the Meriden Gap. The allocation of land to the east of Balsall Common conflicts with the challenge to safeguard key gaps between settlements such as the Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Balsall Common is omitted from Challenge D. The improvement of Balsall Common centre should become a strategic objective for Solihull.</p>
Birmingham City Council (Waheed Nazir) [3971]			Q01	<p>Support the objective in Challenge B 'to ensure that provision is made for an appropriate proportion of the HMA shortfall in new housing land consistent with the achievement of sustainable development and the other objectives of the Plan.' However, BCC is of the view that this objective does not currently translate into an appropriate strategy which takes into account the scale of the housing shortfall.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q01	<p>Challenges are appropriate base from which to progress the LPR.</p> <p>Challenge B - is considered particularly relevant., but should be amended to acknowledge the implications of a historic undersupply of housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q01	<p>Challenge A - needs to recognise poor public transport links between settlements in the rural area which lead to isolation and inequality. Link to challenge J "improving health and well-being".</p> <p>Challenge E - some site allocations go against these objectives.</p> <p>Challenge F - No real provision to improve public transport. New builds should incorporate renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Challenge H - No definitive statements that poor public transport in the rural area can be improved. Statements are aspirational rather than practical.</p> <p>Challenge J - No detail that sustainable additional educational facilities will be built should the individual sites be allocated.</p>
Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd [3894]	Harriet Barber	Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd (Harriet Barber) [3895]	Q01	<p>Support challenges identified.</p> <p>Objective to meet own housing needs accords with Housing White Paper.</p>
Chris Crean [3631]			Q01	<p>A further challenge will be in how these challenges are prioritised. Another challenge will be the threat of sprawl, the ability of the plan to withstand pressures from national government and developers, and the need for Solihull to support the rest of the conurbation by protecting its natural assets and assisting development to take place where required, not just developing green field/green belt sites in close proximity to the Motorway network or the badly located station associated with High Speed Rail.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q01	<p>We are in agreement that the Council have identified the correct challenges facing the Borough</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Colin Davis [3352]			Q01	its an impossibility to answer just yes on no to such a long list of challenges. I object fundamentally to Solihull taking extra homes and eroding the Boroughs Green belt to accommodate birminghams shortfall.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q01	<p>Generally agree.</p> <p>Challenge K - disappointed that there wasn't equal weighting given to some of the natural environment that borders Shirley, as was given to the Arden landscape (excepting the River Blythe area).</p> <p>Pleased that both inequality and climate change have been identified as being challenges that the Borough needs to address but how inequality will be tackled is not explained.</p> <p>The plan seems overly reliant on a few businesses (JLR, NEC airport) and there is a risk of inequality worsening if the plan is too centred around a few businesses.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q01	agree, but would like to see more details in the LP re how economic inequality will be tackled.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q01	<p>Challenges seem appropriate but not always clear how they will be addressed.</p> <p>Challenge A - need to consider impacts of increased population on social infrastructure, including green spaces.</p> <p>Challenge C - Need to consider attractiveness of walking and cycling opportunities to the intended audience. Consideration for cyclists needs to cater for all levels of experience.</p> <p>Growth is important but direct investment in improvements is also required. Need SMEs too.</p> <p>Challenge F - means used to address it is inadequate. Concern that benefits of Solihull Connected may never be realised if all available enthusiasm is poured into the pursuit of growth.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q01	<p>Supports 2 challenges (K & E) in the DLP. but would like to see Shirley South mentioned with reference to these challenges.</p> <p>Inequality and climate change are also supported as challenges which the DLP is addressing, but would like to see more prominence in the LP for how these will be addressed.</p> <p>Also too much emphasis is given to JR/ BAirport as drivers of the local economy and would want to see the LP address the role/place of other businesses in the borough's development.</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q01	<p>Support challenges, especially tackling inequality.</p> <p>Lack of actions on how inequality will be addressed; is a challenge in itself and should be included.</p> <p>Centre of Local Economic Studies give examples.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q01	<p>- protecting and maintaining the Meriden Gap and ensuring that Birmingham and Coventry are kept separate has not been adequately addressed in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>- A new Policy that picks up the principle from the UDP should be added regarding the Green Belt</p>
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q01	<p>Challenge of meeting own and HMA's housing need.</p>
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q01	<p>Challenge E - Protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements:</p> <p>Challenge K - Protecting and enhancing our natural assets. Degrading of the historic Arden landscape character in parts of the Borough.</p> <p>The proposed housing count for Balsall Common and Berkswell is only possible by infringing upon the Green Belt land of the Meriden Gap.</p>
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q01	<p>I believe that improving the centre of Balsall Common has failed to be recognised as an additional key challenge that Solihull Council needs to address. The current facilities within Balsall Common centre struggle to support the existing populace so could not support up to an additional 1350 houses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q01	<p>One stated challenge is to retain the nature of the Borough.</p> <p>A key challenge therefore is for the growth of the Borough to be managed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *whilst keeping Balsall Common:a rural village *& at the same time, improving the village centre *& preventing its growth into a small commuter town <p>This growth trend must be stopped, because if not, the nature and character of Balsall Common WILL BE IRREVERSIBLY DAMAGED.</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q01	The key challenges for Balsall Common of addressing traffic congestion and parking in the centre, and park and ride at the station are omitted from the Borough plan.
Ellandi LLP [3670]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q01	Agree with range of challenges identified, but should be extended to explicitly cover retail needs across the Plan area taking into account cross boundary requirements. Will require substantial update of Retail, Leisure & Office study to assess quantitative capacity and qualitative need for further retailing to inform clear strategy as to where, when and how much further retail should be accommodated to comply with town centres first approach in national policy
Environment Agency (Martin Ross) [4669]			Q01	<p>Challenge F - recommend additional objectives relating to sustainable urban drainage systems</p> <p>Challenge L - suggest rewording of the 2nd objective to make it stronger.</p>
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q01	Challenges D,E,H & M need to refer to need for Motorway Service Area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q01	<p>Very relevant and appropriate but concern that subsequent policies (as drafted) will not deliver.</p> <p>Concern that OAN inappropriate and insufficient sites allocated.</p> <p>Inadequate housing provision will lead to: rise in inequality between North and South, increase commuting, stifle economic growth due to lack of labour force.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q01	<p>Challenge H currently identifies the poor north-south public transport links, but omits the massive need in the Knowle/Dorridge area? From 2000 until now, approximately 1000 new homes have been added in the Knowle area, but since that time bus service connectivity and frequency have reduced. Yet, the Council is now proposing an additional 1000 homes for Knowle, without any significant improvement to transport infrastructure. The scope of Appendix 1 is completely inadequate and should be expanded to show the wider infrastructure needs across Solihull. Air quality is a massive challenge and should be addressed separately.</p>
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q01	<p>Challenges should acknowledge the poor public transport serving rural areas and the benefits of improved services, the impact of the major developments proposed on quality of life, recreational facilities, the rural setting or key gaps between settlements. Challenge H should include an objective for a ramp/lift at Hampton rail station, and Challenge L a requirement for porous driveways. There is no mention of the role or impact on education, or the importance of traffic calming for health and well being. There is little evidence of impact mitigation whilst the relocation of the Municipal WRC would be totally inappropriate.</p>
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q01	<p>Challenges should acknowledge the poor public transport serving rural areas and the benefits of improved services, the impact of the major developments proposed on quality of life, recreational facilities, the rural setting or key gaps between settlements. Challenge H should include an objective for a ramp/lift at Hampton rail station, and Challenge L a requirement for porous driveways. There is no mention of the role or impact on education, or the importance of traffic calming for health and well being. There is little evidence of impact mitigation whilst the relocation of the Municipal WRC would be totally inappropriate.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q01	<p>Amend text under Challenge/Objective B second bullet to give greater certainty of approach regarding the need to satisfy the "duty to co-operate" test with other HMA authorities in making provision for the shortfall in new housing land</p> <p>as recommended in the GBSLEP SHNS.</p> <p>Add new point under objectives for Challenge D to maximise the opportunity for reducing congestion on motorways, the strategic rail network and rail through delivery of an appropriate level of new housing.</p> <p>Amend objective for Challenge E to ensure justification for green belt releases is based on green belt functions and outcomes from the Green Belt Assessment.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q01	The proposed challenge lists are quite comprehensive and in the main appropriate.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q01	<p>The proposed challenge lists are quite comprehensive and in the main appropriate.</p> <p>Suggest wording changes to some of the challenges.</p> <p>Birmingham should be doing more to meet its needs.</p> <p>Need focus on rural area issues such as transport, infrastructure including superfast broadband.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q01	<p>Challenge B - agree with objectives, particularly the first three bullet points.</p> <p>Challenge H - agree with objectives, particularly first and third bullet points.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q01	<p>Challenge B - agree with objectives, particularly the first three bullet points.</p> <p>Challenge G - objectives do not seek to address the 'need' for employment land specifically, a fundamental component of economic growth.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q01	Challenge of meeting housing need not been fully addressed. More land needs to be release.
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q01	Broadly welcome Challenges and Objectives. Should set out commitment to need to continually review the Local Plan to accord with national guidance. Challenge D - be more positive; set challenge of actively improving economic role of Borough, not just maintaining it. Actively address managing congestion through infrastructure planning and investment. Challenge F - Currently studying provision of PV panels on roof of proposed Logistics Operations Centre. Challenge H - require permissive policies to support economic growth of employers such as JLR. Challenge N - HS2 construction works may have significant adverse effects on efficient operation of highways network.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q01	I agree that the plan has identified the right challenges.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q01	Yes, agree with the challenges identified particularly meeting housing need across the Borough, including the Borough's own need and where possible assisting with accommodating the HMA wider shortfall.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q01	<p>Challenge E: by proposing housing development on the east side of Balsall Common this narrows the green belt between Balsall Common and Coventry to a far greater extent than if development took place to the north, west or south of the settlement where the distance to Knowle would remain significant.</p> <p>Challenge N: construction of HS2 and establishment of construction service area is planned 2017/8 - 2025/6. This timing will co-incide with proposed Barratt's Farm development and use of Hallmeadow Road, A452, Kelsey Lane/Waste Lane. This could cause major community disruption and difficulty and needs addressing.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q01	Correctly identified the challenges that face the local authority.
Lionel Johnson [3582]			Q01	I believe that improving the centre of Balsall Common has failed to be recognised as an additional key challenge that Solihull Council needs to address. The current facilities within Balsall Common centre struggle to support the existing populace so could not support up to an additional 1350 houses.
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q01	<p>Support the Challenges and Objectives, but recommend adding an additional objective to Challenge B to encourage the early development of brownfield sites in sustainable locations for residential development. This should be encouraged by reducing the affordable threshold on such sites in the first five years of the Local Plan period to 40%.</p> <p>Also recommended extending the scope of the objectives associated with Challenge D to include support not only for the key economic assets, but also the smaller businesses and services that support the key economic assets.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q01	<p>Needs a more joined-up approach. Plans should not look at development in isolation; the impact of growth and development on communities is a challenge.</p> <p>Maintain the affordability of dwellings by designing them so that there is no scope to increase their size.</p> <p>Support the need to maintain rural communities.</p> <p>HS2 challenge (N)needs to be strengthened. Construction will impact on local communities.</p> <p>A challenge for Meriden is the loss of key services and isolation from being between HS2 and the proposed garden city.</p> <p>Need to prioritise senior population needs.</p> <p>Objective to encourage sustainable travel, yet rural public transport provision is decreasing.</p>
Messrs Wheeldon & Gooding [3886]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q01	Support challenges and objectives relating to UK Central Hub area
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q01	Will the impact of Brexit have a material effect on the total number of homes needed in the Borough?
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q01	Will the impact of Brexit have a material effect on the total number of homes needed in the Borough?
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q01	<p>Yes, agree with the challenges identified particularly meeting housing need across the Borough, including the Borough's own need and where possible assisting with accommodating the HMA wider shortfall.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q01	Although there is reference to green infrastructure and infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of High Speed 2, there is no detail about the infrastructure, i.e, roads, doctors, schools etc required for the additional housing. This makes it difficult to make informed comments.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q01	<p>Challenge D</p> <p>This fails to mention Balsall Common centre whilst mentioning 3 other centres. Given that Balsall Common will become a town under the draft plan this is an omission. I suggest that Balsall Common Centre is added to this section with the following comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Dated appearance and in need of environmental improvements * High impact of traffic and a lack of parking to support growth * Maintain its local importance <p>Challenge E</p> <p>I totally support the policy objective of improved public access. However, the wording does not accurately reflect NPPF para 81 and should be modified</p>
Mr Andrew Rusher [3532]			Q01	with houses & jobs come families & children , Solihull schools are already oversubscribed, GP surgeries and hospitals beds full , how do the council propose finding places for the additional populus ?
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q01	I think there are too many challenges to allow proper focus. In short, it should be to manage all changes (HS2, additional housing etc) without compromising the community, which is something the residents have worked hard to create and have lived with for many years.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q01	Yes, however I do believe some of the smaller areas, such as Hockley Heath, Earlswood and Chadwick End can accept additional housing without ruining the character of these places, so long as the bulk of the development is behind the high street outwards and is screened by natural vegetation where possible so is in keeping with the surrounding area. I do not feel it right to restrict the development just to the bigger suburbs.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q01	Development of Balsall Common village centre has not been identified as a challenge in the context of the scale of the proposed housing development. Currently the village centre is far from an conducive area to attract interesting, attractive and desired investment from commercial ventures. Instead it is a collection of convenience outlets for fleeting visits only - not for daily or extended visits. This is because the area sits on the axis of traffic flow, and with parking and feeder roads un-sighting drivers and pedestrians, it is not a nice place to stop and likely will reduce in quality.
Mr Daniel Fowler [3460]			Q01	I agree that the challenges listed are important but others are some missing. E.g. three important bottlenecks through the centre of Solihull. 1: The large car park on Monkspath Hall Road is used by traffic from the M42. A large scale car park is required that avoids clogging the road past St. Alphege, e.g. expand Mell Square car park across the Morrisons car park. 2: Sort the traffic in/out of Solihull School at peak times. 3: Sort out the roundabout by the train station. There is no talk of future autonomous transport and more ideas needed on safer cycling.
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q01	Yes however in addition to the challenges indentified should be added: Ensure the infrastructure is sufficient to meet the needs of the growing population
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q01	Why revised housing numbers compared to scope issues and options document? Why does our Borough need to provide housing for Birmingham overspill?
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q01	No not fully. Balsall Common village centre is very small and the increase in population over recent years has meant the centre can no longer cope with the throughput of vehicles and parking in the area. In the plan there appears to be no mention of major improvements to this area but to suggest an increase of a further 1150 houses to the village. 800 of those dwellings are suggested for Barratt's Farm area which would cause further chaos in the centre of the village.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q01	<p>Challenge K - Protecting and enhancing our natural assets. Site 13 is an area of biodiversity and habitat of value, an important area for local wildlife in Shirley. We have lost too many of these areas already.</p> <p>Challenge E - Protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements. Building houses on Allocation 13 is contrary to the objectives of this challenge. I live in Shirley South adjacent to the Green Belt and can testify to the biodiversity that still exists in this area and the benefits it brings to the local residents and the area.</p>
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q01	BC is a village not a town. increase by 1350 properties beyond belief. also contrary to govt policy.
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q01	Balsall Common has grown hugely and is now planned to grow even further. Improving the centre should be one of the key challenges that the Council addresses.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q01	<p>I disagree. There is far too little emphasis on challenge E. Protection of Green Belt. Protection of Green Belt while also providing land for development is probably the most difficult challenge the Borough faces.</p> <p>Also there is almost no mention of protecting and increasing access to the countryside in terms of footpaths and cycle tracks.</p>
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q01	<p>Offer comments on challenges:</p> <p>A - problems accessing housing outside the regeneration area is a consequence of the type of housing stock which dominates these areas. Therefore need more variety.</p> <p>B - Need to widen housing offer (mix and type, including starter homes and shared ownership) and range of affordable housing in mature suburbs and rural areas.</p> <p>E - Need to consider the release of other poorly performing Green Belt whose size prevents it from being a strategic allocation but could accommodate other more specialist housing need.</p>
Mr John Outhwaite [3785]			Q01	I disagree with "Challenge G" - do think that the council should be spending time and money addressing the needs to this community

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q01	<p>General support for challenges.</p> <p>To what extent do the proposals offer a viable response to these challenges?</p>
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q01	<p>Housing and population growth is a major challenge for our infrastructure and has not been fully addressed.</p> <p>The existing infrastructure in Balsall Common is already under extreme pressure and will not be able to cope with the proposed massive increase in housing and the community being severed by HS2.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q01	<p>Challenge D makes no reference to managing plan impacts on Balsall Common. The proposals to increase the number of houses by over 34% will fundamentally change a village into a town. This will result in overwhelming pressure on already stretched public facilities and infrastructure (schools, medical, roads, car parking) and an outdated and crowded village centre. Neighbourhood planning processes are already dysfunctional and a holistic Balsall Common plan is required to deliver an integrated approach and avoid unacceptable damage to the existing community.</p> <p>There is no recognition of need to address poorly maintained (potholed) rural road infrastructure to encourage sustainable transport (cycling).</p>
Mr Matthew Bragg [3069]			Q01	<p>Additional challenges:</p> <p>Spreading the required housing burden evenly across the whole borough rather than blighting key areas</p>
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q01	<p>The significant omission is about people who have lived in the rural setting for several years - who specifically moved to quiet villages e.g. Balsall Common and who have progressively seen the erosion of their way of life by the incursion of ever more housing into their village. Why is there no challenge to satisfy this significant group of people?</p> <p>In all scenarios the improvement of the centre of BC should be recognised as a key challenge.</p>
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q01	<p>'B' is not agreed as it is based on a subjective test that puts artificial limit on housing provision where impact on environment or attractiveness of Borough to business, which will result in house price rises and migration contrary to Government sustainability policies.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q01	Whilst the broad approach to challenges is acceptable, the challenge of maintaining settlement cohesion and sense of community is not
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q01	Balsall Common should be included as a key centre if over 1000 new homes are to be built
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q01	The current Draft Plan housing development plans for Knowle are completely at odds with the stated aims of Challenge C
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q01	The centre of Balsall Common is a key challenge if there is to be an above 1,000 housing increase. It will have to expanded to take in more shops as well as an appropriate increase in car parking.
Mr Stephen Hill [3208]			Q01	No, Challenge J should include a specific Objective in terms of Sporting Activities/Sports Facilities, to give confidence that the Council does care about, and wishes to plan appropriately for, Sporting Activities in Solihull. An appropriate Objective could be - 'Promote indoor and outdoor sporting activities, by supporting the provision of appropriate facilities and working with existing agencies, clubs and sports providers to maintain existing facilities and also, where existing facilities are lost to new development, seeking the provision of replacement facilities.'
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q01	I think far to much emphasis is being placed on HS2, especially associated with housing growth. It is implied in the document that this will provide major benefits, I see no proof of this it is all supposition. In order for somebody to make use of HS2 and save 20 minutes they would have to travel a fair distance slowly via bus or train, it would be far easier to travel to Solihull station and use the existing train network to get to London or to Birmingham that way.
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q01	Allocation 13 in local plan fails to maintain the green belt between urban areas under challenge C The green belt is vital to maintain the feel of borough and for the wellbeing of the people that live here The housing minister Gavin Barwell stated in a paper recently building on green belt is not needed to solve the UK housing problem
Mr Terry Hughes [3293]			Q01	An additional challenge should be specifically to ensure that development includes infrastructure needs to meet the growing population size

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q01	You plan is to vastly increase the size of Balsall Common conurbation yet do not address the centre of the village which will be inadequate in terms of shops and car parking, and will lack adequate up to date community facilities. A new school will also be required and its location will be critical to ensure easy access and safety of children
Mr. Nicholas Maltby [3224]			Q01	I broadly agree with the challenges and objectives set out. However, many of them, such as health and education concerns relating to the people living in the North of the Borough are beyond the ability of the LPR to have any significant impact. "You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make it drink." In our society, as it has developed, we can no longer accommodate free movement of travelers and gypsies.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q01	All supported in general, in particular Challenges B and D.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q01	The green belt should still be protected, care taken to ensure nothing is built on flood plains. More cycling routes should be developed.
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q01	I agree with the challenges identified. It is essential to keep green spaces allowing for safe places for children to play and go for walks. Currently the Kenilworth Greenway is under threat because of HS2. The Barrett's Farm land is essential for families on the Berkswell side of Balsall Common and is used by all for dog walking and weekend walks.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q01	Key challenge is improvement of Balsall Common centre. Parking and congestion is a daily issue.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q01	Balsall Common needs a plan for it's centre now. If 1000 more homes are built it won't cope. HS2 works coinciding with this scale of development will overwhelm local roads
Mrs Christine Plant [4686]			Q01	The improvement to the centre of Balsall Common is a key challenge that needs to be addressed. The central shopping area has inadequate parking facilities. It is congested at peak times to the point where some residents are forced to shop further afield.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q01	<p>I believe that the following key challenges should also be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Improving the range and number of facilities in Balsall Common, including the town centre, without this creating further problems with traffic and car parking * Retaining the character and attractiveness of rural and semi-rural locations in the borough
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q01	Support challenges identified, but feel that bigger focus should be on congestion reduction, air quality improvement, public transport to Airport and HS2 interchange, energy plan to achieve carbon reduction targets, cycling and pedestrian routes.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q01	Support challenges identified, but feel that higher importance should be given to ensuring that congestion, noise and pollution impacts can be minimised during construction
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q01	Mitigation of construction phase impacts is critically important.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q01	Right challenges identified, need to ensure required housing whilst retaining green belt.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q01	<p>These challenges seem quite comprehensive but Challenge E is critical to preserving the character of Solihull. . It is how SMBC respond that will be the key to success.</p> <p>Challenge J objectives could include the provision of safe cycle routes throughout the borough</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q01	<p>Challenge D - Securing sustainable economic growth:</p> <p>Impact of congestion of motorways, the strategic highway network and rail from additional growth/housing.</p> <p>The impact of additional congestion on the local roads from the proposed new housing sites needs to be assessed. The internal roads within Dickens Heath are already experiencing congestion during peak hours in the morning and do not have the capacity to accommodate additional traffic from the proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley. Proposed sites 12 and 11 would also worsen the existing congestion and cause traffic to back up into Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q01	Agree mostly with the challenges, however they are too focused on special projects and not enough recognition regarding the challenges we face as a community just to retain the status quo. Plan is largely silent on educational facilities for children, particularly in light of the housing growth that is so focused on in the plan. Solihull is well known and recognised throughout the UK for its excellent education and this will be severely affected by the growth forecast.
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q01	Challenges make no reference to managing plan impacts on Balsall Common where proposals to increase the number of houses by over 34% will fundamentally change a village into a town, resulting in overwhelming pressure on already stretched public facilities and infrastructure (schools, medical, roads, car parking) and an outdated and crowded village centre. Neighbourhood planning processes are already dysfunctional and a holistic Balsall Common plan is required to deliver an integrated approach and avoid unacceptable damage to the existing community. There is no recognition of need to address poorly maintained (potholed) rural road infrastructure to encourage sustainable transport (cycling).
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q01	The challenges listed are important.
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q01	Challenge K - 'Protecting and enhancing our natural assets' should give equal weighting to the natural environment that borders Shirley. We have lost too many of these areas already and important areas for wildlife in Shirley should be maintained. Challenge E - 'Protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements' is not being followed in allocations for Shirley.
Mrs Mary Hitchcock [4671]			Q01	Object. Council Tax payers should have been consulted before agreeing to take Birmingham housing shortfall.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q01	Will the impact of Brexit have a material effect on the total number of homes needed in the Borough?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]			Q01	<p>Increased housing would not sustain the attractiveness of the area or existing properties;</p> <p>Increased traffic would not assist tackling climate change;</p> <p>Increased traffic would reduce accessibility;</p> <p>Increased population would add pressure on local services;</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt;</p> <p>Increased flooding;</p> <p>New housing in Shirley area will not benefit HS2;</p>
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q01	<p>Allocation 13. There is less than one kilometre of open green fields between Shirley and Dickens Heath, building on this land will leave a narrow corridor/airfield of green belt land, with no public footpaths.</p> <p>There is a clear boundary on the northern edge, a very well used public footpath, resurfaced by Solihull council after a local petition, and public amenity land.</p> <p>As the only green space is extremely important for the health and welfare of the locals. I walk over these fields every morning on well-worn footpaths, along with many other local residents making it a very enjoyable social activity.</p>
Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [3301]			Q01	<p>I disapprove of so many houses being built in this area 41%. While appreciating the need for more houses. South Shirley green belt is heavily used and enjoy by dog walkers, children, runners, ramblers and cyclists. If the council take all the fields, so much enjoyed by the residence. Activities will be forced onto already busy streets: it will be to the detriment of health. I ask you to consider how much open space there is in Shirley. Already Shirley Park has been eroded for shops and flats. Green lane Park is really hardly fit for purpose.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms D Spavin & Mr S Milner [3883]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q01	support the release of green belt land for employment uses.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q01	Agree that sustaining the attractiveness of the Borough should be a priority but building on the greenbelt wont achieve this - should be a last - not first - option. I refer particularly to the development southwest of Balsall Common where not only are you not protecting gaps between urban areas and settlements but given the highly visible nature of the Frog Lane are detracting from it i don't see how you improving the health and wellbeing if you remove playing fields and allotments. The impacts of High Speed 2 to Basal are huge - will coincide with housing developments!
Ms Lisa Inkpen [3557]			Q01	Balsall Common village centre is highly congested and would benefit from reorganisation to improve access and the flow of traffic around the area.
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q01	Welcome the revisions to P1 in the DLP from the SIO version, and provision within the Policy to support residential and other business uses on this site.
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q01	Agree with the challenge and make comments on challenge D
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q01	Natural England broadly agrees with the challenges your authority has identified as facing Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q01	Challenge N - further consideration needs to be given to impact of HS2 on farms and rural businesses: Loss of agricultural buildings and homes. Severance of existing farmsteads.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q01	<p>Whilst meeting the aspirations of "key businesses" (Challenge D) is important, the Council should also support smaller businesses and employers in the Borough.</p> <p>One of the key challenges currently facing retail businesses such as Notcutts is increased competition from online shopping.</p> <p>Driving need to invest in existing premises, to present an attractive alternative offer.</p>
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q01	<p>Agree that challenges are correctly identified in the DLP.</p> <p>Commentary on Challenge B includes need to have 5 year housing supply; addressing affordable homeownership across the borough and in the mature suburbs; provision for appropriate mix and type including specialist housing.</p> <p>Also, should have some provision for custom and self build housing</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q01	<p>Consider right challenges have been identified.</p> <p>Challenge B is key.</p> <p>Recognised need to plan for economic growth and impacts of HS2 development.</p> <p>Council should use this plan to set the correct minimum number of homes required within this plan period, set out how and where these homes are to be provided, with particular reference to Solihull's share of Birmingham's need.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q01	<p>Correctly identified the challenges that face the local authority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q01	An impressive set of challenges, in some ways I can support the set but they are diverse multi challenges that require their own solutions. It is clear to me that not one will ever be achieved, history tells us this. Recent history is more profound where economic headlines disagree and finance is wasted on chest expanding projects that have no impact on the challenges. All that can be done is control.
phillippa holroyd [3193]			Q01	there is no mention of provisional of healthcare or schooling while meeting these needs. should this not be an integral part of the plan?
Richard Evans [2640]			Q01	1-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q01	No. Challenge C - Balsall Common village centre suffers from many of the challenges listed for Solihull, Shirley, and Chelmsley Wood Centres
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q01	* Yes, agree with the challenges identified particularly Challenge B, the requirement, in line with the NPPF, to meeting the Boroughs full objectively assessed housing needs and also accommodating some of the HMA wide housing shortfall and, * The fourth bullet of the objective in Challenge B to address constraints in supply through windfall development and, * Challenge E, to maintain the integrity of the Green Belt.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q01	Agree with Challenges, in particular to meet full objectively assessed housing needs and accommodating some of HMA shortfall. See response to Q.15.
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q01	Consider consultation identifies the right challenges, but these are not responded to or prioritised in an appropriate way.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SMBC - Public Heath & Commissioning Directorate (Nick Garnett) [2295]			Q01	<p>Challenges A, C, H, J, K</p> <p>Are acknowledged with infrastructure that promotes physical activity, a key facet of a healthy lifestyle, that addresses the health inequalities, values the built and green infrastructure and that supports the creation of a health led environment will be crucial to creating a whole system that encourages activity rather than mitigate against it.</p> <p>To this end Public Health has identified in the draft WM combined authority physical activity strategy supports the adoption of the Sport England and Public Health England 'Active by design' principles and specifying the Lifetime Homes standard in housing.</p>
Solihull Community Housing (Mr K Donohoe) [2166]			Q01	<p>As an established provider of new affordable Homes within Solihull we strive to overcome the major risk of land availability and the limited supply of sites that can be redeveloped for future residential use.</p>
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q01	<p>We feel that the inclusion of the land in the proposed development of our Organic Horticulture/conservation/sports service for Solihull people with mental health problems - see attached description and photos - will negatively impact on Challenges C,F,J,K. Most importantly it delivers part of the Health and Well-being Strategy (J) by contributing to the physical and emotional health of the population; however we also positively contribute to C by providing a healthy space for cycling and walking, plus F and K as our work has sustained/brought back biodiversity through the ponds, meadow, replanting of indigenous apple trees and organic plants/vegetable growing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull School [261]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q01	<p>Little mention of additional education provision proportionate to proposed housing provision.</p> <p>Solihull School identified in Solihull Town centre masterplan as an important asset to the Council, but it not mentioned in Para. 80 of DLP.</p> <p>Solihull School must be protected from encroaching development to continue to provide exceptional level of education and expand to accommodate additional population.</p> <p>Challenge D does not recognise the importance of Solihull School, and its vital role in educating the future's economic growth drivers.</p>
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q01	<p>Support the identification of Challenges H, J and K.</p> <p>These challenges are consistent with Government planning policy (section 8 of the NPPF) on creating healthy communities and are consistent with Sport England's current strategy 'Towards an Active Nation'.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q01	<p>Very relevant and appropriate but concern that subsequent policies (as drafted) will not deliver.</p> <p>Concern that OAN inappropriate and insufficient sites allocated.</p> <p>Inadequate housing provision will lead to: rise in inequality between North and South, increase commuting, stifle economic growth due to lack of labour force.</p>
Stoford Properties [4587]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q01	<p>Agree with Challenges, in particular Challenge D.</p> <p>Employment Land Review by PBA (Jan 2017) highlights Borough is strategically placed to capture industrial and logistics demand because of the access to the national motorway networks.</p> <p>SHLEAA identifies that a recent regional study has confirmed there is substantial demand for large industrial and distribution units across WM Region, with Solihull/M42 at the epicentre.</p> <p>Stoford Properties consider one of objectives of Challenge D should be to maximise employment growth for office, industrial and logistics development in UKC Hub area, where there are excellent road links to A45 and M42.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q01	Yes, agree with the challenges identified particularly meeting housing need across the Borough, including the Borough's own need and where possible assisting with accommodating the HMA wider shortfall.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q01	Agree with challenges identified. Not changed much since SLP 2013. Vitaly important to address unmet housing needs within the Borough, in particular the significant shortfall in the delivery of affordable housing. Some of biggest challenges faced within Borough.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q01	Consider that the most significant challenge is the need to address the imbalance housing offer across the Borough and where possible assisting with accommodating the wider HMA. The additional challenge is addressing the shortfall in the Birmingham Housing Market Area. Not only is there a need to provide the total number of new houses over the plan period but there is a need to provide these locations where the balance of beneficial and adverse effects is most acceptable.
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q01	Council not meeting OAHN.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q01	<p>Welcome challenges noted in the Plan.</p> <p>Not all transport challenges been noted, in particular connectivity issues which could constrain growth.</p> <p>1) West Midlands motorway network - subject to heavy congestion, traffic delays and poor journey reliability.</p> <p>2) Increasing capacity and overcrowding issue on rail.</p> <p>3) Planning for demographic changes. E.g. over 65s increasing car dependency.</p> <p>4) Challenge H should include transport barriers to specific developments e.g. Birmingham Airport.</p>
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q01	<p>Challenges facing the Borough are broadly supported. Specifically working to support the key economic assets identified in Challenge D M and N by producing the Hub Growth and Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>Challenge B- Recognise the importance of meeting housing needs whilst making a significant contribution to the HMA shortfall within the plan period. Where this approach involves green belt release and/or the identification of strategic site allocations for housing (and mixed use development), keen to see large sites developed with supporting infrastructure and facilities (so as not to encourage a pattern of piecemeal development that may not be as sustainable).</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q01	Agree

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q01	I do not believe Solihull Council's challenges have been met in the draft plan. If 1350 new homes are placed in Balsall Common, inequalities in housing, health and well being, and education will not be addressed; the attractiveness of the village, green belt and borough will not be sustained instead the village will no longer be a semi rural village but a soulless commuter town, our natural assets and green belt lost forever; accessibility to motorways and HS2 hub will not be sustained instead congestion will worsen dramatically. Measures should be put in place to avoid building in this area.
Question 2 - Vision				
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q02	The vision set out seems skewed towards the interests of developers, rather than local communities. In particular, by adding piecemeal to existing settlements, there is a great danger that existing communities will come under pressure - transport and infrastructure. This pusillanimous piecemeal approach stands in vivid contrast to an approach that endeavoured to build a new community at Dickens Heath.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q02	Support the approach taken by the council
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q02	<p>Part of the vision referring to HS2 could be made more robust by reference to the Midlands region (East and West) rather than the "wider area". References to "managed growth" gives a misleading message about the Council's strategic objectives for major growth within the Borough, in particular, the UK Central Hub. The Council should consider rephrasing this to better reflect the spatial strategy. Suggested alternatives are "major sustainable growth" or "planned growth".</p> <p>With regard to Green Belt, the Vision should reflect support for release of sustainable locations for growth and appropriate protection of other retained parts of the Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q02	Does not include the vision that essential infrastructure improvements will be delivered for existing communities that will be affected by large scale housing development.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q02	Balsall Common village centre does not meet the needs of existing residents. It is constrained and the village focus needs to extend towards the railway station and medical centre. Opportunities for development need to be considered as part of the master plan for proposed housing to the east of the village.
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q02	<p>Paragraph 83 should be amended to state;</p> <p>"The Borough will have continued to protect the best of the Green Belt, whilst sustainable extensions to those settlements that are highly accessible or have a wide range of services, based upon the evidence set out through the Borough's Green Belt Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal will provide for the needs of the Borough and proportionate needs of the wider HMA, as agreed through the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>Paragraph 84 should be amended to include;</p> <p>"A mix of market and affordable housing will have been provided in Balsall Common, with significant new development on the edge of the settlement, achieved through the careful selection of sites to ensure that the best of the Green Belt is retained, based upon evidence set out in the Borough's Green Belt Assessment."</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q02	<p>Disagree with the Vision as it effects Balsall Common. A mix of housing needs to be provided but significant development on the edge of Balsall Common is inappropriate. Balsall Common is not a sustainable location. Protection of key gaps should be given great weight and a high planning priority.</p> <p>The overall scale of development planned is not required to secure a thriving village centre.. Housing should be reduced to 300-400 homes in Berkswell Parish, plus an appropriate amount for Balsall Parish.</p> <p>Object to the bypass, which is not justified and would impact on openness of the green belt and landscape.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q02	It is considered that as drafted the Borough Vision is ambiguous and should be amended to be explicit on the aim to meet the Borough's own objectively assessed housing needs in full, as well as an adequate proportion of the shortfall arising in the wider Housing Market Area.
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q02	Many of the proposals in the plan contradict statements in the vision such as protecting the Green Belt, sustainable development, maintaining the distinctive historic and natural environment. In section 85, there is no reference to Catherine-de-Barnes in the text.
Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd [3894]	Harriet Barber	Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd (Harriet Barber) [3895]	Q02	Support overarching Vision included in paragraphs 79 and 80.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Crean [3631]			Q02	<p>There is too much emphasis on the flawed HS2 proposals. There needs to be more focus on intensifying developments by increasing densities and a wider mix of affordability and tenure to accommodate people of all ages and abilities.</p> <p>There should be more acknowledgment of the agricultural aspects of land use within the borough, including the need to be able to grow more food locally. It is welcome that soil quality is part of the evidence base.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q02	<p>We agree with the Borough Vision, in particular (paragraph 86) that for Balsall Common it is acknowledged that market and affordable housing should be provided for the village by way of a sustainable urban extension, to also address community needs and that an alternative route to Kenilworth Road can be provided</p>
Colin Davis [3352]			Q02	<p>more pie in the sky words. i dont believe letting developers knock down large houses in the mature suburbs to infill the back gardens with extra houses with tiny gardens, or worse all those too expensive to buy retirement apartment blocks is a form of regenerating and enhancing a leafy suburb . if the transport strategy is just to make driving a worse experience and force through cycle lanes then it will never work. by your own admission Solihull has an aging population who are unlikely to start cycling they need safe and reliable public transport</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q02	<p>Do not agree entirely as too much emphasis on HS2 being the panacea. There should be more promotion of local jobs for local people. Local economies need to be developed to avoid traffic congestion.</p> <p>Pleased about emphasis on affordable housing. This has to include social-rented housing. Off site provision should be the exception.</p> <p>Need to adequately address how people with disabilities will be provided for.</p> <p>Detail regarding dealing with climate change is good, but it should receive much more emphasis in the overview of the vision, and throughout the document.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q02	<p>not entirely - borough vision is more than just HS2, and DLP needs to reflect this. Support inclusion of affordable housing and climate change in vision but would like to see more prominence for these in it.</p> <p>While supporting inclusion of NS Regen area in vision would like to see more reference in the DLP to job creation in Chelmsley Wood.</p>
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q02	I cannot support proposed housing that is accepted as being remote from most facilities.i can only support large scale housing if it is conditional on providing infrastructure such as new schools,sports facilities , new parks better parking in the centre and at the station and a promise of relief for the already strained Kenilworth Road..We deserve much more than just housing.
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q02	Support of the vision.
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q02	see below
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q02	<p>Too much reliance on assumed benefits of HS2. Support intention to minimise disruption, but seems inevitable that this will be significant, while far from clear that the stated benefits will ever be realised.</p> <p>There needs to be a greater emphasis on socially rented housing in the vision.</p> <p>Climate change should take a central role in the vision with clear emphasis on how Solihull will play an active part in the threat it poses.</p>
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q02	qualified support for the vision depending on what is meant by 'aspirational'. would like to see place of Shirley higher in the hierarchy of 'mature suburbs'.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q02	<p>Support much of vision but HS2 overemphasised.</p> <p>Should promote homegrown economy and not just key economic assets that are already doing well.</p> <p>Need more social-rented affordable housing.</p> <p>Climate change needs to be added to headline.</p> <p>Support inclusion of NSRA GI, but needs more on local economy.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q02	<p>The Borough Vision is defective.</p> <p>- housing proposed would undermine the character of Solihull and reduce its rural features.</p> <p>Heavy traffic levels would make journeys slow and uncomfortable</p> <p>Vision should be revised to reflect the fact that Solihull is a location for employment for many who live in other local authority areas and is itself a place for people who work in Birmingham to live.</p> <p>Vision should state that the Green Belt will be fully protected and that new housing will be developed where small, sustainable locations are available; large greenfield sites for new housing will generally not be permitted</p>
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q02	<p>UK Central Hub section excellent.</p> <p>Question whether sufficient housing allocated.</p>
David Holtom [3685]			Q02	<p>The improvement of Balsall Common centre needs to be addressed to cater for any significant population increase.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Knowles [3742]			Q02	<p>In relation to "significant new development on the edge of Knowle" in paragraph 84, the scale of housing development proposed for Knowle is disproportionate and unacceptable, and there has been inadequate consideration of reasonable alternative patterns of distribution across the Borough.</p> <p>The views expressed in the KDBH Neighbourhood Plan Residents Survey must be acted upon when finalising the plan for the Borough Vision.</p>
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q02	<p>Broadly agree with Vision Overview.</p> <p>However, Sites 4 and 13 do not accord with this overall vision.</p> <p>Distinct rural character of Dickens Heath will not be retained.</p> <p>Integrity of Green Belt and important gaps with Shirley and Majors Green will be eroded.</p>
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q02	<p>Object to vision.</p> <p>Does not provide for improving the centre of Balsall Common nor how it will need to change to cater for new development.</p> <p>Fails to note the need for improvements to local facilities, services and public transport.</p> <p>Negative to state 'Schools will have continued to thrive and grow' as already at capacity.</p> <p>Relocation of school should be referenced here.</p> <p>Do not agree with 'an alternative route will have been provided to relieve traffic from the Kenilworth Road'. Will result in a further loss of greenbelt, an increase in traffic and act as a catalyst for additional development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q02	<p>The vision fails to fully mention enhancement of EXISTING arrangements.</p> <p>*It focusses far more on NEW development.</p> <p>*The centre of Balsall Common should be enhanced to make it much more appropriate to its PRESENT size and nature.</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q02	<p>Paragraphs 73, 74, 75 do not seem to have been considered for Balsall Common. Increasing the village size as proposed will weaken the integrity of the community, losing the village spirit, the healthier lifestyles mentioned will not happen with the hugely increased number of cars, especially from Site 1, recent research shows clearly the damage to physical and mental welfare from traffic pollution and loss of green spaces.</p> <p>Many points made in paragraph 86 will be destroyed in Balsall Common, by using Green Belt land there will be loss of fields, trees and open countryside.</p>
Ellandi LLP [3670]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q02	<p>Welcome reference to Chelmsley Wood as a focus for regeneration and growth and policy protection afforded which subject to wider amendments to the Plan will support investment strategy for Chelmsley Wood shopping centre. There are development opportunities throughout the centre which should be identified in the Plan as part of the masterplan/investment strategy. The whole of the town centre should be defined as primary shopping area to ensure that retail proposals can come forward without unnecessary sequential and impact assessment requirements.</p>
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q02	<p>Support Vision Overview.</p> <p>Explanation supporting vision should include reference to need of MSA to support the motorway network.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q02	<p>Relevant and appropriate but concern that policies will not deliver.</p> <p>Timescales of Local Plan contradict Council Plan, which states that UKC will be delivered in 2020.</p> <p>Para. 73 contrary to spirit NPPF as it implies there will remain an unmet need for housing.</p> <p>Should be amended to read 'responded and met the Borough's local housing need...'</p>
Genting Solihull Ltd [3409]	Ms Andrea Arnall	Turley Associates (Ms Andrea Arnall) [2025]	Q02	<p>Generally support the Vision, in particular the statement that "the NEC will have diversified its offer in leisure and visitor facilities and remained a nationally important centre for exhibition and major events" by 2033.</p>
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q02	<p>Agree with Borough Vision.</p> <p>Need Council will and policies to follow them through.</p> <p>Particularly supportive of approach to consider needs of Rural Area (Para. 83).</p>
Graham Brown [2506]			Q02	<p>The proposals provide an excellent balance if new developments are required in the rural villages without destroying the atmosphere of these communities .</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q02	<p>I do not believe it is within the Council's power to make people safer, except in relation to road transport and health which is already covered in the vision statement. Similarly prosperity depends on national government and worldwide circumstances (outside of Council control) and the likelihood is that people will become less prosperous over the coming years due to these factors. I have therefore deleted the words safer and prosperous from the vision statement, but have added "fulfilled" since by increasing the local cultural opportunities, Solihull people can become fulfilled which can be more important than prosperity alone.</p>
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q02	<p>Paragraph 83 refers to local facilities and services readily accessible on foot and bicycle, though bus services in Hampton have been withdrawn and no safe cycle route exists beyond Catherine de Barnes. The claims about continuing to protect the green belt and environment is not based on fact. Welcome commitment to secure the reclamation of the former ammunition depot in Hampton.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q02	Paragraph 83 refers to local facilities and services readily accessible on foot and bicycle, though bus services in Hampton have been withdrawn and no safe cycle route exists beyond Catherine de Barnes. The claims about continuing to protect the green belt and environment is not based on fact. Welcome commitment to secure the reclamation of the former ammunition depot in Hampton.
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q02	Para. 83 fails to define how justification of release of Green Belt land for sustainable extensions will be made. Should be amended to include reference to evidence base. Para. 84 should be amended to refer to evidence base.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q02	Vision paragraph for Hockley Heath (paragraph 84) includes provision for affordable housing. However, residents identified a need for some new housing but support a mix that suits 'all pockets', especially the provision of bungalows or similar properties that would be accessible for elderly residents or those looking to downsize, not just affordable housing. Residents strongly feel that Hockley Heath should not be earmarked as available for development for affordable housing for the Borough, as this statement suggests. We would like this statement reworded to include Hockley Heath in the earlier part of the sentence with Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath.
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q02	DLP established a positive economic context and ambition for Solihull. Support the proactive visioning within the Draft Local Plan. Concern that this ambition is not matched through other draft policies, including scale of housing to be provided for in Policy P5.
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q02	DLP established a positive economic context and ambition for Solihull. Support the proactive visioning within the Draft Local Plan. Concern that this ambition is not matched through other draft policies, including scale of housing to be provided for in Policy P5.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q02	<p>Only In a very small part yes, as they are clearly written from an urban Solihull centric perspective, once more bringing into disrepute the belief that Solihull successfully combines a well-balanced combined Urban and Rural vision.</p> <p>SMBC are not following their own policies and building on the most vulnerable portion of the Green Belt between Balsall Common and Coventry.</p>
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q02	<p>Support Vision linking future economic success with key economic assets at UK Central Hub.</p> <p>Development at Dickens Heath will meet aims of Para. 83.</p> <p>More land needs to be released for housing.</p>
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q02	<p>Broadly support.</p> <p>Vision Overview solely focused on opportunities and economic growth provided by HS2.</p> <p>Should also recognise economic growth independent of HS2, e.g. JLR.</p> <p>Does not recognise infrastructure needs which should be addressed to support such businesses, including connecting suppliers, operations and markets.</p> <p>Welcome reference to JLR in Paragraphs 72 to 87. Should also reference relationship with Fen End site close to Borough boundary.</p>
James Hatton [3312]			Q02	<p>Whilst I support some aspects of the vision, the areas selected, particularly those in green belt away from major roads or rail links are completely wrong. We have the M42, A45 and West Coast main line running through our borough, as well as the planned HS2. The areas selected for development do not take advantage of these. The Arden Triangle proposal in particular would destroy Knowle and I believe is a lazy option being taken based in the ambitions of the Arden academy with little regard to the impact on the village.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q02	<p>I agree with the borough vision. I admire the level of ambition, which I hope will not be derailed by economic uncertainty that is likely for the next few years. I trust that risks such as these have been considered</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q02	<p>* Agree in principle and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o That high density development will have been delivered along key public transport corridors, and sustainable urban extensions accommodated to help meet the housing needs of the Borough and its housing market area.
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q02	<p>Housing development in Balsall Common constitutes transformational change.</p> <p>How is SMBC proposing Balsall Common's centre growth could happen? What is required?</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q02	<p>Agree with the Borough vision as set out and consider there are opportunities for new development to come forward that will fit comfortably with the proposed vision to allow the delivery of the housing needed within the HMA.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lionel Johnson [3582]			Q02	<p>do not agree with vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - neither provides for improving centre of BC nor how to change to cater for growing community - already insufficient parking - fails to note need for improvements to local facilities, services and public transport; encourage more sustainable travel patterns; improved connectivity to surrounding communities - generic statement 'Schools will have...and grow' naive- primary school already at capacity; required growth not possible at current location <p>Relocation alongside other significant developments proposed</p> <p>also do not agree with 'an alternative route...Kenilworth Road'. alternative route will result in loss of greenbelt; increase traffic; catalyst for additional development.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q02	Support the Vision for Meriden.
Messrs Wheeldon & Gooding [3886]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q02	Support vision subject to time for other businesses to relocate where necessary.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q02	<p>Partly support.</p> <p>Written from urban perspective, does not reflect a well-balanced urban and rural vision.</p> <p>Green Belt gap under threat.</p> <p>Balsall Common already congested, with poor infrastructure and poor public sector connectivity.</p> <p>Looks to East and South, not towards Solihull.</p> <p>No consideration given to impact of JLR development at Fen End.</p> <p>Bypass should be on West side.</p> <p>Disproportionate housing will impact sensitive and fragile Green Belt areas.</p>
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q02	<p>partial agreement with the vision, but overall not supportive of the vision as set out in the document. Concerned that development will lead to loss of green belt between BS and Coventry.</p>
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q02	<p>Agree in principle and in particular:</p> <p>Rural area Vision and sustaining network of strong and vibrant communities & increased range of affordable housing.</p> <p>However, concerned over lack of reference to Catherine de Barnes in the 'distinct places' section.</p> <p>Cdb has strong, vibrant community, some facilities and accepted successful housing development.</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q02	<p>Largely I agree with the vision but I think the idea for housing and moving between housing and workplace is flawed. Particularly object to large % of housing around Shirley, Dickens Heath etc. We may be villages but we are becoming 'go no where' as the roads grind to a halt.</p>
miss Stephanie Archer [3793]			Q02	<p>Vision for Dickens Heath and South Shirley is not followed through as the proposed housing sites not consistent with paragraph on how settlements have green belt separating them because will reduce gap to one field only which is not green belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q02	Vision for Balsall Common given in paragraph 86 fails to mention that the centre must be improved to make it fit for the larger number of residents planned, provide additional car parking and bring it to a modern standard with an improved balance between pedestrians and vehicles.
Mr Anthony Morris [3401]			Q02	<p>Ref 86.</p> <p>I would add that the following sentence:</p> <p>"Open green spaces should to be provided, centrally located with the enlarged village, in keeping with previous development"</p> <p>The fields to the east of meeting house lane are a valued local amenity, used by many dog walkers and children. Similar to the Riddings Hill development, in which Lavender Hall park was developed as an open space for the community, a similar accessible local space, in a central location should be protected for.</p>
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q02	<p>I think more clarification is needed on relieving additional traffic, as this means both existing and additional traffic caused by the new housing.</p> <p>The vision should be aimed at providing additional housing using facilities that are already available and minimise impact on the village itself. For example, building housing in proximity to the dual carriageway north of the village (the north exit being the major in/out route) minimises the impact on the village itself.</p>
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q02	Yes, however how do you quantify 'happier' this is very subjective and although admirable in including this in the consultation a difficult one to fulfil and should perhaps be removed.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q02	Solihull's proposal for Balsall Common contradicts its Plan. It is disproportionate in scale versus the current settlement size, eroding hierarchy and balance. 1150+ homes built on ecologically important Green Belt and furthermore terribly reducing the Meriden Gap is not managed nor low impact development. The distinctiveness of the North and East of the village with healthy access to ancient woodland is removed in totality and residents once on the edge of the settlement, by choice, will find themselves living in the middle of the settlement. There is no space to channel more traffic through without the same destruction.
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q02	Under point 73 reference is require to ensure that essential infrastructure is in place for local residents as well as local businesses

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q02	You talk of the pleasant well facilitated rural village themes that make up our lovely well presented Borough and then set about to destroy it in large part. None of which , when the public are made aware of how their current environments are to be altered, receives the thumbs up . The alternative is to leave well alone!
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q02	No I would refer to the answer in question 1. Balsall Common village centre on Staion Road needs to be reviewed for the longer term success of a growing village. It does not appear on the plan.
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q02	<p>The Shirley Mature Suburb will not retain the suburbs leafy character as the draft plan shows building houses on our network of high quality open spaces and not preserving them which is in direct conflict with the Borough Vision.</p> <p>The Parkgate development has only served to increase the decimation of the Stratford Road shopping area, moving some shops from the Stratford Road to Parkgate and leaving them vacant. Parkgate has attracted shoppers to the ASDA anchor store from outside the area contributing nothing to the community except increased levels of traffic. Shirley should be given a higher priority in the plan.</p>
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q02	can you provide your detailed view of how you envisage improvements to affect Berkswell/BC villages? I forecast nothing more than chaos as the population you hope to provide housing for expands uncontrollably.
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q02	Again, there is no mention of Balsall Common centre; the vision should include improving the centre.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q02	The vision is inadequate in its treatment of the Meriden Gap in spite of the SMBC's own Atkins report describing it as "vital" and "strategic".
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q02	Agree with the Council's vision for the Borough as set out but consider that there are some missed opportunities for smaller scale developments to come forward in other poorly performing Green Belt locations which would assist in the Council in reducing its reliance on windfall permissions and assist in its visionary aim of ensuring that centres such as Knowle remain strong, vibrant places to live.
Mr James Lupton [3554]			Q02	A more ambitious vision is required for Balsall Common that covers development of the centre and transport infrastructure. Traffic problems will beset the village whilst HS2 construction and the new house building is taking place. A better road solution is urgently required.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q02	<p>Broadly agree with Vision, but difficult to see how parts will be delivered, especially Shirley.</p> <p>Para. 74 - Ignores erosion of Green Belt and threat of urban sprawl.</p> <p>Para. 79 - Difficult to see how leafy suburban character can be retained if transport infrastructure is updated to cope with existing and additional development.</p>
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q02	Does not include a vision for infrastructure improvements necessary to cope with very large housing developments being proposed.
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q02	<p>Whilst agreeing the spirit of vision in paragraph 86, the narrative implies that the centre of the village is currently thriving when in reality it already faces significant challenges in terms of parking and loss of commercial properties to residential build thereby further restricting meaningful expansion. Many of the properties are old with a poor selection of facilities available when compared to Knowle or Dorridge. Overwhelming expansion of Balsall Common can only worsen this.</p> <p>There is also no reference to Green belt between Balsall and Coventry which is already highly pressurised and risks being decimated by the proposals</p>
Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]			Q02	Adding more housing in greenbelt areas detracts from the vision. Building the proposed additional housing on the existing country side will not solve the traffic and schooling issues specifically in the Balsall Common area. Both the school and local facilities are currently over capacity, without the additional of 1600 plus cars and kids. Nothing in the proposal caters for this increase and a considerable lack of consideration to this.
Mr Matthew Taylor [2935]			Q02	Vital to have an allocation of homes spread out over the borough but with protection in areas that are historically important such as Berkswell, Hampton, Catherine de Barnes etc. by restricting to small developments.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q02	The disproportionate allocation of Solihull's housing needs to Balsall Common does NOT meet the objectives of the vision as outlined for the residents of Balsall Common. It is therefore basically unfair as the village has had far more than its fair share of housing development over the last 20 years. The natural environment which we enjoy today is neither being protected or enhanced - it is being systematically destroyed. Rather than graft more housing onto an already overloaded infrastructure which is totally unsustainable the logical approach would be to create a completely new "town" elsewhere in the borough.
Mr Michael Scott [3291]			Q02	It feels somewhat contradictory. You stress the importance of protecting the green belt, yet significant development will occur around Balsall Common. These objectives are at odds.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q02	The vision for Balsall Common is fantasy. There is nothing to suggest that the current choice of location of developments will provide the outcome of the vision. I see a vision of a reduced quality of life, increased pollution, increased pressure on social services, a combination of HS2, bypass, and housing development turning the east side of the village into a concrete and noisy thoroughfare, with reduced natural habitat and a village centre unable to cope with demands of the additional population.
Mr Paul Southall [3776]			Q02	<p>The proposals have focused more upon the less affluent areas of the area, how does this ensure a fairer more equal borough, as stated in paragraph 73?</p> <p>The area around the South of Dog Kennel Lane, the Village Green, Shirley, Cheswick Green, Blythe Valley Business Park and Dickens Heath will no longer be a rural area, housing is planned to be so dense.</p>
Mr Peter Seddon [2409]			Q02	Whilst the Borough has a vision to "retain its sense of identity both in its urban and rural area (including appropriate protection of the Green Belt); and the quality of the environment that make it a special place." It is difficult to reconcile that statement with the level of house building that has and will be taking place at considerable cost to the green belt (Site 4, 12 and 13 are all in the green belt.).
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q02	Balsall Common centre is already congested and difficult to use. It needs a major rethink

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q02	<p>Whilst the actual fabric of the centre of Knowle will be protected as far as development is concerned the character of the village will be destroyed by the proposed completely inappropriate development of the two proposed sites for housing. The infrastructure is already overloaded and the vehicles associated with 1,050 homes will cause massive issues.</p> <p>There is available space for housing around Catherine de Barnes where the main business development is due to take place around HS2 and the airport expansion - the housing will then be directly next to where the jobs will be.</p>
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q02	As far as Balsall Common is concerned there seems no plans to improve the centre. Another 1,000 houses will mean a quarter increase in the number of people using it. There needs to be more shops and more car parking with particular thought applied to the main roundabout on the Kenilworth Road. There is room to expand the shopping centre on the opposite side of the road to the present centre.
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q02	There is no vision for Balsall Common town centre improvement. The current arrangement results in a standstill mornings noon and evening S. It requires a significant overhaul to limit cars through the use of a nearby park and walk access scheme or similar. Doing nothing is not a viable option
Mr Stephen Hill [3208]			Q02	<p>No, the Vision needs to include something specific about Sporting Activities/Sports Facilities, to give confidence that the Council does care about, and wishes to plan appropriately for, Sporting Activities in Solihull.</p> <p>A general statement, or appropriate statements within relevant sections of the Vision, is required about Sporting Activities/Sports Facilities, such as - 'In promoting Health and Well Being, Solihull will have a wide range of facilities for outdoor and indoor sporting activities, to meet the needs of its residents, with the Council working with existing agencies, clubs and sports providers to improve existing facilities.'</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q02	<p>The 2012 National Planning Policy Framework states that the Green Belt has five functions: 'to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character or historic town; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land'. In short, it helps to keep the spatial and material character of England's cities static.</p> <p>I fail to understand how the planned housing developments meet these requirements as they are mostly green belt.</p>
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q02	Allocation 13 does not add to the North Solihull regeneration programme in any way
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q02	Managed growth is your stated aim but for Balsall Common I see little in the proposal that takes into account the close on 30% increase in dwellings. Furthermore the intention is to use green belt land in the strategically important Meriden Gap that is the only remaining feature to the prevent the urban sprawl from Birmingham/Solihull towards Coventry. Proposals also from Coventry City Council indicate a further narrowing of the gap. You should consider brownfield and PDL sites around the settlement of Balsall Common as priority, you have chosen to ignore these, why?
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q02	<p>Vision Overview is supported.</p> <p>Paragraphs 82 and 83 strongly supported.</p>
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q02	Knowle needs long stay car parking included in the local plan, and primary schools need either expansion of a new primary school built.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q02	<p>Vision fails to address:</p> <p>Key challenge is improvement of Balsall Common centre.</p> <p>Parking and congestion is a daily issue.</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q02	Balsall Common centre should be included
Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]			Q02	comment on borough vision and Balsall Common sites 1, 2 & 3. Suggest that development should take place at the HS2 areas and at a reasonable distance from existing development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Christine Plant [4686]			Q02	The improvement to the centre of Balsall Common is a key challenge that needs to be addressed. The central shopping area has inadequate parking facilities. It is congested at peak times to the point where some residents are forced to shop further afield.
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q02	<p>I believe that my responses to question 1 should also form part of the vision for the plan, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Improving the range and number of facilities in Balsall Common, including the town centre, without this creating further problems with traffic and car parking * Retaining the character and attractiveness of rural and semi-rural locations in the borough
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q02	Important to provide affordable housing in Solihull area.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q02	<p>Concern about the Meriden Gap at its narrowest point between Coventry and Solihull.</p> <p>Need additional infrastructure in place prior to any major developments</p> <p>New development in Balsall Common should be to the north or north west of the village</p> <p>Any incursion into the Green Belt should be within the Borough not towards other larger conurbations.</p>
Mrs Geri Silverton [2911]			Q02	Concerned about paragraph 87 relating to the vision for Dickens Heath, which was designed as an independent village with its own infrastructure but has had more than its fair share of expansion, with new developments still being completed, resulting in infrastructure that cannot cope and car based journeys where walking was envisaged.
Mrs Jacqui Gardner [3687]			Q02	Your vision does not mention how the current Balsall Common village centre will support the additional families which will have been housed there.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q02	<p>para. 74 - The two proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley would not protect and enhance the natural environment of the rural village of Dickens Heath, and therefore these two proposed housing sites do not support the borough vision stated in chapter 4</p> <p>para. 83 - The two proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley would not protect the best of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Para. 87 - The above two proposed housing sites would result in the loss of open countryside around the village of Dickens Heath.</p>
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q02	<p>Object strongly to wording of vision for Hockley Heath in paragraph 84 which focuses solely on affordable housing, whereas a Parish Council consultation event identified need for a mix of properties especially for the elderly and people looking to downsize. Affordable housing being built in the village and there are other groups that have equally important needs who are not being addressed. Hockley Heath should be included in those settlements identified for a mix of market an affordable housing.</p>
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q02	<p>Whilst agreeing the spirit of vision in paragraph 86, the narrative implies that the centre of Balsall Common is currently thriving when in reality it already faces significant challenges in terms of parking, loss of commercial properties to residential thereby restricting meaningful expansion, and old properties with a poor selection of facilities when compared to Knowle or Dorridge, and overwhelming expansion can only worsen this. There is no reference to green belt between Balsall and Coventry which is already highly pressurised and risks being decimated by the proposals.</p>
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q02	<p>Who can say that Solihull will have more equality and a healthier lifestyle for its residents? Taking away a vast area of green belt in one area i.e> Shirley, Dickens Heath, will not lead to healthier lifestyles as residents' outdoor activities will not be as accessible.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q02	<p>The Shirley Mature Suburb will not retain the leafy character as the draft plan proposes housing on our network of high quality open spaces and not preserving them is in direct conflict with the Borough Vision.</p> <p>The Parkgate development has only served to increase the decimation of the Stratford Road shopping area, moving some shops from the Stratford Road to Parkgate and leaving them vacant. Parkgate has attracted shoppers to the ASDA anchor store from outside the area contributing nothing to the community except increased levels of traffic. Shirley should be given a higher priority in the plan</p>
Mrs Maria Morris [3534]			Q02	<p>It doesn't make it clear where the relief road for Kenilworth road lies, at which points it will provide relief - this is very important for traffic and the character of the village.</p> <p>The village should have central green spaces incorporated into any new development.</p>
Mrs Mary Hitchcock [4671]			Q02	Balsall Common Centre is a bottleneck. Question SMBC funding in Balsall Common.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q02	<p>Agree with very little.</p> <p>Clearly written from an urban Solihull-centric perspective.</p>
Ms D Spavin & Mr S Milner [3883]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q02	agree with the vision, but have some concerns that smaller employment businesses in the area may be at a disadvantage.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q02	I can see the vision you paint for Balsall, Berkswell etc but I don't see how what you are proposing meets that need or meets the vision. Through the document what you vision and what you are proposing are at odds. The Traffic problem in Balsall is to the southwest of the town -where you are proposing significant development and no where in this document have you taken any account of the JLR development in Fen End, rumoured to have 3000 employees.
Ms Lisa Inkpen [3557]			Q02	Balsall common centre needs to be mentioned for improvement to cope with the increased housing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q02	Agree with the vision but would like to see minor amends to it to make consistent with P1
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q02	<p>Welcome support for farm-based rural economy in Para. 83.</p> <p>Would like to see strengthened references, and in compliance with paragraphs 20 and 21 of NPPF.</p>
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q02	Should be updated to emphasise that the Council supports the sustainable growth of all businesses within Solihull, not just key economic assets.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q02	Agree with the vision as set out in the DLP
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q02	<p>Agree with Vision.</p> <p>Agree significant new development should be directed towards sustainable settlement of Dickens Heath to meet Borough's housing need.</p> <p>Dickens Heath has number of services and good public transport links.</p> <p>Dickens Heath is capable of accommodating and being enhanced by level of growth identified.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q02	Agree with the Borough vision as set out and consider there are opportunities for new development to come forward that will fit comfortably with the proposed vision to allow the delivery of the housing needed within the HMA.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q02	The vision statement is good, it appears to rely on HS2, the Airport and JLR - things that are not in their control. Balsall Common is affected by the increased traffic from the Airport and soon to be HS2. This does not fit in with the vision in any way. Housing should be moderated in this area. A larger population cannot be supported by the current infrastructure. The village centre is bursting at the seams now and development in the centre exacerbates this and is a poor showing against the vision for Balsall Common. We want no more of this.
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q02	Vision for Balsall Common, is insular. The influence of North/South traffic on A452 is being added to by increased West /East flow and employment towards Coventry and new JLR site at Fen End. The proposal to divert traffic / build bypass should be shown on the plan as it is pivotal to how the settlement develops. A much larger BC is not a big issue for me, provided done sympathetically with appropriate school and recreational facilities.and roads.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q02	2-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q02	<p>The vision relies on increasing transport dependency. It implies that employment growth will necessitate people travelling from outside the area to work within Solihull, and Solihull residents travelling long distances outside the Borough to go to work. A better strategy would be to focus on creating local employment, with the transport growth aimed at transporting materials and goods. Transport of people for employment purposes could be reduced by improved broadband network infrastructure and tele-working.</p> <p>A bypass for Balsall Common is proposed without consideration of the impact on the viability of the village centre, the environment, or existing residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q02	<p>Agree in principle with particular reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Higher density development will have been delivered along key public transport corridors, and sustainable urban extensions accommodated to help meet the housing needs of the Borough and its housing market area. o The Rural Area vision of sustaining the network of strong and vibrant communities across the rural area o In the Dickens Heath, Tidbury Green, Cheswick Green Rural Area the reference to contributing to meeting the Borough's housing need, whilst retaining its intrinsic character of distinctive villages separated by open countryside.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q02	<p>Agree in principle, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher density development along key public transport corridors. Sustainable urban extensions. Rural Area vision, noting severe shortage of affordable housing. Mix of market and affordable housing in Knowle and Dorridge. Reference should also be made to affordable housing need in Hockley Heath.
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q02	<p>Number of priorities seem in contradiction to one another, and it is not clear which of these is the most important.</p> <p>Para. 87 is flawed, i.e. significant new development at Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley park will not allow the area to retain its intrinsic character of distinct villages separated by open countryside.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q02	The inclusion of the land where we deliver our Organic Horticulture/Conservation/Sports project for people with mental health problems (see attached description and photos) in the Arden Triangle development will undermine two of the Borough Vision priority areas. The loss of the service will reduce the Borough's aim to 'Improve Health and Well-being' and also 'Building Stronger Communities' as it involves both health promoting activities; and also engages with Solihull residents (see attached petition) not only through their direct access for themselves/family or friends, but also as volunteers and more widely at our popular twice annual plant and pop-up shop sales.
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q02	Relevant and appropriate but concern that policies will not deliver. Timescales of Local Plan contradict Council Plan, which states that UKC will be delivered in 2020. Para. 73 contrary to spirit NPPF as it implies there will remain an unmet need for housing. Should be amended to read 'responded and met the Borough's local housing need...'
Stoford Properties [4587]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q02	Support the Vision. In particular, agree with Vision for the UKC Hub area and the UK Central initiative captures the potential and ambitions for the Borough as a catalyst for a globally competitive knowledge based economy and driver for sustainable economic growth and employment. To achieve this Vision, needs to be sufficient employment land to meet the economic needs of industry and the clear market demand that exists.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q02	* Agree in principle and in particular: Rural area Vision, Specific rural vision for Catherine de Barnes, Hampton and Meriden which states a mix of market and affordable housing will be required.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q02	<p>Agree with Vision.</p> <p>Sets out to be forward thinking to provide the homes, employment opportunities and green spaces require to provide for sustainable and balanced communities and managed growth for the Borough.</p> <p>Consider Growth Options (in particular G) meet the Vision.</p> <p>E.g. Site 9 in Knowle.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q02	<p>Taylor Wimpey is committed to making places where people want to live and supporting the aims of the Council in creating 'attractive and aspirational place to live, learn, invest, work and play.'</p> <p>To ensure that the above vision is fulfilled within the plan period there needs to be specific, achievable and deliverable growth in planned locations.</p> <p>Support the need to release parts of the Green Belt to meet housing need.</p> <p>Vision should recognise that there will be selected releases/amendments to the Green Belt boundary to provide sustainable housing growth.</p> <p>Support planned Green Belt release for well integrated sustainable urban extensions.</p>
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q02	<p>Welcome Vision overall.</p> <p>Reference to the wider West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and meeting the aspirations of key businesses would therefore be welcomed, to help maintain Solihull's important regional and sub-regional role.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q02	Welcome the opportunity to maximise the economic and social benefits of HS2 and the interchange for the Borough and wider area. In particular the opportunity to ensure that HS2 Interchange is well integrated to the Borough's green infrastructure and key economic assets, including Birmingham Airport, the NEC and JLR will help capitalise on the potential. The UGC will continue to explore how development opportunities within the UKC Hub area can contribute significantly towards the Council's vision, in particular bringing forward the delivery of sustainable forms of development and required infrastructure within the Hub for the benefit of the wider area.
Viv Smith [4670]			Q02	The housing proposals for Dickens Heath do not comply with policies in the adopted local plan/review or paragraph 87 in the draft local plan as would not retain its intrinsic character of a distinctive village separated from others by open countryside.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q02	The borough vision fails to address improvements to Balsall Common village. Instead in placing additional housing on greenbelt land the area will lose its natural assets. The fields of Barretts farm where much of the housing is planned at present provide a sanctuary for residents and local birds and wildlife. This area of greenbelt between the current housing and the HS2 route requires additional planting in order to provide a buffer from HS2 to the local community not additional housing. HS2 is already causing destruction of the countryside, footpaths and cycle routes. Further housing would worsen the situation.
Question 3 – Spatial Strategy				
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q03	The document talks about piecemeal development being accessible. However, this accessibility is at the expense of existing transport links, which are often already frequently congested. In the B90 area, there will be substantial additional congestion on the Stratford Road and other arterial routes to the motorway, to the Town Centres, and to the stations.
Andrew Hodge [3103]			Q03	I understand SCC favours the decision to commence the larger residential developments at Arden school and Knowle Football club. The numerous smaller infill options have been excluded from the council draft plan. I applaud this decision which delivers maximum housing growth potential without blighting large areas of rural Knowle and Dorridge for relatively little housing occupancy upside. Representations to pursue smaller infill options should be resisted - they underestimate the corrosive nature of suburban sprawl into green belt land and the negative economic impact on the Solihull borough of reducing the mix of suburban/rural housing stock across the region.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q03	- support the councils spatial strategy conclusion re site 9 (growth option G)
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q03	<p>Support the identification of Growth Option E.</p> <p>The identified development figures for jobs and homes in the UKC area represent a conservative assessment of development potential and capacity. The LPR should promote the maximised economic and social benefits that can be achieved.</p> <p>The sequential approach set out at paragraph 96 of the Draft LPR should be radically revisited. It currently contradicts much of the broader content of the Plan's Vision and Spatial Strategy relating to the scale of growth to be delivered at the UKC Hub which involves releasing land from the Green Belt to meet development needs.</p>
Ayaz Mahmood [4485]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q03	<p>Para. 96.</p> <p>Strategic objectives sequential approach should start with and include the development of Brown Field Land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q03	<p>Risk of not sustaining a rural based economy, particularly livestock farming.</p> <p>No evidence that some of the 'guiding principles generally in support' are reflected in the proposals for Balsall Common.</p> <p>Balsall Parish support Option A - High frequency public transport and hubs with improved train services that justifies the provision of affordable housing that is located to provide good access to employment without the need for a car.</p>
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q03	<p>BDW and GE welcome approach within the DLPlan and agree that development should be focused in most accessible locations and to maximise the objective of ensuring that new development delivers the infrastructure needed to support new development.</p> <p>But concerned that DLP does not set out how it will assess alternative locations and the absence of this will leave the DLP unsound.</p> <p>suggest that this can be remedied through amendment to para 101.</p> <p>Also, do not consider that the implementation of the spatial distribution is correct.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		Q03	<p>Balsall Common is not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Significant new housing should be located in areas of high public transport accessibility to employment growth.</p> <p>Need greater densities and more development in Solihull Town Centre, Shirley and UK Central.</p> <p>Failure to investigate the potential for a garden village close to the A45.</p> <p>Use of previously developed land (PDL) is supported but no PDL has been identified in Balsall Common.</p> <p>There is a disconnect between the evidence and the sites chosen.</p> <p>Growth is unequally distributed without justification. All parts of the Borough should take some new housing development.</p>
Bethan Jackson Baker [4495]		Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>
Birmingham City Council (Waheed Nazir) [3971]		Q03	<p>The objective 'to ensure that provision is made for an appropriate proportion of the HMA shortfall in new housing land consistent with the achievement of sustainable development and the other objectives of the Plan' does not currently translate into an appropriate strategy which takes into account the scale of the housing shortfall.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]</p>			<p>Q03</p>	<p>Housing site allocations appear to presented as options they are not truly options since they do not provide comparative levels of growth and all appear to be required to meet the Housing requirement.</p> <p>Topic Paper 4 'Options for Growth and Site Selection' does not appear to reflect findings of Green Belt Assessment or Landscape Character Study for Area F.</p> <p>Unclear how meaningful Green Belt gaps will be retained in Blythe ward close to Bromsgrove District and Worcestershire County boundary.</p>
<p>Catesby Property Group [3038]</p>	<p>Miss Sarah Butterfield</p>	<p>WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]</p>	<p>Q03</p>	<p>Broadly support the spatial strategy.</p> <p>The draft Local Plan Review proposes a sequential approach to the identification of sites for development.</p> <p>The approach, which seeks to focus new development on land in and around existing settlements is supported and will achieve the aims of sustainable development.</p> <p>The proposed expansion of the rural villages such as Balsall Common is supported specifically.</p> <p>In summary, the proposed spatial strategy is considered sound. It has been positively prepared to achieve sustainable development and is justified by the evidence base supporting the Local Plan Review.</p>
<p>Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]</p>			<p>Q03</p>	<p>Growth Option G Large Scale Urban Extensions - This option specifically includes "Land east of Solihull (between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton Lane"- later identified as LPR site 16). This statement is grossly misleading as the land sits in the Green Belt and plays a major part in maintaining the separation of settlements namely Solihull and Catherine de Barnes and its inclusion seems to be totally contradictory to many of the policy objectives SMBC are looking to achieve.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd [3894]	Harriet Barber	Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd (Harriet Barber) [3895]	Q03	Support proposed growth locations and support the proposed spatial strategy for the Borough.
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
Chiltern Railways (Mr David Heathfield) [2998]			Q03	Support intention of the spatial strategy to promote the use of sustainable transport modes and reduce reliance on private vehicles.
Chris Crean [3631]			Q03	This plan could result in ever more sprawl and car based development. There is not enough emphasis on increased densities as well as catering for a truly mixed community in terms of age, affordability and abilities.
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q03	We agree with the spatial strategy as set out in the draft Local Plan, in particular that the Green Belt releases will be required to ensure that local housing needs and community facilities are met and compliant with paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
Colin Davis [3352]			Q03	i object and reject the assumption that large areas of green belt must be taken away for ever - worst of all to house Birmingham's overspill
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q03	Proposed strategy for housing growth is not sound. Need a range of small, medium and large sites. Concentrating on fewer large sites will result in over-dependence on volume housebuilders, and lower delivery rates.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q03	<p>The very rigid sequential approach to development is not correct in that it does not get the right balance between Greenfield and Green Belt sites. In some instances, particularly where there is very little open space within an area Greenfield sites should be considered as being more important than Green Belt sites.</p> <p>There is logic in building properties around UKC, but residents around Shirley would need to access both the A34 and the M42, worsening congestion.</p> <p>Question the fairness of opting for a strategy which focusses on concentrated development. In Shirley 41% of the dwellings will impact on one community.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q03	<p>the approach to the spatial planning should not be as rigid as stated in the DLP. need to have some flexibility as some green field sites are more important than green belt.</p>
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q03	<p>While I agree that Green Belt land is valuable socially and ecologically, it's important to also consider it in the wider context of other valuable green spaces, especially where these are more precious given the nature of the built environment of which they form a part.</p>
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q03	<p>think the approach is right for town centres /urban area do not consider that the DLP allocations for Shirley are in keeping with the principals of the spatial strategy, as there is a disproportionate level of housing allocated to shirley.</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q03	<p>Too linear an approach.</p> <p>Greenfield sites in urban areas can be more important than Green Belt, e.g. playing field next to Jenson House is important community asset in a built-up area.</p> <p>Approach should be more nuanced and case by case basis.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]</p>			<p>Q03</p>	<p>The Spatial Strategy is not sound as written:</p> <p>four issues put forward to support this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) level of employment 2) extent of Green Belt 3) Capacity of main road system 4) nature and type of new housing development <p>An essential revision to the Spatial Strategy is to replace the proposal for a few large greenfield housing allocations with a principle that small and medium-sized sites will be the preferred way to deliver new housing.</p>
<p>D Pick [3481]</p>	<p>Gill Brown</p>	<p>Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]</p>	<p>Q03</p>	<p>Concur with Paragraphs 89 and 91.</p> <p>Release land from Green Belt near Tidbury Green early in plan period.</p>
<p>Daron Gay [4545]</p>	<p>Mr Richard Cobb</p>	<p>Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]</p>	<p>Q03</p>	<p>Most housing sites are large scale. Consider Council is relying too much on volume housebuilders performing and delivering such sites to meet annual targets.</p> <p>Recent research indicates more small and medium sites should be allocated to deliver housing by smaller building companies.</p> <p>Housing White Paper suggest 10% of allocation are 0.5ha or less.</p> <p>Should be preference for small/medium sized allocations.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of proposed housing in Blythe ward and parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Sunner [3946]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q03	There are 2 major faults with the way in which new housing is proposed and located: 1) concentration on a small number of large housing sites instead of a range of different sized sites. 2) disproportionate amount of additional housing proposed in the Local Plan Review is proposed to be located in Blythe Ward - Parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. 45% of all the proposed additional housing would be sited in these two parishes.
David Holtom [3685]			Q03	In growth option F, why suggest constructing increased housing in a wedge between the SE of Balsall Common and the proposed HS2 line, with an expected exposure to high noise volumes. The SW or West of Balsall Common would be a much more satisfactory choice of location.
Diane Mahmood [4490]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q03	General spatial strategy is sound, but two anomalies: Concentration of fewer large housing sites. Disproportionate allocation in Blythe Ward; 45% of new allocations. Note there are no housing allocations in Dorridge and Hockley Heath ward. Remote from employment growth at UKC Hub, would be better to place more development there.
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport and has limited employment opportunities, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to settlement is in breach of policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations" and should be reassessed.
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q03	Balsall Common and Berkswell are rural areas in the Green Belt. If the borough's plan is increase housing for employment, these need to be where the jobs will be, near the UK Central Hub Growth Area, not a remote location in the /southeast of the borough.
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q03	There seems to be unequal loading on Knowle with clear intention of intrusion into Green Belt which is unacceptable.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]		Q03	<p>Agree that brownfield land and accessible locations should be prioritised.</p> <p>Disagree with growth opportunities in Para. 108.</p> <p>Do not understand why Green Belt and Greenfield sites are identified as locations where growth should be focused when there are a number of Brownfield sites.</p> <p>Contrary to the guidance as set out within:</p> <p>a) Strategic objectives of this DLP paragraph 96),</p> <p>b) Step 1 of Housing White Paper</p>
DR David Gentle [4632]		Q03	<p>rationale for choosing two sites unclear and lack of strategic planning.</p> <p>-unclear how the choice of sites arises from the policies, criteria and spatial strategy. methodology to arrive at the proposal unsound.</p> <p>-Access/transport criteria evaluated from nearest point to the village of each site, giving falsely favourable reading to the site suitability overall.</p> <p>- methodology/choices around 'call for sites' model contradicts government policy of only using greenbelt in 'exceptional circumstances'.</p> <p>-quality of green belt should have been safe from major development.</p> <p>-promise of community facilities. However, much is problematic.</p> <p>-KDBH-NF data gives, without bias, as clear a picture as possible of community need and aspiration.</p> <p>-no account of cost in terms of lost estate, revenue, recent investment and resource.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q03	The Council has opted for a spatial strategy that places large numbers of houses in rural locations away from the main centres of employment and where car-borne travel and related congestion would be an inevitable outcome. There seems to be little or no relationship between the Council's Transport Strategy, Solihull Connected, its priorities and implied spatial strategy, and the allocation of over 1000 houses in Knowle (and elsewhere in the rural areas). The Strategy therefore fails to achieve its fundamental aim of a sustainable pattern of development.
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q03	<p>I object for three reasons:</p> <p>*Criteria have been specified, but there appears to be no weighting attached to the different criteria. This will almost certainly lead to flawed decision-making. This should BE CORRECTED.</p> <p>*A specific example is the preservation of the green belt. In the last few weeks, the Government has announced that it intends placing FAR MORE emphasis on green belt retention. This should retrospectively be built into weighted criteria.</p> <p>*Therefore, preservation of green belt should TAKE ABSOLUTE PRIORITY over all other criteria, and the huge proposed developments in Balsall Common should be REJECTED.</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q03	Selection criteria have not been correctly applied in Balsall Common because available brownfield sites not used, all sites are green field/Green Belt, and the scoring for the different sites lacks clear criteria.
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Eric McClenaghan [4555]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q03	<p>SHELAA Site 238, land at 33 Wootton Green Lane.</p> <p>Most housing sites are large scale. Consider Council is relying too much on volume housebuilders performing and delivering such sites to meet annual targets.</p> <p>Recent research indicates more small and medium sites should be allocated to deliver housing by smaller building companies.</p> <p>Housing White Paper suggest 10% of allocation are 0.5ha or less.</p> <p>Should be preference for small/medium sized allocations.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of proposed housing in Blythe ward and parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q03	<p>The Councils spatial strategy is not clear or coherent. it fails to link housing distribution to its economic and transport policies.</p> <p>Allocation of large sites does not balance large and small sites.</p> <p>RE KDBH area:</p> <p>1- knowle is not adjacent to main providers or employment or drivers of employment growth</p> <p>2 - Knowle not well connected to PT, no proposals in Solihull connected to remedy this</p> <p>3- significant additional journeys by car, contrary to objectives of Policies P7, P8 & P9.</p> <p>A number of alternatives suggested.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q03	The Council has, therefore, opted for a spatial strategy that places large numbers of houses in rural locations away from the main centres of employment and where car-borne travel and related congestion would be an inevitable outcome. There seems to be little or no relationship between the Council's Transport Strategy, Solihull Connected, its priorities and implied spatial strategy, and the allocation of over 1000 houses in Knowle (and elsewhere in the rural areas). The Strategy therefore fails to achieve its fundamental aim of a sustainable pattern of development.
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q03	Local Plan entirely ignores the release of the Green Belt to support the delivery of essential supporting infrastructure in the form of a new southern Junction, delivered in conjunction with a MSA, as part of the Junction 6 improvements. This needs to be addressed and should be included as a guiding principle.
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q03	<p>Welcome strategy in the DLP to meet the economic and housing needs for the plan, as well as wider housing market area.</p> <p>Support development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Concerned that quantum of housing is insufficient to fulfill objectives of plan, and need to provide housing in the wider HMA.</p> <p>Important that Birmingham's neighbouring authorities' are able to meet the shortfall figure for the benefit of the region as t.a whole. This is to ensure that the economy is supported, potential offered by HS2 is realised and the housing needs of the existing and future workforce are met.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q03	<p>Welcome Council using land use powers to maximise economic benefits of HS2 and acknowledgement of need to release Green Belt.</p> <p>Insufficient land allocated in Plan. Green Belt boundaries will not be permanent. Requirements of NPPF not met.</p> <p>Potential to release more for safeguarded land.</p> <p>Concern that 'managed' part of Managed Growth is overly restrictive and outdated planning policy approach.</p> <p>Sequential approach not in accordance with NPPF. Sustainable land should be identified regardless of existing policy constraints.</p> <p>Support growth in most sustainable locations, but a wider dispersal strategy would meet local needs and provide housing in short term.</p>
Genting Solihull Ltd [3409]	Ms Andrea Arnall	Turley Associates (Ms Andrea Arnall) [2025]	Q03	<p>Support Growth Option E (UKC Hub and HS2) as the most appropriate opportunity for where growth should be focussed. This will enable the delivery of the UKC Masterplan and HS2 Growth Strategy, including major growth opportunities and place-making potential around the HS2 Interchange Station, such as the NEC.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gill Corns [4448]			Q03	<p>The Council's spatial strategy is not clear or coherent. It fails to link housing distribution to its economic and transport policies.</p> <p>Allocation of large sites does not balance large and small sites.</p> <p>RE KDBH area:</p> <p>1- knowle is not adjacent to main providers or employment or drivers of employment growth</p> <p>2 - Knowle not well connected to PT, no proposals in Solihull connected to remedy this</p> <p>3- significant additional journeys by car, contrary to objectives of Policies P7, P8 & P9.</p> <p>A number of alternatives suggested.</p>
Gill Corns [4448]			Q03	<p>The Council has, therefore, opted for a spatial strategy that places large numbers of houses in rural locations away from the main centres of employment and where car-borne travel and related congestion would be an inevitable outcome. There seems to be little or no relationship between the Council's Transport Strategy, Solihull Connected, its priorities and implied spatial strategy, and the allocation of over 1000 houses in Knowle (and elsewhere in the rural areas). The Strategy therefore fails to achieve its fundamental aim of a sustainable pattern of development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q03	<p>Support the settlement strategy.</p> <p>Support principle of looking for wide range of sites to meet housing needs, more deliverable than just large urban extensions.</p> <p>Concerns about Para. 104 and guiding principles.</p> <p>Small and medium sites can support early stages of plan.</p> <p>Too vague.</p> <p>Need overarching assessment to consider whether proposed developments can be considered sustainable as per NPPF.</p> <p>Support dispersal approach but concerns about evidence base supporting Green Belt release.</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q03	<p>Broadly agree with distribution strategy.</p> <p>Does not identify sufficient growth locations.</p> <p>Additional growth should be in/around rural settlements.</p>
Graham Brown [2506]			Q03	<p>I believe that the solutions that you have proposed are an excellent mix of meeting future requirements and have considered not only housing but the infrastructure that will be required (especially educational facilities) for the population that will occupy the properties. The land you are proposing to use gives a good balance between the use of green belt and the road infrastructure, so as to minimise the negative impact on existing road networks around the smaller villages.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Graham Jones [3354]			Q03	<p>Para 104 sets out the guiding principles. An additional guiding principle should be to give priority to releasing land (greenbelt and non-green belt) to facilitate a rapid transit system, preferably a tram system.</p> <p>Over recent years the Council has released land for housing in locations which then restrict and hamper the development of a rapid transit system, thereby hindering the future development of both houses and jobs, which is the situation we are now in. A more strategic approach to transport planning is needed within the spatial strategy.</p>
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q03	The inclusion of land east of Solihull in Growth Option G Large Scale Urban Extensions is misleading as this land is wholly green belt and part of the narrow gap to Catherine de Barnes, not an extension of the existing urban area. Some limited infilling in the vicinity of Catherine de Barnes may not be precluded but to include it in Growth Option G is inappropriate.
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q03	The inclusion of land east of Solihull in Growth Option G Large Scale Urban Extensions is misleading as this land is wholly green belt and part of the narrow gap to Catherine de Barnes, not an extension of the existing urban area. Some limited infilling in the vicinity of Catherine de Barnes may not be precluded but to include it in Growth Option G is inappropriate.
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]</p>	<p>Mr Stuart Field</p>	<p>GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]</p>	<p>Q03</p>	<p>Welcome approach in Plan. Agree development should be focused in most accessible locations and ensure necessary infrastructure is delivered.</p> <p>DLP does not define how Council proposes to assess alternative locations for development. Absence of such criteria renders DLP unsound.</p> <p>Para. 101 should be amended to refer to evidence base.</p> <p>Para. 107 includes inconsistencies on spatial distribution. Should be reworded to ensure equal consideration of alternative development.</p> <p>Strongly object to Reviewing the Options paper.</p> <p>Lack of comparative analysis.</p> <p>Overestimated site delivery timescales.</p> <p>Should make more reference to Neighbourhood Plans, e.g. KDBH, and amend Para. 108.</p>
<p>Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]</p>			<p>Q03</p>	<p>Strategic objectives fail to fully reflect that local plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Strategic decisions should be made having regard to the great weight that needs to be applied to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>The limited number of 'Guiding Principles Generally in Support' fail to reflect this.</p> <p>Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment.</p> <p>The conservation of heritage assets should be seen as a positive place shaping principle/objective reflected in the plan to deliver sustainable development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q03	HHPC does not agree that spatial strategy should be looked at afresh (paragraph 91). "Releasing land from the Green Belt to maximise the growth potential from HS2" has yet to be agreed (Paragraph 104). The cascade model is a reasonable approach and the outcome connects proposed developments to existing urban areas with access to services whilst maintaining the rural area, but needs to say more on transport network design and upgrades and avoidance of overloading rural networks connecting to primary routes. Do not agree with Growth Option G relating to significant expansion of rural villages/settlements.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q03	<p>Disagree with paragraph 91 which states "The two factors outlined above represent a significant shift from the starting point of the 2013 plan and requires the spatial strategy to be looked at afresh. This is in the context</p> <p>that to deliver the level of growth envisaged, will require significant releases of land from the Green Belt".</p> <p>Paragraph 104 states "Releasing land from the Green Belt to maximise the growth potential from HS2". This is yet to be agreed</p> <p>Disagree with Paragraph 105 - "Growth Option G - New Settlements, Large Scale Urban Extensions or Significant Expansion of Rural Villages/Settlements".</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q03	<p>DLP established a positive economic context and ambition for Solihull.</p> <p>Support the proactive visioning within the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Concern that this ambition is not matched through other draft polices, including scale of housing to be provided for in Policy P5.</p> <p>DLP has more positive approach to support the full economic growth associated with its strategic economic assets than accommodating a more reasonable and justifiable level of overall housing need shortfall in HMA. Significant benefits in ensuring sustainable distribution of housing and employment growth.</p> <p>Plan fails to adequately align its economic and housing policies, a key NPPF requirements (Para. 158).</p>
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q03	<p>DLP seems a combination of all Options from SIO consultation - 'Concentration and Dispersal' strategy lacks focus.</p> <p>Should prioritise PDL in Green Belt first before greenfield sites in Green Belt.</p> <p>Paragraphs 101, 103, 104 need further work.</p> <p>Growth opportunities not supported by evidence base.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q03	<p>DLP established a positive economic context and ambition for Solihull.</p> <p>Support the proactive visioning within the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Concern that this ambition is not matched through other draft polices, including scale of housing to be provided for in Policy P5.</p> <p>DLP has more positive approach to support the full economic growth associated with its strategic economic assets than accommodating a more reasonable and justifiable level of overall housing need shortfall in HMA. Significant benefits in ensuring sustainable distribution of housing and employment growth.</p> <p>Plan fails to adequately align its economic and housing policies, a key NPPF requirements (Para. 158).</p>
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q03	The approach defined for sites being appropriate for development as written looks good with the right priorities, But Unfortunately they have not been adhered to in this draft plan.
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q03	<p>Agree with Para. 89.</p> <p>Important Solihull addresses its own housing needs and Birmingham overspill.</p> <p>Agree significant Green Belt release is required.</p>
J D Green [3195]			Q03	brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield
J D Green [3195]			Q03	development should be done equally once moving beyond brownfield into greenfield

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q03	<p>Brownfield-first approach in spatial strategy is contrary to NPPF; which supports the review of Green Belt where required to promote sustainable patterns of development.</p> <p>Also contrary to Policy P7 which seeks to focus development in most accessible locations.</p> <p>Limits necessary flexibility required to respond to business needs in most appropriate locations. Should delete this paragraph.</p> <p>Guiding principles which support delivery of UK Central Masterplan, including JLR, are consistent with NPPF. However, ignores release of Green Belt to support businesses other than HS2.</p> <p>Growth ambitions of JLR are supported in Policy P1 and need to be added to Paragraph 104.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q03	I can see the logic behind the prioritisation criteria that should minimise the impact on greenbelt land and ensure that new development is not piecemeal, however some of the proposed development seems to contradict the other objectives within the plan. Please see my response to question 15 for further details.
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
John Maguire [3543]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q03	The draft Local Plan Review's spatial strategy which includes a variety of locations will enable housing to be provided in a range of locations across the Borough. This is considered to be positive and with reference to housing development, will enable sustainable development in sustainable locations.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q03	<p>* Agree in principle with the exception that :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o At paragraph 108 Growth Option G - Large scale Urban Extensions, the third Bullet Point should read "Land East of Solihull (between the Grand Union Canal and Hampton Lane).
Johnnie Arkwright [3903]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q03	<p>Focus for growth should be around sustainable transport nodes. This is supported by Solihull Connected.</p> <p>Mass transit is a role that Hatton Station is Warwick District can play. Rail services directly connect Solihull and Hatton.</p> <p>Option should be explored by Solihull in meeting own and Greater Birmingham HMA housing shortfall.</p>
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q03	<p>Support the sequential approach, PDL/brownfield, greenfield outside greenbelt, greenfield and green belt but why hasn't this hasn't been applied in Balsall Common? How can Balsall Common contribute to both 'Limited Expansion of Rural Villages/Settlements' and 'Significant Expansion of Rural Villages/Settlements' as the total means significant expansion.</p> <p>The selection of sites to the east, south east and south of Balsall Common may well preserve the green belt space between Balsall Common and Knowle, but certainly reduces the gap between the village and Coventry - a far smaller separation.</p>
Karen Bell [4586]			Q03	<p>Object to total of 1150 new houses in Balsall Common as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed as existing infrastructure is inadequate,</p>
Karin Chessell [4284]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q03	<p>The spatial strategy is well thought out and will assist in delivering a wide range of homes across the Borough It will also will allow the authority to make the most of the urban edge of urban sites to make the best use of previously developed land, whilst protecting and minimising the need to encroach into the Green Belt. However, there will be a need to release some lower performing areas of Green Belt to meet the housing need across the HMA in order to meet the authorities own needs as well as overspill from elsewhere within the HMA.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q03	<p>The Council's spatial strategy is not clear or coherent. It fails to link housing distribution to its economic and transport policies.</p> <p>Allocation of large sites does not balance large and small sites.</p> <p>RE KDBH area:</p> <p>1- Knowle is not adjacent to main providers or employment or drivers of employment growth</p> <p>2 - Knowle not well connected to PT, no proposals in Solihull connected to remedy this</p> <p>3- significant additional journeys by car, contrary to objectives of Policies P7, P8 & P9.</p> <p>A number of alternatives suggested</p>
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q03	<p>The Council has, therefore, opted for a spatial strategy that places large numbers of houses in rural locations away from the main centres of employment and where car-borne travel and related congestion would be an inevitable outcome. There seems to be little or no relationship between the Council's Transport Strategy, Solihull Connected, its priorities and implied spatial strategy, and the allocation of over 1000 houses in Knowle (and elsewhere in the rural areas). The Strategy therefore fails to achieve its fundamental aim of a sustainable pattern of development.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q03	<p>Proposed strategy for housing growth is not sound. Need a range of small, medium and large sites. Concentrating on fewer large sites will result in over-dependence on volume housebuilders, and lower delivery rates.</p>
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
Lioncourt Strategic Land [3843]	Robert Gardner	GVA (Robert Gardner) [3700]	Q03	Broadly agree. However, fails to acknowledge growth opportunity at Tidbury Green. Proposed amendment - Addition of a red "Locations and directions of growth in the rural area" arrow on the east side of Tidbury Green to be added to the "Spatial Strategy Key Diagram".
Lionel Johnson [3582]			Q03	I agree with a strategy and approach where areas of previously developed land (Brownfield) are selected ahead of non-developed land (Greenfield) and areas with good public transport links are considered ahead of those with poorer public transport links.
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.
Louis Burns [4069]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q03	The spatial strategy is supported. The larger greenfield allocated sites will require the provision of extensive infrastructure and services. It would be advantageous to encourage the development of sustainably located brownfield sites in the early part of the Local Plan period so as to provide a more even supply of new homes throughout the Plan period.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Taft [3595]			Q03	Whilst the need for new housing is recognised, it cannot be right that 41% of all new houses is proposed to be located on Green Belt land within the Shirley area. It appears there has been little or no consideration of identification and recycling of brownfield sites.
McLean Estates Limited (Mr N McLean) [2241]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q03	There are 2 major faults with the way in which new housing is proposed and located: 1) concentration on a small number of large housing sites instead of a range of different sized sites. 2) disproportionate amount of additional housing proposed in the Local Plan Review is proposed to be located in Blythe Ward - Parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. 45% of all the proposed additional housing would be sited in these two parishes.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q03	We support growth option F, para 105 which is limited expansion of rural villages/settlements. We also support para 106 to maintain as much greenbelt as possible.
Messrs Wheeldon & Gooding [3886]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q03	No fundamental objection to provision of employment land to support Airport and JLR subject to concerns over existing business operation and future.
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q03	Spatial approach has right priorities, but then not followed in DLP. Barratt's Farm is Greenfield land not Brownfield land and has significant drain off issues. Not accessible location - village has little public transport.
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q03	The approach defined for sites being appropriate for development as written looks good with the right priorities but unfortunately these have not been adhered to in this draft plan.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q03	Agree in principle, in particular: balanced approach between concentration and dispersal of housing. Exceptions are: Growth option F should include Catherine de Barnes (Para. 108). Spatial Strategy diagram should include Catherine de Barnes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Elizabeth Adams [3492]			Q03	<p>I object to the special strategy on the grounds that the housing proposal for the Shirley area will have huge implications with green spaces, traffic congestion (already a problem in the area) and demand on schooling.</p> <p>There are masses of wildlife in the area and a thorough review needs to be undertaken to ensure endangered species such as great crested newts are not affected.</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q03	<p>I don't like option G. If you are developing the UK central hub, HS2 etc it would make sense to build residential property nearby to reduce commuting, the need for a lot of travel and pollution.</p>
Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	Paul Watson	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	Q03	<p>Need to allocate more Green Belt land for housing.</p> <p>Examine locations in Green Belt which have little/no strategic impact on its character/openness; brownfield land; new development could support public transport provision; fund green infrastructure in urban/rural fringe.</p>
Mr Adam Hunter [3332]			Q03	<p>I Believe solihull is focusing on extending current developments but has not fully considered brand new sites in the east and south where there a large areas of land available. Whilst more complex than developing exiting areas such as dickens Heath. Adding more housing to already over extened sites like dickens Heath is now fundamentally altering the boroughs make up and merging solihull completely with birmingham, and other surrounding areas, removing the green rural feel to the bourgh.</p>
Mr Adam Weber [3072]			Q03	<p>Large scale housing allocations in Dickens Heath parish would reduce or remove key gaps between settlements.</p> <p>A major expansion of the urban area.</p> <p>More small/medium sites is better distribution strategy than few large sites; more quickly built out; more opportunities for SME builders; more aligned with Housing White Paper.</p> <p>SoS statement in the Commons on 18.07.16: Green Belt is absolutely sacrosanct.</p> <p>Should be building more on public sector land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Adrian Jones [3065]			Q03	<p>Summary</p> <p>1) Site Alloc 20 site will probably reduce the number of people employed in the midlands within JLR supply chain.</p> <p>2) By freeing up the land identified in allocation 20 will create an uninterrupted length of commercial land in excess of 5 miles from Lode Lane in the West to beyond the current NEC site in the East.</p> <p>3) The buildings proposed by JLR for the logistic centre are totally disproportionate in terms of scale and height.</p> <p>4) JLR will take the cheapest solution as they have demonstrated already.</p> <p>5) Several thousand homes East/North East of Lugtrout Lane will be negatively affected</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q03	<p>The spatial strategy ignores SMBC policies with respect to sustainable development particularly public transport policy. Balsall Common is an unsustainable location but SMBC plan large amounts of housing there creating further road traffic.</p> <p>The strategy for developing PDL land before greenfield is correct but that it not what this plan does.</p> <p>The strategy makes sweeping claims about developing urban areas then puts large numbers of houses in rural areas without transport and other infrastructure</p> <p>For both reasons the plan is unsound.</p>
Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]			Q03	<p>The appropriateness of the spatial strategy for waste management is uncertain, as proposals lack appropriate detail and justification and data sources dated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q03	<p>You have identified potential growth for Balsall Common as being South and East of the village, this directly contradicts the common sense approach of developing where existing infrastructure is located (dual carriageway with large capacity) and where all transport routes are located (HS2 stations, motorways, Birmingham etc). The central hub, a major focus of this development, is north, so why are you proposing to develop the opposite side?</p> <p>The only eastern/southern link is Berkswell station, but this will be within 30 minutes walk of any housing development so is not a concern.</p>
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q03	<p>In part, I appreciate the points noted but some allowance should be made to developing isolated settlements. It should not be the preserve of a select few to live in these isolated settlements but opened up to others while preserving the nature of the location as best as possible. I do not agree with the ranking order as set out in options A - G. Option G is possibly the easiest to bring to fruition in a relatively short space of time, especially where existing public transport links exist, such as close by (within relatively easy walking distance bus stops.)</p>
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q03	<p>Object to total of 1150 new houses in Balsall Common as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed as existing infrastructure is inadequate,</p>
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q03	<p>Solihull's plan for Balsall Common, whilst in adherence with its own simple site selection criteria, seems at odds with the stance of the current Government, insofar as the development of green belt land should be absolutely sacrosanct until all other alternatives have been exhausted. Mindless spatial infilling which begins with the surrender of green belt surely just begets further green belt surrender. There is no published evidence Solihull has adequately appraised numerous brownfield sites in and around the village and has instead opted for the simplest and most economical option for large scale yet disproportionate development. This appears plainly unlawful.</p>
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q03	<p>point 96, section 1a should begin with brownfield land before previously developed land</p>
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q03	<p>These plans are housing plans in the main. they are not accompanied by any sensible infrastructure ideas for the settlements suggested e.g. Knowle no extra schools, roads will be excessively imposed on. The High Street needs a By Pass. With proposed housing numbers like these villages will final seize up.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q03	<p>No as spatial strategy cannot fully be answered by a subjective criteria. It is a reasonable starting point but one that may need weighting. Transport links and terminal need planning at the same time as development.</p> <p>Being near public transport can change. Berkswell station platform needs improvement for the future it may become an issue if trains were no longer allowed to stop at the station.</p> <p>I do agree that Brownfield sites should be used in preference to Greenfield sites however in Balsall Common you have chosen to develop 3 Greenfield sites at odds with your categories. Why?</p>
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q03	<p>Disproportionate amount of building in Shirley South. Inadequate infrastructure which cannot be mitigated. Loss of valuable amenity space. impact on health and wellbeing of residents. Impact on valuable eco systems and wildlife. In crease in urban sprawl. Merging of communities losing identity. Increase in pollution. Full utilisation of brownfield sites has not been made. Should be building close to employment growth areas in the east and centre of the borough not in south Shirley.</p>
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q03	<p>cannot support any scheme that encroaches on greenbelt. Smbc have failed to take account of brownfield sites. many in the north of BC.</p>
Mr G Walters [2324]			Q03	<p>Large scale housing allocations in Dickens Heath parish would reduce or remove key gaps between settlements.</p> <p>A major expansion of the urban area.</p> <p>More small/medium sites is better distribution strategy than few large sites; more quickly built out; more opportunities for SME builders; more aligned with Housing White Paper.</p> <p>SoS statement in the Commons on 18.07.16: Green Belt is absolutely sacrosanct.</p> <p>Should be building more on public sector land.</p>
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q03	<p>Development should be concentrated on brownfield sites which have good access to public transport. The green belt should be preserved and the narrow part of the Meriden gap between Balsall Common and Coventry should be protected.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q03	The allocation of housing units for Balsall Common represents at least a 25% increase over its current size - most of it in the Meriden Gap. This is unacceptable.
MR GRAHAM PARRY [3865]			Q03	Support.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q03	<p>The spatial strategy is well thought out and will assist in delivering a wide range of much needed homes across the Borough throughout a dispersed method of provision to take advantage of the most sustainable rural settlement and villages that are most accessible to public transport or where there are opportunities to make improvements to make the current offer more sustainable.</p> <p>However, in order to meet the authority's own needs as well as overspill from elsewhere within the HMA there will be a need to release some of the lower performing areas of Green Belt.</p>
Mr Jason Gardner [2909]			Q03	With the large central growth areas potentially growing even more and with HS2 on the horizon, the need for additional housing around the borough must definitely be considered, in particular around the South Solihull / Knowle area where there is undeveloped land currently green belt but which could be used.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q03	<p>Scale of development proposed South of Shirley is inappropriate.</p> <p>41% of new allocations, 80% of land in Green Belt, part of which is 'high performing'.</p> <p>Remote from economic development at UKC Hub.</p> <p>Will conflict with challenges C, D, E, H, J, K, L.</p> <p>Distribution of spatial strategy needs to be reconsidered.</p> <p>Unclear why more brownfield sites are not included; or why Birmingham's brownfield sites are not favoured over Solihull's Green Belt.</p>
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q03	The spatial strategy should start with development of brown field sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q03	<p>I welcome the sequential approach to site selection set out in paragraph 96 but note that this has not been followed in the case of Balsall Common. Proposals contain no brownfield sites (of which there are many around the village) and do not provide any form of explanation as to why they have been excluded.</p> <p>Either the council should fully follow the NPPF and its stated policy or specifically provide reasons as to why Balsall Common is to be treated as an exception.</p>
Mr M Khan [4149]	Atief Ishaq	Planning Design & Build (Atief Ishaq) [4116]	Q03	<p>There is justification made to concentration development, with advantages of accessibility, ranges of services, development adjacent to existing settlements or built up areas as the client site is in and he supports this.</p>
Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]			Q03	<p>I believe that the building so many properties in such a small area will be devastating to the area and cause more problems than it solves. ASB, crime, will rise and health and wellbeing will plummet. The roads will not cope, regardless of what improvements are made. Businesses will suffer and move out of the area. FORWARD THINKING PLEASE!</p>
Mr Matthew Bragg [3069]			Q03	<p>The proposal is not a balanced approach. The 'needs of the borough' need to be spread across the borough to be fair and proportionate.</p>
Mr Matthew Taylor [2935]			Q03	<p>There is always a risk that these infilling and add-ons will spiral out of control, but what is suggested seems reasonable. Mostly smaller developments so not to burden the infrastructure in place, with larger ones, around Knowle and Balsall common, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green etc. where there is stronger infrastructure.</p>
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q03	<p>The high % of use of greenfield vs developed land not in line with policy. "...balance should be struck between concentrating development in a relatively small number of locations and dispersing development over a greater number of locations" - with regard to the disproportionate allocation to Balsall Common this is NOT achieved. Rather than destroy a whole village both for the present and the future there should be a cap on the allocation to any single community based on the planned % increase in population. This would ensure some objective fairness</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Scott [3291]			Q03	<p>I disagree with the amount of growth planned for Balsall Common. It seems disproportionate to many other areas (i.e. Dorridge, Hockley Heath, Tidbury Green etc). I'm also not convinced that enough focus is paid to expanding the mature suburbs and brownfield sites.</p> <p>Balsall Common will no longer be the aspirational place that you currently pitch it as. Kenilworth Road is already too busy, the high street is too small, schools are over-crowded and we are already subject to increased flight noise and soon, the HS2. The current proposals ruin the greenbelt.</p>
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q03	The Spatial Strategy includes a variety of locations which will enable housing to be provided across the Borough. This is considerably positive and will enable sustainable development in sustainable locations.
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q03	The draft Local Plan Review's spatial strategy which includes a variety of locations will enable housing to be provided in a range of locations across the Borough. This is considered to be positive and with reference to housing development, will enable sustainable development in sustainable locations.
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q03	Having regard to law, policy and case law (IM Properties v Lichfield DC [2014] EWHC and Gallagher Homes v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283) it is considered that the approach to testing of Green Belt sites for release is misplaced, as should involve consideration of impact on openness and accessibility to facilities, including reference to travel to work patterns, as part of overall sustainability assessment.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q03	The increased development on greenfield land, where there are other brown field and old commercial sites to the north of Balsall Common that could have been considered, including a previous proposal to develop a new settlement on the land north of the village adjacent to the old quarry workings, would make more efficient and effective use of the space around the village rather than continue to erode the rural nature of Balsall Common itself.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Paul Southall [3776]			Q03	Housing should accommodate people that work in the Midlands rather than providing housing for the needs of people in London, and community will suffer because we will simply be a commuter town. Council should be working to encourage business in Solihull, but building houses in Blythe Valley Park shows that the council have failed the community. People working in London will shop there, go out there, Solihull will not benefit, house prices will rise to the detriment of local people. It will however benefit builders!
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q03	PDL sites have been ignored and only Greenbelt sites considered for Balsall Common.
Mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q03	<p>The policy seems to be to build more houses regardless of the availability of suitable land. with the loss of green field sites and farm land. Suppose it is more profitable for the farmer to sell the land for devopment and sit back and live of the proceeds.</p> <p>Solihull and surrounding Councils are being forced to become overspill areas for Birmingham as a large central ring around the city is now becoming a run down slum area. Let more brown field sites be redeveloped.</p>
Mr Robert Wardle [3455]			Q03	Far too much over development already in Shirley which is the dumping ground for Solihull, Dorridge and Knowle This is the only bit of green belt we have left and it will create total chaos by adding more traffic onto Bills Lane and the Stratford Road which are already over crowded. You have already ruined Shirley with all the current developments, suggest you concentrate on other areas, ie Solihull, Dorridge and Knowle
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q03	<p>Chapter 99 - where is the balance between dispersed and concentrated housing development in Knowle. There is none - it has been concentrated solely on two sites. However, even dispersed development is not acceptable as it will still create additional pressure in Knowle and Dorridge which cannot support the increase in residents, housing and infrastructure.</p> <p>Chapter 102 - point 2 the development of significant housing will completely go against the objective stated in that it would result in a disproportionate addition to a settlement that only has a limited range of facilities.</p> <p>Also being proposed on Green Belt land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q03	More thought should be given to brownfield sites rather than eating into the Green Belt again. Can the council justify this approach? Not according to the draft local plan. And more thought needs to be put into public transport links. With more than 1,000 houses proposed for Balsall Common there has to be an improvement but the local plan seems to disregard the fact that the area has an aging population as well as great many schoolchildren.
Mr Stephen Hill [3208]			Q03	No, the Spatial Strategy needs to include something specific about Sporting Activities/Sports Facilities, to give confidence that the Council does care about, and wishes to plan appropriately for, Sporting Activities in Solihull. Such a statement would also provide support for the subsequent sections/policies relevant to Sporting Activities and reassurances where policies could result in the loss of existing Sports Facilities. A general statement about facilities for Sporting Activities is required in the Spatial Strategy, such as - 'Solihull will need a range of facilities for outdoor and indoor sporting activities, to meet the needs of its residents.'
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q03	101 - The term 'less accessible' is a bit unclear, Does this mean a location that is difficult to reach due to being out of the way from other area's or simply that it is difficult to travel to and from ? Taking the land between Hampton Lane and Lugtrout lane for instance, on the face of it is near to the town centre so potentially has a lot of local services, and geographically it could be considered to be very near the town centre, however transport around that area is constantly at a standstill.
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q03	Allocation 13 (south Shirley)does not support the HS2 vision as this likely to located to North east of the borough With journey times by car to access HS2 to be greater than 1hr at peak times
Mr Terry Hughes [3293]			Q03	Because Point 96 Section A should specifically give priority first to Brownfield Sites
Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]			Q03	Object to strategy that focusses 41% of housing in Shirley South when the real need is for housing along the HS2 route and transport routes to HS2 interchange inadequate, to allocation of 2000 houses from Birmingham which should not be built in Solihull until Birmingham has developed all of its brownfield sites, and to loss of what little green space left in Shirley South.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q03	Balsall Common is surrounded by green belt, present public transport fails to meet the new criteria for both rail and bus. No bus services after about 6.30pm none on Sundays, in the day once an hour to Coventry and 2 an hour to Solihull. Settlements like Balsall Common only exist because people have access to cars. Improved public transport will not encourage people to switch the convenience factor of the car for other considerations. This means improved bus services are unlikely to be sustainable. Rail is the best but parking limitations at the station must be addressed
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q03	Proposed strategy for housing growth is not sound. Need a range of small, medium and large sites. Concentrating on fewer large sites will result in over-dependence on volume housebuilders, and lower delivery rates.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q03	Guiding principle in Para. 104 is supported.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q03	New settlements should not be allowed in the KDBH area as this will erode the green space between KDBH and Solihull
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q03	Some of the proposed housing development is too far away from the JLR/HS2 and would add to the already congested transport infrastructure and would impact the already congested roads and parking in the village of Knowle/Dorridge in particular
Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]			Q03	Objects to proportion of new housing proposed in Shirley South at 41% of the total, which should be spread more evenly over the borough. Can Solihull provide a list of brownfield sites in the borough.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q03	The selection of Greenfield sites while ignoring PDL sites and the opportunity for a new settlement north of Balsall Common are inexplicable. Building in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap will increase the merging with Coventry
Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]	Mrs Caroline Gooding	Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]	Q03	I agree partly in that non green belt land should be allocated first for development. However, no green belt land need be used as there is enough non green belt land that may be used by developers and permitted by the Council.
Mrs Christine Plant [4686]			Q03	Agree that Brownfield sites should be chosen in preference to Greenfield sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
Mrs Denise Delahunty [3156]			Q03	I agree with principle of concentrated development so that infrastructure can be built in BUT to have MORE concentrated development in the Shirley/Dickens Heath would put too much pressure on existing infrastructure. Due to Dickens Heath, local 2ndary schools are already at capacity (all schools have porta-cabins already), roads are full to capacity & parking space is at a premium. There are other suburbs of Solihull on the edge of the urban area that have not had this amount of development imposed.
Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]			Q03	Concentration of houses in one area
Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [3869]			Q03	Plan has major flaw in that new infrastructure and employment centres are in north-east of Borough whilst housing development proposed in south, meaning new residents commuting across Borough, with no plans for new transport infrastructure when main links are already at capacity in peak periods. Housing should be located near to areas of economic activity/employment.
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q03	Agree that Brownfield sites should come ahead of Greenfield/Greenbelt, but does not consider that the distribution of sites in the DLP is sufficiently reflective of this approach.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q03	Important to make sustainable use of natural resources, design and integrate new developments into existing communities and protect green belt.
Mrs Faye Doble [4650]			Q03	Solihull MBC would be far better putting all their proposed concentrated development for a new village, homes 6000+, with all new infrastructure and facilities. Somewhere between Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden could be a location Could Cheswick Green be increased to form a lovely Garden Village?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q03	<p>Any significant expansion of rural villages/settlements should be directed away from other conurbations and not reduce the green belt between Coventry, Burton Green and Coventry.</p> <p>No mention is made of using Brown field or previously developed Green field sites although this is said to be a guiding principle.</p> <p>The LPR evidence base is flawed. Although it purports to use a pseudo-scientific method to identify sites the actual scoring is subjective and in some cases incorrect.</p> <p>There are sites in Dorridge and Barston which may be more suitable and are further from the boundary with Coventry thus protecting the Meriden Gap.</p>
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q03	<p>I do not understand why 41% of the new build has been proposed for such a small area in South Shirley and so far away from HS2. Surely, 'spreading the load' and locating more in reach of HS2 would be sensible.</p> <p>Residents will not catch the train, congestion will increase and will contribute to climate change.</p> <p>Alternative brownfield sites should be considered. Use Monkspath Hall Road carpark. Add additional floors to existing buildings. Convert commercial to residential.</p>
Mrs Jacqui Gardner [3687]			Q03	<p>It is preferable to build on existing developed land over green belt, however I believe that public transport links will need improvement.</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q03	<p>para. 92 - the proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath, south of Dog Kennel Lane Shirley and south of Shirley do not protect the open countryside within the Solihull Green Belt.</p> <p>para. 102 - the two proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley should be discouraged since they represent "a disproportionate addition to a settlement that only has a limited range of facilities". Although Dickens Heath has a primary school it is oversubscribed and has a waiting list for entry. The internal roads within Dickens Heath are already congested with no capacity for additional traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jean Walters [2569]			Q03	<p>Large scale housing allocations in Dickens Heath parish would reduce or remove key gaps between settlements.</p> <p>A major expansion of the urban area.</p> <p>More small/medium sites is better distribution strategy than few large sites; more quickly built out; more opportunities for SME builders; more aligned with Housing White Paper.</p> <p>SoS statement in the Commons on 18.07.16: Green Belt is absolutely sacrosanct.</p> <p>Should be building more on public sector land.</p>
Mrs Joanna Holloway [3491]			Q03	<p>at least spread it more evenly across Solihull and not build such a high amount in one place, ie Shirley.</p>
Mrs Joanna Holloway [3491]			Q03	<p>I understand that you wish to use the area by Bills Wood Shirley to build houses which surely goes against your view not to use open green belt land. In the plan you recognise the high traffic in Shirley building more properties would make traffic worse. It would also put pressure on local services. It's hard enough as it is to get a doctors appointment at the moment. I want to keep Shirley's green belt land please look at building on brown field land</p>
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q03	<p>Welcome sequential approach to site selection but note this has not been followed for Balsall Common, as brownfield sites (of which there are many around village) not included and no explanation why excluded. Council should fully follow NPPF and its stated policy or provide reasons why village treated as an exception. Balsall Common not a sustainable transport location as bus services intermittent and daytime only, journey times to Solihull are very slow and indirect, only 2 local train services per hour in each direction and services overcrowded, roads are poorly maintained and dangerous for cycling, and limited employment opportunities.</p>
Mrs Judy Hill [3463]			Q03	<p>Allocation 4 is bad enough taking of our kids football pitches. Now you want to take their only bit of open space in Shirley that is left. We do not have the resources for this many houses. There are not enough schools, doctors surgeries etc.</p>
Mrs Julie Cooper [3800]			Q03	<p>Given the significant use of green belt for proposed development, concerned that council has not sufficiently explored non green belt sites available, of which there are many in the Balsall Common area, nor has this been sufficiently evidenced throughout the plan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q03	The number of houses to be built in the Shirley, Dickens Heath area is too many and will further expand the urban town of Shirley affecting green belt, increasing traffic to a ridiculous level on already very busy roads. The existing roads, Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Road, Tilehouse Lane, Tythebarn Lane, Dickens Heath Road, Shakespeare Drive are already congested at certain times of the day. The A34 and junction 4 of the M42 are congested throughout the day.
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q03	Object to disproportionate amount of building in Shirley South as full utilisation of brownfield sites has not been made and should be building close to employment growth areas in the east and centre of the Borough not in south Shirley.
Mrs M A Highfield [3162]			Q03	Objection to increasing demands of traffic to and on A34 Objection to increasing demands of residents by overpopulating the existing structure. Objection to loss of open fields and public walkways Objection to loss of local amenities
Mrs Mary Hitchcock [4671]			Q03	Balsall Common does not have good transport links. The A452 is overused by huge commercial vehicles.
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q03	Brownfield should be first areas to be developed. Green belt already affected by HS2.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q03	The approach defined for sites being appropriate for development as written looks good with the right priorities, but unfortunately they have not been adhered to in this draft plan.
Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]			Q03	Object to proportion of new housing proposed for South Shirley, as believes building 41% of the Borough's housing allocation in one small area would be a major error by the council, and building on such a large scale will change the whole character of the area, turning it into just another part of the urban sprawl.
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q03	Allocation 13. Concentrating 41% of housing in one area will greatly affect the local infrastructure, already overcapacity since the building of Dickens Heath. The allocation of sites needs to be much more evenly spread and be built in small pockets throughout the borough so as to not adversely impact on any one community.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q03	There are too many developments, too focussed on the area south of Shirley where roads are already too busy and there is no space to widen roads or provide new infrastructure.
Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [3301]			Q03	This is a difficult form to understand and fill in. However, the green belt I do understand. If all 'allocation 13' is used for building it will box South Shirley in, giving residence no open area for recreation. This will be a major health problem. Who benefits the residents or the builders? It does make one wonder who is benefiting financially from this project. To take all our environment is scandalous! It makes one question who is working for us the residence.
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet Council's specified criteria for accessibility as does not have high frequency public transport, so allocation of around 20% of Borough's new housing in village is contrary to policy and should be re-assessed.
Ms D Spavin & Mr S Milner [3883]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q03	support the spatial strategy and the allocation of employment land in the area, but would like to see a balanced approach to large and small businesses.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q03	Solihull's 'enviable record' of and delivering growth in a way which enhances the Borough whilst not undermining its attractiveness is now in doubt. Particularly for Balsall Common. The failure of our MP to secure tunneling of HS2 throughout the borough will have a huge effect on its attractiveness, as will the years of hosting a building compound to the east of BC. In addition the routing of aircraft over the village will diminish its attractiveness meaning people will travel here - but likely live elsewhere.
Ms Lisa Inkpen [3557]			Q03	Yes, I agree with the criteria for selection of sites.
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q03	Agree with content of Paragraph 101 in relation to category B(iii) extension

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
National Motorcycle Museum [370]	Louise Steele	Framptons Planning (Louise Steele) [4592]	Q03	<p>Suggest growth in the Spatial Strategy key in Growth Option E should be extended south to include the National Motorcycle Museum.</p> <p>The UKC Masterplan published in June 2013 set out a map of the Central Hub; the NMM sits immediately south of it.</p> <p>There is proposed major investment at the Museum which has substantial synergy with the proposals for UKC and the High Speed 2 Interchange Area, in particular:</p> <p>Contribution to the local economy,</p> <p>150-200 additional jobs, plus construction jobs, and potential apprenticeships,</p> <p>Links with schools, technical colleges and manufacturers,</p> <p>Optimise and existing cultural asset,</p> <p>Will support conference facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q03	<p>The spatial strategy should take a strategic approach, identifying all natural environment objectives as well as opportunities and areas for enhancement or strategic projects. Ideally there should be linkages with BAPS, NIAs, LNPs, NCAs, and Green infrastructure strategies. The strategy should be additional to positive policies on, landscape, biodiversity (including geodiversity), green infrastructure and access to nature.</p> <p>Growth opportunities should avoid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï,· designated sites/priority habitats ï,· protected landscapes ï,· Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land ï,· areas at risk of flooding ï,· brownfield sites of high environmental value <p>Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value.</p>
Neil Jackson Baker [4668]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>
Neil Sears [3923]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q03	<p>The Council has, therefore, opted for a spatial strategy that places large numbers of houses in rural locations away from the main centres of employment and where car-borne travel and related congestion would be an inevitable outcome. There seems to be little or no relationship between the Council's Transport Strategy, Solihull Connected, its priorities and implied spatial strategy, and the allocation of over 1000 houses in Knowle (and elsewhere in the rural areas). The Strategy therefore fails to achieve its fundamental aim of a sustainable pattern of development.</p>
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q03	<p>The Councils spatial strategy is not clear or coherent. it fails to link housing distribution to its economic and transport policies.</p> <p>Allocation of large sites does not balance large and small sites.</p> <p>RE KDBH area:</p> <p>1- knowle is not adjacent to main providers or employment or drivers of employment growth</p> <p>2 - Knowle not well connected to PT, no proposals in Solihull connected to remedy this</p> <p>3- significant additional journeys by car, contrary to objectives of Policies P7, P8 & P9.</p> <p>A number of alternatives suggested</p>
Nigel & Robin Tarplin [4326]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q03	<p>Too much reliance on large housing sites and delivery by volume housebuilders.</p> <p>Should be a range of housing site sizes.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of housing proposed in Blythe Ward; parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. I.e. 45%.</p> <p>Smaller sites encourage self and custom build as well as SME housebuilders.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nikki Burns [4068]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.
North Warwickshire Borough Council (Mr M Dittman) [3848]			Q03	Recognise and welcome that DLP fully addresses Solihull's own FOAN. Note the emphasis the plan places on economic growth and regeneration of areas such as Chelmsley Wood. Notwithstanding the above, there are significant local concerns over impact of UK Central proposals and development around HS2 Interchange station with regards to local, rural highway network and increased traffic flows and levels. Need to consider and include in DLP measures to address any potential adverse impacts, in parallel with maximising connectivity to the HS2 station.
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q03	Support sequential approach of locating development in spatial strategy. Would welcome acknowledgement of role that existing sites play in meeting development needs of Borough, which benefit from good transport links.
Nurton Developments [390]	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Q03	The lack of provision for housing growth at Hockley Heath means that the Draft Local Plan fails to provide for proportionate development to this sustainable rural settlement in order to sustain it as a strong and vibrant community.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q03	consider the spatial strategy as set out in the DLP is well thought out and will assist in delivering a wide range of housing across the borough in a dispersed method, taking advantage of the most sustainable settlements.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q03	Proposed strategy for housing growth is not sound. Need a range of small, medium and large sites. Concentrating on fewer large sites will result in over-dependence on volume housebuilders, and lower delivery rates.
Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsey [4654]			Q03	The Spatial Strategy is inconsistent with other Council strategies and Draft Local Plan policies.
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q03	<p>Agree with spatial strategy.</p> <p>Need to consider that currently Council cannot identify a five year housing land supply.</p> <p>Larger strategic allocations likely to come forward later in plan period.</p> <p>Vital to identify smaller, deliverable sites to provide housing numbers earlier in the plan period.</p> <p>Land at Tythe Barn Lane (part of Site 4) can come forward independently as an early phase, without prejudicing larger site allocation.</p> <p>Could provide affordable and market housing earlier in plan period as well as assist delivery of wider scheme.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q03	The spatial strategy is well thought out and will assist in delivering a wide range of homes across the Borough It will also will allow the authority to make the most of the urban edge of urban sites to make the best use of previously developed land, whilst protecting and minimising the need to encroach into the Green Belt. However, there will be a need to release some lower performing areas of Green Belt to meet the housing need across the HMA in order to meet the authorities own needs as well as overspill from elsewhere within the HMA.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q03	Solihull may have the correct approach but in doing so they will destroy totally the space to the north east of Balsall Common and no indication this loss will be replaced in breach of their own policy. No explanation has been given for this breach. They should look again at the selection of Barretts Farm for development to take off the unfair pressure from the local community.
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q03	No account of factors impacting Balsall Common. Draft plan indicates a bypass for BC is desirable but no proposed line on the map! No consideration is given to long term use of proposed HS2 construction site at north of BC, this is in Green Belt, so should reuse when build completed. also influence of Coventry based businesses on traffic flows in BC, Univ of Warwick and JLR are bringing skilled jobs to S of Coventry, need to consider this and where Coventry itself in planning to grow (ie abutting Solihull). No decisions on BC until crucial infrastructure is planned
Philip Wood [4552]			Q03	Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.
phillippa holroyd [3193]			Q03	more use of infill and less of green belt should be considered especially around the areas heavily impacted by the M42, HS2, Jaguar land rover, airport & proposed service station
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q03	Reasonable case for the housing numbers but concerned that it falls short of what should be provided in terms of meeting the Objectively Assessed Housing Need requirement for the Birmingham HMA. There is a reliance on too many large sites and volume housebuilders do not perform at the pace necessary to deliver the housing target requirements. More small and medium sites should be made available for local building companies who can deliver faster.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q03	3- The size of the proposed developments around rural villages appears out of proportion. The alternative options would be to concentrate future housing developments closer to the local areas of employment. There are also areas around Water Orton and Coleshill which could be considered

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q03	<p>The spatial strategy seems to run counter to the wish in paragraph 74 for preserving the environment.</p> <p>The proposed significant expansion of rural settlements is in conflict with the stated preference and national policy of giving preference to brownfield sites, and does not recognise the absence of high frequency public transport in most of the Borough.</p> <p>Given the shortage of housing land to meet the Government's housing targets, it is essential that all new development is to a high density to reduce the land-take.</p>
Richard Onions [4280]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet Council's specified criteria for accessibility as does not have high frequency public transport, so allocation of around 20% of Borough's new housing in village is contrary to policy and should be re-assessed.</p>
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q03	<p>* Agree in principle with particular reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Strategic objectives and sequential approach of Non Green Belt previously developed land first, o the positive approach to development at paragraph 100 which refers to the balanced approach between concentration and dispersal and cites a number of advantages including the provision for some smaller sites which will assist the early delivery of housing during the plan period and support existing services

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q03	<p>Agree in principle, in particular:</p> <p>Balanced approach of concentration and dispersal of housing sites - but concerned an overreliance on larger urban extensions.</p> <p>Optimise opportunities to bring forward development for community benefit.</p> <p>Exceptions are;</p> <p>Growth option F has excluded Dorridge and Hockley Heath, should be included. Critical to meet affordable housing need, cater for ageing population and address loss of key services and facilities in these settlements.</p> <p>Spatial Strategy Diagram should include Dorridge and Hockley Heath.</p>
Russell East [4330]			Q03	<p>Large scale housing allocations in Dickens Heath parish would reduce or remove key gaps between settlements.</p> <p>A major expansion of the urban area.</p> <p>More small/medium sites is better distribution strategy than few large sites; more quickly built out; more opportunities for SME builders; more aligned with Housing White Paper.</p> <p>SoS statement in the Commons on 18.07.16: Green Belt is absolutely sacrosanct.</p> <p>Should be building more on public sector land.</p>
Russell Hogg [3235]			Q03	<p>Suggesting that development be delivered on brownfield land first before releasing greenbelt land, and is not convinced that all brownfield land has been used up in B'ham or Solihull. .</p>
Sarah Ravenscroft [4478]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	Mr Miles Drew	GVA (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	Q03	<p>Broadly agree with spatial strategy.</p> <p>Ought to recognise the opportunity to round off the edge of the Solihull urban area.</p> <p>Proposed that the spatial strategy diagram on p.37 of DLP is amended to show a 'Location of Growth' arrow between fringe of Mature Suburbs area south of Town Centre and northern side of M42, concentrated around the railway line.</p>
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's own criteria for high frequency public transport and therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility. As such, the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough to Balsall Common, is in breach of SMBC's policy that "all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations". Moreover it is a settlement with limited employment opportunities and most people have to commute. A significant expansion will add unnecessary pressure to the road network as well adding to the carbon footprint. There are no proposed Sprint Runs to mitigate for this.</p>
Shirley Golf Club Ltd and IM Properties Ltd [4153]	Gary Stephens	Marrons Planning (Gary Stephens) [4152]	Q03	<p>qualified support for the spatial strategy and much of its content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - express concerns that allocation of sites has not be in keeping with the spatial strategy as set out in the DLP. - suggest amendments to the criteria b (Green belt) - selection of opportunities within the less preferred Options E to G instead of land adjacent Stratford Road <p>(SHLAA reference 62) is not justified by the evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognition within the Strategy to the role of smaller sites in assisting with early delivery during the Plan period is welcomed

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q03	<p>Agree with the strategy {sequential approach} as it is set out, but do not consider it has been followed. In particular Para. 102.</p> <p>Missed opportunity to expand along the M42 corridor.</p> <p>Disproportionate development south of Shirley (40%).</p> <p>No development around Dorridge is an omission.</p> <p>Suggest more even distribution across Borough.</p>
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q03	<p>Our project lies within the Greenfield site of the Arden Triangle development and losing it would not only damage the 'Guiding Principle' relating to supporting developments which 'contribute to the health and Well-being of communities'; but also to the Guiding Principle stated in 'not in Support' where a development challenges 'the protecting, conserving, enhancing and restoring environmental assets' as our project has taken derelict and unused field and turned it into a community asset which would be destroyed if the development was to proceed as planned.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q03	<p>Site selection process has resulted in a disproportionate concentration of new housing (2550 homes) adjacent to the South Shirley Urban Area mainly in Blythe Ward, rather than providing a more even distribution across the borough.</p> <p>Should have flagged up need for a further assessment stage that limited such a concentration occurring and the adverse impact this would obviously create on the ability of the local infrastructure to assimilate such large scale new development without harming community cohesion.</p> <p>Allocation of smaller Green Belt sites across the Borough could reduce concentration of housing in the South Shirley & Blythe Villages area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q03	<p>Site selection process has resulted in a disproportionate concentration of new housing 2550 homes adjacent to the South Shirley Urban Area mainly in Blythe Ward, rather than providing a more even distribution across the borough.</p> <p>Should have flagged up need for a further assessment stage that limited such a concentration occurring and the adverse impact this would obviously create on the ability of the local infrastructure to assimilate such large scale new development without harming community cohesion.</p> <p>Allocation of smaller Green Belt sites across the Borough could reduce concentration of housing in the South Shirley & Blythe Villages area.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q03	Support release of Green Belt land for housing.
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q03	support the general approach to the proposed level of growth within the rural areas, but question the allocation of a number of sites (DLP site 4, DLP site120)

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q03	<p>Welcome Council using land use powers to maximise economic benefits of HS2 and acknowledgement of need to release Green Belt.</p> <p>Insufficient land allocated in Plan. Green Belt boundaries will not be permanent. Requirements of NPPF not met.</p> <p>Potential to release more for safeguarded land.</p> <p>Concern that 'managed' part of Managed Growth is overly restrictive and outdated planning policy approach.</p> <p>Sequential approach not in accordance with NPPF. Sustainable land should be identified regardless of existing policy constraints.</p> <p>Support growth in most sustainable locations, but a wider dispersal strategy would meet local needs and provide housing in short term.</p>
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q03	<p>Richborough Estates Limited support the principles of the spatial strategy and the broad locations for growth. Based upon the range of technical and environmental assessments undertaken by the Council and Richborough Estate, the Proposed Housing Allocation 2: Frog Lane, Balsall Common and Proposed Housing Allocation 4: West of Dickens Heath accord with the spatial strategy and national planning policy about the sustainable locations for growth.</p>
Stoford Properties [4587]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q03	<p>Agree with spatial strategy.</p> <p>In particular Growth Option G, which includes land to the north east of Damson Parkway.</p> <p>Support the release of Green Belt at Damson Parkway; is considered an appropriate response to the economic development needs and ambitions for the UKC Hub area.</p> <p>Provides a unique opportunity to enable immediate strategic growth that is consistent with SMBC and GBSLEP.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q03	<p>Agree in principle, and support:</p> <p>Strategic objectives and sequential approach to directing growth;</p> <p>Advantages of balanced approach between concentration and dispersal;</p> <p>Selection of land west of Meriden as an appropriate growth opportunity.</p>
Stuart Wilson [3256]			Q03	do not agree that large scale sites should be the way development is delivered and would rather that consideration is given to sites throughout the borough.
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q03	<p>Accept that there are 'exceptional circumstances' justifying the altering of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate housing (and employment) requirements.</p> <p>Does not give proper consideration to the strategic role and function of the West Midlands green belt.</p> <p>DLP has been published in advance of the satisfactory resolution of the apportionment of meeting the needs of Birmingham, nor indeed any proper consideration of this important strategic issue.</p> <p>Not possible at this stage to identify the full housing needs across the housing market area.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q03	<p>Agree with spatial strategy.</p> <p>Acknowledge it has required updating from 2013 Plan.</p> <p>The growth options put forward allow for development to be focused around sustainable locations and hubs to further enhance the HS2 Interchange offering.</p> <p>Particularly support Growth Option G.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q03	<p>Support the concept of large scale urban extensions by releasing land in the Green Belt which is truly sustainable, well located to existing infrastructure and that can deliver a considerable amount of housing in order to help meet the HMA need.</p> <p>Releasing Green Belt land strategically through the Local Plan process, provides the opportunity to ensure that the principles of the Green Belt are retained and ensuring that the sites which are released protect against coalescence.</p>
Terra Strategic [3918]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q03	<p>Broadly agree with distribution strategy, but fails to address scale of housing growth required.</p> <p>Housing should be increased and additional growth allocated to the rural villages and settlements within the Borough.</p>
Terry Corns [4446]			Q03	<p>The Council's spatial strategy is not clear or coherent. It fails to link housing distribution to its economic and transport policies.</p> <p>Allocation of large sites does not balance large and small sites.</p> <p>RE KDBH area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- knowle is not adjacent to main providers or employment or drivers of employment growth 2 - Knowle not well connected to PT, no proposals in Solihull connected to remedy this 3- significant additional journeys by car, contrary to objectives of Policies P7, P8 & P9. <p>A number of alternatives suggested.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Terry Corns [4446]			Q03	The Council has, therefore, opted for a spatial strategy that places large numbers of houses in rural locations away from the main centres of employment and where car-borne travel and related congestion would be an inevitable outcome. There seems to be little or no relationship between the Council's Transport Strategy, Solihull Connected, its priorities and implied spatial strategy, and the allocation of over 1000 houses in Knowle (and elsewhere in the rural areas). The Strategy therefore fails to achieve its fundamental aim of a sustainable pattern of development.
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q03	Proposed strategy for housing growth is not sound. Need a range of small, medium and large sites. Concentrating on fewer large sites will result in over-dependence on volume housebuilders, and lower delivery rates.
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q03	The Council's decision-making process has been based on a points system which includes the following aspects: Well defined parcels of land; Preventing towns merging, Checking unrestricted sprawl, Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; Preservation of the setting of historic towns. The weighting of each of these five points has not been explained by the Council. Must be explained by Council if they want support for proposals in Knowle.
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q03	Proposed strategy for housing growth is not sound. Need a range of small, medium and large sites. Concentrating on fewer large sites will result in over-dependence on volume housebuilders, and lower delivery rates.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tim & Morwenna Hocombe [4917]			Q03	Generally support proposed strategies with limited incursion into the Green Belt.
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q03	<p>TfWM favour development that is located along high frequency public transport corridors and hubs, existing town centres and the UK Central hub area/HS2 (growth options A - E) rather than existing or new rural villages/settlements or new locations (growth options F-G) as sustainable transport is often limited.</p> <p>Need to emphasise future rapid transit routes in relation to locating new development (see Sections 2.12-2.14 of Movement for Growth strategy).</p> <p>Above policies should be explicit in Local Plan and aligned to vision.</p>
Trustees of the Berkswell Estate [629]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q03	<p>Most housing sites are large scale. Consider Council is relying too much on volume housebuilders performing and delivering such sites to meet annual targets.</p> <p>Recent research indicates more small and medium sites should be allocated to deliver housing by smaller building companies.</p> <p>Housing White Paper suggest 10% of allocation are 0.5ha or less.</p> <p>Should be preference for small/medium sized allocations.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of proposed housing in Blythe ward and parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q03	<p>Generally support the Council's approach.</p> <p>The Strategic key map (para 109) could be amended in the next stage of the local plan to reflect the HGIP and emerging Hub Framework.</p> <p>The opportunities within the UKC Hub area are unique and need to be considered in light of bringing forward development allied to a significant amount of supporting infrastructure and facilities. As such and given the level of investment required to enable the appropriate kind of development, there may well be specific opportunities to consider bringing forward a range of sites for development in The Hub area, within the plan period.</p>
Viv Smith [4670]			Q03	<p>No robust and detailed appraisal of alternative sites to Site 4 west of Dickens Heath have been carried out, nor have the infrastructure requirements of developing in the green belt been fully examined.</p> <p>The Green Belt Assessment findings have not been taken into account with some higher performing sites proposed for removal from the green belt, such as Site 4.</p> <p>There should be a preference for small/medium sized allocations which can be delivered faster, absorbed more easily and made available to smaller builders, rather than large scale allocations proposed.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q03	<p>Identified nationally important habitat network that runs south to north, roughly following the M42 corridor.</p> <p>Is the series of connected habitats that our native species are most likely to follow as their populations move in response to the predicted changing climate.</p> <p>Spatial strategy should be mindful that development in the borough does not form a barrier to movement along this corridor for wildlife, or cause a bottle neck, particularly around the proposed UK Central Growth Hub Area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q03	<p>Agree with overarching spatial strategy.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release exist.</p> <p>Disagree that Hampton-in-Arden is a settlement with a limited range of services.</p>
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q03	<p>Should use brownfield land ahead of green belt land, as extensive brownfield, industrial or abandoned land throughout the Borough, crying out for development. New housing should be closer to employment eg HS2, Airport, NEC, Resorts World and JLR, with improved transport links between communities, such as Kenilworth and Balsall Common, universities and employment areas, as would reduce congestion and carbon emissions. If development to be proposed in Balsall Common needs to be a settlement masterplan to cover use of brownfield land, transport and accessibility and infrastructure requirements.</p>
Zoe Speed [4472]			Q03	<p>Balsall Common fails to meet the Council's specified criteria for high frequency public transport, therefore is not a settlement with good accessibility, so the allocation of circa 20% of new housing in the Borough, is in breach of policy that all new development should be focused in the most accessible locations. A re-assessment is required of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common.</p>
Question 4 – Policy P1 UK Central Hub Area				
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q04	no comment to make

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q04	<p>Generally support. However, given the significance attached to Arden Cross by the Government, WMCA and GBSLEP, it is considered that the wording of Policy P1 can be refined to better reflect the Arden Cross Vision and the potential for early delivery of development to coincide with the arrival of HS2 in 2026. Welcome working with the Council to assist in this.</p> <p>The flexibility afforded by the Policy and justification is supported and is necessary, however, In justifying removal of the site from the Green Belt, the exceptional circumstances are much stronger than outlined in the draft Plan.</p>
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q04	agree
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q04	Support for Policy 1 and 1A but planning rules should be used to discourage distribution or warehousing in UK Central area because of the negative impacts this will have on the road network. Development should be focussed on high productivity, high talent enterprise.
Bickenhill & Marston Green Parish Council [3391]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q04	<p>Additional development at the NEC should be within its boundaries. There should be a stated protection for Bickenhill Plantations as a buffer to residential development in Marston Green.</p> <p>Any reduction in car parking should not be detrimental to the local area.</p> <p>Birmingham Airport development must maintain and enhance the living environment around the airport and development should be within its boundaries.</p> <p>Development at Birmingham Business Park should minimise environmental impact on surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>The Garden City approach at Arden Cross should not be compromised. Retail and other development should be of an appropriate scale the site, not large scale.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Birmingham Airport Ltd (FAO: Planning Manager) [2471]			Q04	<p>Generally support but could be strengthened to reflect role as a key economic driver.</p> <p>Should be additional support for the growth of BHX outside its current boundary on clearly identified land that is either currently owned by BHX or could be made available.</p> <p>Green Belt should be released to the South West of the A45 to allow future growth of the airport.</p> <p>Provision should be made for a combined HS2/ BHX Terminal on the Triangle Site.</p> <p>The wider Green Belt to the South West of the A45 should be released for airport related uses and other economic and infrastructure uses.</p>
Birmingham City Council (Waheed Nazir) [3971]			Q04	<p>Supportive of the UK Central proposal and the recognition of the importance of Jaguar Land Rover, the NEC and Birmingham Airport as key economic assets.</p> <p>Support work of the Urban Growth Company in assisting delivery of development in this area.</p> <p>Welcomes the approach set out in the Plan with regard to the NEC and the general support for the expansion of the airport to maximise use of the existing runway.</p> <p>Concern that the plan does not recognise the potential to relocate passenger facilities to the Arden Cross site. This should be considered in the next version of the Local Plan.</p>
Chris Crean [3631]			Q04	<p>This policy could create sprawl as well as a huge growth in car dependency as area not well served by public transport, BUT where the opportunities arise to curb traffic growth all the plan suggests is 'Encourages modes of travel other than the private car'. Where is the reduction in dependency upon the private car?</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q04	<p>We are in agreement with the Council's policies relating to economic growth.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Colin Davis [3352]			Q04	it appears that JLR will be given a green light to develop all the land up to the A45 regardless of what all the local residents of Elmdon Heath and Damsonwood want . we will suddenly be on the edge of a huge industrial zone
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q04	Broadly in favour of the policy, especially in that it seeks to promote alternative modes of transport to the car. I also recognise that some of the larger employers and contributors to the business rates revenue the council receives play an important role in the borough. I do also feel that their needs shouldn't be met at a cost to the community. As the policy is written this seems largely to be the case.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q04	Policies P1 and P1A I'm encouraged by the implication here that currently underused land in places such as Blythe Valley and the NEC could be used for a broader range of development, including housing.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q04	Agree with the policy, but have some reservations about the drafted policy bias towards the larger employers in teh borough.
Coventry City Council (Planning Policy Officers) [2112]			Q04	Support in principle for HS2 to ensure the benefits are realised. Whilst it will result in a reduction in the gap between the western edge of Coventry and the eastern edge of Solihull being reduced, this is acceptable in the context of the economic benefits of the region as a whole.
Ellandi LLP [3670]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q04	Object to lack of suitable guidance to define appropriate scale for retail and leisure elements identified for Arden Cross and Birmingham Business Park to ensure they do not compete with existing or planned facilities elsewhere. The policy should set a suitable threshold beyond which an impact assessment is required to test the consequences of proposals, to be informed by an updated Retail and Leisure study, and ensuring that development is delivered only when the development itself requires it. It should ensure no standalone or destination retail or leisure development beyond that required for the primary function.
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q04	Need for comprehensive upgrade to Junction 6 to support UKC ambitions. Requires a MSA to support this. Should be recognised in text.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q04	<p>General support.</p> <p>Key assets are important; should encourage other employment growth/land opportunities to support chain of businesses.</p> <p>Local Plan states delivery of UKC Hub will be after plan period for housing policy, but immediately in economic policy. ELR stated 5,400 new jobs from UKC to be delivered 2026-2033. SHMA states job growth from UKC not to be included in analysis.</p> <p>Contradiction should be clarified.</p> <p>Should clarify if 1000 dwellings in UKC Hub are part of or in addition to OAN.</p>
Genting Solihull Ltd [3409]	Ms Andrea Arnall	Turley Associates (Ms Andrea Arnall) [2025]	Q04	<p>UKC hub area has potential to deliver sustainable economic growth over the plan period and the concept of flexibility is supported to ensure that no future development opportunities are lost.</p> <p>Agree with the aim of Policy P1 which is realistic and will address the spatial implications of economic and social change over the plan period.</p> <p>The policy offers the opportunity for further retail and leisure activities at Resorts World to support the ambitions of the NEC.</p> <p>Support mixed use areas but need to ensure that this does not result in a conflict of uses and impact on amenity.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q04	<p>P1 should be a policy for Solihull overall, with the UK Central section set out in the Plan being Policy 1X. The Solihull-wide policy should recognised that workers for UK Central and JLR will come from 10 -20 miles around, including Knowle and Dorridge.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q04	<p>The scale and location of development would affect (to varying degrees) the setting of a number of important heritage assets. There are also numerous designated heritage assets within proximity to the site. It is important that the direct and indirect impact on these assets and their setting are considered at this strategic plan making stage in accordance with the NPPF (para158).</p> <p>The draft Local Area Plan (Draft 2014) for this nationally significant development area provided a welcome commitment to ensuring that heritage assets are protected and enhanced. It would be helpful to include a similar commitment in the local plan.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q04	<p>Neither the Local Plan nor the associated HS2 Growth Strategy adequately explain how existing stations such as Solihull and Dorridge will integrate with the new rail infrastructure. As plans for Birmingham International are not clear from the evidence base it is uncertain how the development will allow commuters to reach HS2 from within the Solihull borough. There is insufficient detail here to ensure the Policy is compatible with P8.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q04	<p>Neither the Local Plan nor the associated HS2 Growth Strategy adequately explain how existing stations such as Solihull and Dorridge will integrate with the new rail infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no rail connectivity indicated from these stations to the HS2 link, driving traffic to these stations - hardly "...an integrated approach to movement through the Hub area...". As plans for Birmingham International are not clear from the evidence base it is uncertain how the development will allow commuters to reach HS2 from within Solihull borough. Insufficient detail to ensure the Policy is compatible with P8.</p>
Holiday Extras & Airparks Ltd [3677]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q04	<p>Support policy which recognises the economic importance of Birmingham Airport and provides a reasoned approach for securing development of supporting facilities and infrastructure</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q04	DLP correctly identifies the significant economic assets captured within UK Central, including UKC Hub, NEC, Airport, Birmingham Business Park, JLR and HS2 Interchange site. ELR does not specifically set out any 'land requirements' associated with supporting growth, but does acknowledge that job growth will be additional to the baseline forecasts 'because it was considered as something that was not anticipated by the forecast i.e. supergrowth.'
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q04	Over-reliant on housing numbers to be delivered in UKC Hub Area. Lack of evidence provided to support delivery or supporting infrastructure. Timescales of HS2 delivery still uncertain.
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q04	DLP correctly identifies the significant economic assets captured within UK Central, including UKC Hub, NEC, Airport, Birmingham Business Park, JLR and HS2 Interchange site. ELR does not specifically set out any 'land requirements' associated with supporting growth, but does acknowledge that job growth will be additional to the baseline forecasts 'because it was considered as something that was not anticipated by the forecast i.e. supergrowth.'
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q04	Strongly welcome Policy P1. Welcome correct identification of exceptional circumstances which warrant Green Belt release at Damson Parkway.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q04	I am very pleased to see some of the items in this policy, particularly diversifying the visitor offer at the NEC and the incorporation of low carbon and renewable energy principles as a general objective.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q04	Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period. No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub. Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q04	Generally agree with Policy P1 which reflects the Government's commitment set out in the NPPF, to secure sustainable economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, which builds on the area strength and meets the challenges of global competition and a low carbon future.
Lendlease [319]	Simon Zargar	dp9 Ltd (Simon Zargar) [3931]	Q04	Growth around the HS2 interchange should be properly planned to ensure the area does not become a new defacto town centre by virtue of its cumulative size and floorspace. The scale of retail developments at UKC should be more tightly defined to reflect its out of centre location. The town centre first approach should not be circumvented either by virtue of failure to identify and plan to meet capacity in appropriate town centre sites, or by allowing a large quantum of retail floorspace, which could be proportionately significant when compared to the scale of the Town Centre and other centres.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q04	Policy P1 - Central Hub Area. There is no mention of the effect of Brexit or US politics especially in relation to car development (JLR expansion)? If US decide to reduce imports of JLR, economic growth significantly affected including all service industries and airport, 'Arden Cross' and Birmingham Business Park. There is no agreed impact of HS2. We agree with the challenges and objectives addressed by the policy on page 47. When did Arden Cross become the name referenced for the new Garden Village? Who decided this. There will be confusion as lots of 'Ardens' already exist in the Borough
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q04	Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period. No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub. Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q04	I object to the amount of land that JLR are getting from the green belt. It appears excessive.
Mr Adrian Jones [3065]			Q04	<p>1) Site Alloc 20 site will probably reduce the number of people employed in the midlands within JLR supply chain.</p> <p>2) By freeing up the land identified in allocation 20 will create an uninterrupted length of commercial land in excess of 5 miles from Lode Lane in the West to beyond the current NEC site in the East.</p> <p>3) The buildings proposed by JLR for the logistic centre are totally disproportionate in terms of scale and height.</p> <p>4) JLR will take the cheapest solution as they have demonstrated already.</p> <p>5) Several thousand homes East/North East of Lugtrout Lane will be negatively affected</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q04	<p>I support Policy P1 but believe that the following should be added.</p> <p>The introduction of new distribution or warehousing activities will be discouraged in view of the congestion of principal roads within the borough including the M6, M42 and A452 and the need to focus valuable land on jobs of high economic value.</p>
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q04	It makes sense to develop an area with major transport links, any future housing developments should be focussed on supporting this area.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q04	Yes
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q04	Agreed
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q04	You can't include ARDEN CROSS as the House of Lords is still discussing Clause 48 of the HS2 bill

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q04	Generally speaking we agree with Policy P1 which reflects the Government's commitment set out in the NPPF, to secure sustainable economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, which builds on the area strength and meets the challenges of global competition and a low carbon future.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q04	Agree in principle. Proposed housing development south of Shirley will be remote from economic activity.
Mr M Ali [4118]	Atief Ishaq	Planning Design & Build (Atief Ishaq) [4116]	Q04	Support in principle for the designation of site 20 as employment land, but would like to see the site continue to deliver mixed use/commercial uses, such as the hotel owned by the representor on the site.
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q04	Any redesignation of current green belt land should be purpose specific otherwise we will see developer creep for certain. The current natural frontiers to unwanted development will be destroyed. In addition - development along or close to the planned HS2 line should be banned for environmental the reasons - not the least of which is noise and the disruption during the construction period. For this reason inter alia the development at Barratts Farm in Balsall Common should not go ahead .
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q04	I am concerned that the policy makes good points about the airport and JLR but no reference to the local parcels of green belt land also put forward for housing close to both. JLR is to be granted land in geenbelt, the airport has expanded both or which have noise and traffic impacts on local residents. I can confirm that the airport noise where I live is often disturbing. Surely if P1 is agreed then also agreeing green belt near solihull centre for housing should be considered inappropriate as residents will feel more than a little put upon.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q04	Strongly supported. Para. 134-137 justify release of Green Belt land to support Policy P1 aims. Should include some residential development to ensure sustainable development of JLR.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q04	Any new settlements should be within the HS2 JLR area to reduce the need for car travel through the local real area
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q04	Let's build for our families, encourage young people and not end up a region for the retired.
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q04	Solihull has a wonderful opportunity to be part of the future. Lets take it there.
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q04	Please make sure we include really good facilities for the arts. Could we have a Tate gallery or a Solihull artists community?
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q04	It is important to sustain the attractiveness of the Borough for people who live, work and invest in Solihull/
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q04	Obviously HS2 will have a major impact on this area and Solihull is right to maximise its potential even though this will have a detrimental effect on the rural landscape. However, it does make it all the more important to protect the remaining Green Belt.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q04	Th Hub should maintain its strength and opportunities for the area.
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q04	Natural England broadly agrees with Policy P1.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q04	Generally agree with the policy.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q04	<p>Generally support.</p> <p>Arden Cross, Site 19:</p> <p>Support release of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Would like to see housing numbers increased back to 2,000 to enable a sustainable vibrant urban quarter.</p> <p>Emphasis should be placed on early development opportunities in line with Government and WMCA aims.</p> <p>Birmingham Airport:</p> <p>Recognise importance of a successful regional Airport.</p> <p>Prefer Site 20 area for expansion to east of A452.</p> <p>Jaguar Land Rover:</p> <p>Recognise importance of JLR to regional economy.</p> <p>Development expansion should not be considered in isolation from Airport aspirations.</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q04	<p>Agree with Policy P1.</p> <p>Council should consider this push of economic and employment growth when deciding their objectively assessed housing needs, and associated market factors.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q04	<p>Generally speaking we agree with Policy P1 which reflects the Government's commitment set out in the NPPF, to secure sustainable economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, which builds on the area strength and meets the challenges of global competition and a low carbon future.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q04	<p>Agree with Policy P1 but lack the faith to achieve it. There is dependence on the fortunes of a small number of enterprises of which SMBC has no control. It is not particularly clear that any are flourishing although headlines are upbeat. It is understandable why HS2 gets the headlines but there is no guarantee that it will be successful when built, too much faith is put into it.</p> <p>Agree that if HS2 becomes reality Meriden Garden City is a step forward to the vision if it takes the pressure off Balsall Common.</p>
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q04	<p>Evidence suggests that the trend line growth in jobs is substantially below what Local Plans aggregated are currently planning for. In order to achieve SEP targets, it is necessary to substantially increase the level of economic growth being planned for in Local Plans.</p> <p>The scale of economic development required can be achieved by increasing the scale of the opportunity significantly beyond Employment site 20, which is all that is proposed in this key strategic location.</p> <p>The conclusions of the WMLC are highly pertinent and should be afforded significant consideration in subsequent drafting of the Solihull Local Plan Review.</p>
Richard Evans [2640]			Q04	4-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q04	<p>No.</p> <p>There doesn't seem any plan to mitigate the increased traffic, congestion, carbon emissions, air quality degradation, and noise disturbance. The land should not be developed until after the aggregate resources have been extracted.</p> <p>Renaming the area as Arden Cross is simply tacky and tasteless. It already has a name, Middle Bickenhill.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q04	<p>Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub.</p> <p>Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q04	<p>Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub.</p> <p>Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.</p>
SMBC - Public Heath & Commissioning Directorate (Nick Garnett) [2295]			Q04	<p>UK central</p> <p>As well as encouraging 'improved public transport' there needs to be 'improved opportunities for walking and cycling'.</p> <p>HS2</p> <p>Make a significant contribution to the transport issues associated with HS2 with a transport infrastructure that maximises the forms of active travel to and within the site creating a more sustainable and healthier development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q04	<p>General support.</p> <p>Key assets are important; should encourage other employment growth/land opportunities to support chain of businesses.</p> <p>Local Plan states delivery of UKC Hub will be after plan period for housing policy, but immediately in economic policy. ELR stated 5,400 new jobs from UKC to be delivered 2026-2033. SHMA states job growth from UKC not to be included in analysis.</p> <p>Contradiction should be clarified.</p> <p>Should clarify if 1000 dwellings in UKC Hub are part of or in addition to OAN.</p>
Stoford Properties [4587]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q04	<p>Agree with principles of Policy P1 (UKC Hub Area) and approach to release Green Belt to the north east of Damson Parkway.</p> <p>Respond to economic development needs and ambitions of UKC Hub area, and the lack of non-Green Belt sites available.</p> <p>Review of GB boundary provides opportunity to shape sustainable future sustainable development in order to meet the longer-term needs of the Borough, in a coherent and logical manner which support the aims on Policy P1.</p> <p>Have submitted a Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Review undertaken in 2016.</p>
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q04	<p>Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub.</p> <p>Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q04	<p>Policy P1 supported by TfWM and is in alignment with the WMCA's SEP.</p> <p>Vital that Solihull MBC and TfWM work together to focus on securing the necessary TfWM (part of the West Midlands Combined Authority) infrastructure, connectivity and infrastructure improvements to create the optimum environment for investment, new jobs and homes.</p>
Undisclosed Client [4645]	Paul Rouse	Savills (Paul Rouse) [4647]	Q04	<p>The policy does not make appropriate provision for the economic growth of Solihull and the West Midlands Combined Authority area.</p> <p>Much of Site 20 is for JLR and the remainder falls short of the amount of land needed to support the key assets and the advanced manufacturing sector.</p> <p>Propose that an additional substantial allocation of land is made for economic development to support the key economic assets of the UK Central Hub. This is shown on the submitted plan.</p> <p>Evidence from the West Midlands Combined Authority should be used to influence the plan.</p>
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q04	<p>Supportive of the overall principles of the policy and opportunities to realise significant economic growth in order to maximise the full potential of the wider UK Central and specific Hub area.</p> <p>The HGIP demonstrates a larger capacity for growth than is outlined in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The overall number of dwellings (1000) should be greater and the HGIP sets out a figure of at least 1500 homes over the plan period, rising to 3-4000 beyond 2032.</p> <p>The HGIP outlines the overall growth ambition plan and sets out development outputs and infrastructure requirements to support the level of growth.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q04	<p>Agree with objective to contribute towards the strategic green infrastructure network across the Hub area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q04	I agree that sustainable economic growth is important however I do not feel this will be achieved by development of the site at Barrett's Farm, Balsall Common.
Question 5 – Key Objectives of Policy P1				
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q05	no comment to make
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q05	<p>The key objectives as identified in Policy P1 should be disaggregated so that it is clear how each economic asset will help to meet them over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>The proposals for each key economic asset should be subject to site-specific objectives in line with those set out at paragraph 58 of the NPPF</p> <p>LPR could also include an additional objective based on the demonstration of how development proposals will contribute to the alleviation of persistently high unemployment across pockets of the Borough and facilitate economic growth across the sub-region.</p>
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q05	agree
Chris Crean [3631]			Q05	Yet again development is centred upon the attractive locations along the M42/M40 corridor. This will result in sprawl as well as an overheating economy. Solihull should be working with the other boroughs of the West Midlands to spread economic activity to help areas where development is required, not adding to an already vibrant area.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q05	I support the objectives of policy P1.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q05	The objectives, if met, would make a beneficial contribution to the borough and its residents, so I support them.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q05	<p>P1 Central Hub Area includes the 'UK Central':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not located at a public transport hub; instead a road-served location. The HS2 station will generate car traffic and not reduce it - No floorspace is given in the Plan for the 'UK Central' proposals east of the M42 - effect of development on the road system, M42 in particular, not addressed in the Plan <p>Policy P1 should be reviewed and revised to put limits on the development proposed at UK Central. make clear that the UK Central proposal called is not required to meet the employment needs of the Borough.</p>
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q05	<p>Not taken sufficient account of link between provision of new employment and provision of housing. Should be above the 'balancing requirement'.</p> <p>Land at Dickens Heath/Tidbury Green well located to Blythe Valley Business Park.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson- Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson- Gallego) [2508]	Q05	<p>Unclear how Objective B (in Challenges), meeting housing needs, will be delivered if uplift is not included to meet economic needs.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q05	<p>As noted above, Policy P1 should relate to the Solihull MBC area as a whole with the UK Central Hub area text as one of the sub-policies.</p> <p>The Key objectives for Solihull (under the proposed revised Policy P1) should be developed as proposed in my representation:</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q05	<p>The key objectives identified are appropriate, but other policies (such as P8) must be assessed against these to ensure that development within the UK Central Hub Area support other policies, notably P9.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q05	The key objectives identified are appropriate, but other policies (such as P8) must be assessed against these to ensure that development within the UK Central Hub Area support other policies, notably P9.
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q05	<p>Economic development ambitions in P1 should be balanced by housing growth in Policy P5.</p> <p>Important to recognise that in supporting the growth objectives of the WMCA, Solihull is advocating to the Government the capacity to support the delivery of a higher level of job growth on the basis of investment support, and the wider success of the sub-region in attracting greater levels of economic growth.</p> <p>DLP fails to adequately consider the wider infrastructure implications of the full potential of investment being realised.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q05	<p>Economic development ambitions in P1 should be balanced by housing growth in Policy P5.</p> <p>Important to recognise that in supporting the growth objectives of the WMCA, Solihull is advocating to the Government the capacity to support the delivery of a higher level of job growth on the basis of investment support, and the wider success of the sub-region in attracting greater levels of economic growth.</p> <p>DLP fails to adequately consider the wider infrastructure implications of the full potential of investment being realised.</p>
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q05	<p>Not taken sufficient account of interlink between provision of new employment and provision of housing.</p> <p>Our view that housing should be significantly above the balancing requirement.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q05	<p>Welcome policy support provided by Policy P1. However, the objectives would be addressed at planning application stage; a number of which are insufficiently clear and/or appear onerous.</p> <p>Clarify terms 'growth' and 'place-making'.</p> <p>E.g. economic development proposals evidently support economic growth. Place-making usually refers to mixed use developments. Unclear how employment-led proposal would support strong, vibrant and healthy communities.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q05	Yes, I agree with these objectives.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q05	<p>Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub.</p> <p>Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q05	<p>Generally agree with the key objectives that development is expected to meet as identified in Policy P1 are appropriate. It would help secure sustainable economic growth in an area which has regional, national and international importance. Linking and development of these sites, which are all within close proximity to each other, increases accessibility as well as encouraging sustainable modes of travel.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q05	Agree with the challenges and objectives addressed by the policy.
Messrs Wheeldon & Gooding [3886]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q05	Agree and support.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q05	Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period. No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub. Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q05	Key principles are fine but the impact of the details is in question e.g. JLR development impacting on the green belt
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q05	I support this
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q05	Yes
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q05	Probably in the most part they work , but the dependency on the locality on JLR is worrying.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q05	Generally we agree with the key objectives that development is expected to meet as identified in Policy P1 are appropriate. The proposals would help the local authority in meeting the housing needs across the Borough to include meeting in full their own OAN and assisting with accommodating the HMA wide shortfall, objective B. It would help secure sustainable economic growth in an area which has regional, national and international importance. Linking and development of these sites, which are all within close proximity to each other, increases accessibility as well as encouraging sustainable modes of travel.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q05	Agree in principle.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q05	Support.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q05	Need to prioritize reduction in pollution, congestion and develop local energy plan to ensure that carbon reduction targets can be met.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q05	It should also ensure that HS2 brings employment and commercial opportunities to the area rather than Solihull becoming a 'commuter village' for London.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q05	Again, economy is important to Solihull.
Ms D Spavin & Mr S Milner [3883]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q05	support the objectives of P1
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q05	Natural England broadly agrees with the key objectives which relates to the protecting and enhancing of natural assets and takes climate change into consideration.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q05	Generally agree with the objectives in P1.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q05	Generally agree with the key objectives that development is expected to meet as identified in Policy P1 are appropriate. It would help secure sustainable economic growth in an area which has regional, national and international importance. Linking and development of these sites, which are all within close proximity to each other, increases accessibility as well as encouraging sustainable modes of travel.
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q05	Economic consideration is limited by considering JLR solely in context of Lode Lane. It is a multi site business, whose staff live all across the borough, and together with nature of its components and product contribute significantly to Solihull's traffic flows. As the business develops there may be opportunities for more employment, but the increased housing need and volume increases are more certain and should be reflected in traffic flow planning

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q05	<p>The scale of economic development required can be achieved by increasing the scale of the opportunity significantly beyond Employment site 20, which is all that is proposed in this key strategic location.</p> <p>An Economic Growth Zone providing JLR expansion, Airport expansion and space for complementary development and supply chain for these assets and HS2, in line with SEP and HS2 Growth Strategy targets, can and should be achieved. It will also allow planned works by Highways England to be capitalised upon.</p>
Richard Evans [2640]			Q05	5-YES
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q05	<p>Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub.</p> <p>Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q05	<p>Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period.</p> <p>No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub.</p> <p>Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q05	Unclear how Objective B (in Challenges), meeting housing needs, will be delivered if uplift is not included to meet economic needs.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q05	Lack of confidence that level of residential development will come forward within the plan period. No certainty on timeframe of HS2 development, UK Central Hub Area in general and precise uses and percentages of different land uses in Hub. Concern about effects of future Airport plans and its land requirements to expand.
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q05	Supportive of the overall principles and opportunities to realise significant economic growth in order to maximise the full potential of the wider UK Central and specific Hub area. The HGIP demonstrates a larger capacity for growth than is outlined in the Draft Plan. The overall number of dwellings (1000) should be greater and the HGIP sets out a figure of at least 1500 homes over the plan period, rising to 3-4000 beyond 2032. The HGIP outlines the overall growth ambition plan and sets out development outputs and infrastructure requirements to support the level of growth.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q05	I agree with sustainable economic objectives
Question 6 – Policy P1A Blythe Valley Park				
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q06	no specific comments in response to this question
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q06	Support for Policy 1 and 1A but planning rules should be used to discourage distribution or warehousing in UK Central area because of the negative impacts this will have on the road network. Development should be focussed on high productivity, high talent enterprise.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Canal & River Trust (Anne Denby) [3983]			Q06	Further clarity within this policy as to what is expected in terms of the wider connectivity for the Blythe Valley development to ensure the overall aim of the policy to integrate and connect the development to the wider area is realised through the development management process. In particular, the towpath offers benefits in terms of providing a sustainable traffic free route.
Chris Crean [3631]			Q06	This is yet more sprawl development.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q06	I support the objectives of policy P1A.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q06	Policies P1 and P1A I'm encouraged by the implication here that currently underused land in places such as Blythe Valley and the NEC could be used for a broader range of development, including housing.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q06	Blythe Valley Business Park borders both a Site of Special Scientific Interest and floodplain. Any development there should pay careful regard to both of these issues. Furthermore, the present arrangements at the site offer very poor public transport connectivity. For any development to be viable would require consultation with public transport providers to ensure that this doesn't become an isolated community, or inaccessible (except by car) place to work.
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q06	The proposed 600 dwellings on land currently designated in the adopted Plan for Blythe Valley Business Park already have outline planning permission. No use would be served now by examining alternatives to Policy P1A, which is already being implemented.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ellandi LLP [3670]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q06	Object to lack of suitable guidance to define appropriate scale for retail and leisure elements identified for Blythe Valley Business Park to ensure they do not compete with existing or planned facilities elsewhere. The policy should set a suitable threshold beyond which an impact assessment is required to test the consequences of proposals, to be informed by an updated Retail and Leisure study, and ensuring that development is delivered only when the development itself requires it. It should ensure no standalone or destination retail or leisure development beyond that required for the primary function.
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q06	Support aspirations for growth at Blythe Valley Park. Highways England have documented in their Holding Objection letter (24 November 2016) the many significant shortcomings in the consideration of the traffic implications for the M42 mainline and M42 slip roads resulting from a MSA located alongside this Junction. Additional traffic using Junction 4 will significantly and detrimentally impact on access to Blythe Valley Business Park and other key economic assets located north of Junction 4 (towards Shirley) which require access via the A34 and Junction 4.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q06	The final paragraph of P1A remains a potential for benefit to the surrounding communities, and HHPC would urge SMBC to ensure that facilities within the BVP development contribute to the needs of surrounding communities in addition to the needs of the BVP development itself.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q06	Would have expected the views expressed within P1A to have translated into planning policy in spite of the draft status of the Local Plan. The sentence indicating that development should demonstrate integration with surrounding areas and facilities has been ignored by the developers of the site. The zero CIL rating will reduce the potential for the development to benefit the wider area and nearby communities. Urge SMBC to ensure that facilities within the BVP development contribute to the needs of surrounding communities in addition to the needs of the BVP development itself.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q06	<p>In principle do not object to separate Policy P1A for BVP, but should not overlook its importance and role in Borough and wider region. Support wording around mixed use community and primary economic asset.</p> <p>BVP has secured mixed use planning permission.</p> <p>Note there are inconsistencies between Table at Para. 230 and footnote 34. Should state BVP can accommodate up to 1000 dwellings (assuming Council includes C2 and C3 uses in housing figures).</p> <p>Request that anomaly between UDP and Solihull Local Plan boundaries for BVP are addressed through DLP.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q06	<p>Concerned that land holdings at BVP not fully addressed and considered as part of DLP evidence base.</p> <p>SHLEAA Ref. 146 does not include any additional land submitted by ILM as part of Call for Sites. Land only considered in terms of housing; not housing and employment. Request that full land holdings at BVP are reassessed for these purposes during DLP.</p> <p>ELR confirms important economic function and attractiveness of M42 corridor for business; Solihull therefore has potential to capture demand far beyond the TTWA geography. ELR conclusion that BVP is 'site for expansion' has not been reflected in DLP.</p>
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q06	<p>Concerns that adequate housing is being provided around Blythe Valley Park to meet their economic needs.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q06	<p>Yes, this is business park with plenty of room for development</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q06	No detailed comments to make in relation to this policy but would agree that the policy will enable the Council to make a meaningful contribution to meeting obvious objectives and provide sustainable mixed use development to meet the needs of its population.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q06	Policy 1A - Agree. You put Blythe Valley Business Park logically in the right place close to M42/M40 links; now housing being developed, it is good integration if community services are developed there too.
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q06	I agree to the proposal, however I question if access along the A3400 and M42 etc. can actually cope with an increase in traffic.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q06	I support policy P1A with the caveat that the introduction of new distribution or warehousing activities will be discouraged in view of the congestion of principal roads within the borough including the M6, M42 and A452 and the need to use valuable greenbelt land for jobs of high economic value.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q06	Yes
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q06	Yes, in the most part . Now you've relaxed planning but this ignores Application 2016/0275 MAJFOT
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q06	I agree with Policy P1A especially if the Blythe Valley Business Park development is supported by well planned residential development that will create an overall sense of place and a more sustainable location. There should be an integration of residential and business developments at the Blythe Valley Business Park and not building homes away from job growth areas on greenbelt land especially Allocation 13.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q06	Agree that the policy will enable the Council to make a meaningful contribution to meeting obvious objectives and provide sustainable mixed use development to meet the needs of its population.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q06	Agree in principle. Could include objective K. Should consider SSSI and floodplain issues.
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q06	The approach to Blythe Valley Park is not supported. It is introducing support for uses in a location which is essentially is unsustainable and whilst the generally poor take up of the original commercial development is probably disappointing to the developers this should not be used as a valid justification for promotion of further classes of development in an unsustainable location.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q06	Support.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q06	A new settlement should be built at Blythe Business park area because the road infrastructure supports this
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q06	It makes sense to develop Blyth Valley Business park in this way
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q06	Solihull is not a 'village' it needs to fulfil it's potential.
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q06	Please include provision for the arts and art groups. Arts council funding has reduced significantly can Solihull try and address this through growth and innovation?
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q06	Building in the Meriden Gap will increase the merging of Balsall Common with Coventry
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q06	The amount of residential properties in the draft seems too high and will take up green belt.
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q06	I agree with Policy P1A especially if the Blythe Valley Business Park development is supported by well planned residential development that will create an overall sense of place and a more sustainable location. There should be an integration of residential and business developments at the Blythe Valley Business Park and homes should not be built away from job growth areas on greenbelt land especially Allocation 13.
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q06	Blythe Valley development is essential to Solihull and its residents.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q06	have no detailed comments on this policy but agree that the policy will allow the council to make meaningful contributions towards achieving objectives and meeting the needs of its population.
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q06	Largely supportive of policy and recognise contribution this area could play in development of wider UKC Hub.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q06	We have no detailed comments to make in relation to this policy but would agree that the policy will enable the Council to make a meaningful contribution to meeting obvious objectives and provide sustainable mixed use development to meet the needs of its population.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q06	Mixed development is a good step forward for major technical companies; I have to support this provided big names can be encouraged to put roots in Solihull.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q06	6-YES
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q06	Welcome the intention to protect and enhance the natural environment. As this phrase is within the policy wording, we suggest that the policy also helps address objective K which could be added to the list.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q06	I agree sustainable economic growth is important

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 7 – Policy P2 Maintain Strong Competitive Town Centres				
ALDI Stores Ltd [3933]	Gareth Barton	Turley (Gareth Barton) [3932]	Q07	<p>Fails to acknowledge that Solihull Town centre's role as the principle focus for retail development in the Borough. The Policy fails to provide a positive framework for the attraction of new retail floorspace into the Town Centre. It is unduly focussed on the diversification of land uses in the Town Centre through the provision of allocation sites to accommodate other town centre uses, but fails to allocate any land to meet the needs of new retailers who may wish to invest in the Town Centre.</p> <p>Policy P2 is not underpinned by an up to date assessment of retail floorspace requirements.</p>
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q07	no specific comments to make on this
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q07	It makes sense to have a policy to develop the retail and commercial centres to build sustainable communities.
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q07	<p>Balsall centre must be added to the list of town centres that require a masterplan to define the nature, timing and scope of improvements such as car parking, maintaining its local importance, improving its dated centre and making it an attractive place.</p> <p>This cannot be done buy a neighbourhood plan given that the level of growth proposed is strategic and not just for local needs. It should therefore be a strategic priority for the Borough.</p>
Chiltern Railways (Mr David Heathfield) [2998]			Q07	<p>Support developing Solihull Town Centre as a place of quality and</p> <p>distinction as outlined in the town centre masterplan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Crean [3631]			Q07	<p>Support much of policy, although the term sustainable economic growth is somewhat confusing. There should be greater ambition for larger number and variety of housing provision in these locations, to provide for all age groups and abilities to create an enhanced churn with these areas.</p> <p>Is relocation of station such a high priority and for what purpose? By taming the car and reducing car dependency enhanced connectivity between the station and the centre could be achieved?</p> <p>Plan will need to be strictly worded to ensure these developments are not traffic generating and Council vigilant in ensuring traffic reduction results.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q07	<p>I support the general approach presented in policy P2. The outline is along the right lines but there is very little detail provided with regard to the approach in all of the areas included. I am obviously aware that an Economic Plan for Shirley document exists. Should there not be some cross referencing?</p> <p>The plans for Solihull town centre seem to offer the opportunity for higher density residential space in a location with good transport connections.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q07	Support policy P2 in relation to Chelmsley Wood TC. Would like to see investment in the TC and opening up of a night-time economy. Currently the policy is weak on this.
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q07	support for Solihull Town Centre
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q07	Policy P2 I support the comments relating to Chelmsley Wood Town Centre here, which is in need of investment and improvement. There are opportunities to create a better sense of place and a night time offer and it would be good to see these realised.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q07	<p>The mentions of Shirley Town Centre are welcomed. Whilst I don't agree with the design of the new building on the site of the existing Powergen building, it is a site that needs redevelopment.</p> <p>The plans for Solihull town centre seem to offer the opportunity for higher density residential space in a location with good transport connections. My only concerns would be that any relocation of the train station is done with full regard to the impact that it might have on residents who currently use it. Similarly, regard should be paid to the businesses that would be net losers in the relocation, as the moving of the station may have an effect on the commercial viability of businesses on Station Approach.</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q07	<p>Welcome part on Chelmsley Wood town centre.</p> <p>However, weak on detail - needs investment and modernisation. Is under-used, no night time economy and facilities are scarce.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q07	see response to Q8
David Holtom [3685]			Q07	There is no mention of a master plan for Balsall Common centre, which needs a complete review and overhaul, as it is already overcrowded and busy, with plans to add more housing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q07	Having reduced Solihull town centre to a soulless mass of amorphous shops all selling similar products together with restaurant chains all giving the same food combined with much vacant office space, I cannot believe that more of the same is proposed. We are told that there is need for dwellings so why the commercial emphasis? As the centre of Solihull is already built on why can not more housing be included rather than office and retail? Any office/shop not occupied for more than a year should be converted to dwellings by compulsion.
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q07	Disagree with Policy P2. Failed to recognise that centre of Balsall Common requires its own masterplan to accommodate proposed housing growth, specifically parking provision.
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q07	I agree with maintaining strong town centres, but I am objecting because a Master Plan is required for Balsall Common to ensure balanced planning and retail services. As examples, this would: *have prevented the over-supply of supermarkets (3) (with associated congestion) in a small village *have limited the excessive number of estate agents in the village centre *help ensure more cohesive planning decisions in the village centre (eg the new Tesco store/flats - it is COMPLETELY out of character with the other buildings in the village centre in terms of style and size. A Master Plan is required.
Ellandi LLP [3670]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q07	Object to Policy P2 as not based on up to date evidence of retail and leisure need and bears no resemblance to the scale of development now proposed. The anticipated timing of growth should influence the phasing for plan led retail need and the preferred strategy for delivering it. The Plan should consider when and where need/capacity is likely to arise and identify locally set thresholds above which impact assessments will be required for town centre uses, including changes of use, as the NPPF threshold is too high where town centres are vulnerable. Policy must define primary shopping areas.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q07	<p>Concept of Policy P2 is worthy, but difficult to deliver mixed use and high density residential. E.g. apartment development requires significant capital as entire development must be completed prior to completion and occupation.</p> <p>Advise surplus contingency housing sites are identified due to risk of delivery in town centre.</p> <p>LPEG recommends 20% surplus.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q07	<p>With the additional 1000 homes to be built in Knowle, Knowle and Dorridge will be larger than Shirley, and so should be included as a separate item within Policy P2. Whilst UK Central will improve the job opportunities, if there are no new transport links then these are likely to be of little benefit to residents of Knowle and Dorridge.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q07	<p>We would expect to see more detail within the Local Plan on how SMBC intend to act to ensure the masterplan proceeds intact.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q07	<p>Whilst the vision is bold, it is not clear to what extent SMBC will be able to realise this vision. The section "...The benefits that could be realised if the train station were to be relocated to an alternative site..." suggest dependencies on other parties. SMBC should be clearer on its plan to realise the objectives of the Solihull Town Centre masterplan with input from the relevant bodies. It is unclear what SMBC intend to do to deliver the masterplan. There are numerous aspirations and more detail is required on how SMBC intend to deliver the masterplan.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q07	<p>IM are committed to improving and reinvigorating Mell Square and contribute towards wider improvements to Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Support Policy P2 and Council's intention to allow Town Centre to diversity and for flexibility in terms of the uses which will be considered suitable. This will encourage investment and allow for wider improvements.</p> <p>Mell Square/Mell Square East 'Preferred Uses' which are established within the Local Plan should allow for greater flexibility. Could successfully accommodate retail, leisure, residential (including PRS) and commercial uses. This should be reflected in Policy P2 and supporting text.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q07	Good principles. But again not seriously considered in the draft plan with no consideration of the disproportionate building of houses on an already congested and ill planned village centre (Balsall Common).
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q07	I am surprised by the desire to relocate the station when the current location is a relatively short walk from the town centre. When walking in from the station, the new Waitrose makes it feel like you have arrived at the retail centre before you actually reach the high street. I'm unconvinced that the Monkspath Hall Road Car Park location would offer easier access to town that would warrant the cost of relocation. The restriction on substantial retail floorspace for the redevelopment of the Powergen site seems very sensible and development should complement the successful Parkgate area.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q07	<p>Agree in principle, particularly ambitions for Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>However, increasing residential capacity and the relocation of the train station closer to the town centre have been longstanding ambitions.</p> <p>Whilst these are supported they have not moved forward towards realisation and remain ambitions.</p> <p>Doubtful that 861 homes in plan period or 1400 homes overall is achievable.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q07	Agree with Policy P2. It would allow the role of the centres to be strengthened as well as safeguarding their character and appearance. The introduction of residential growth within Solihull centre is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and the creation of sustainable places would go some way to assist the authority with the provision of their housing need in a sustainable location with good access to jobs, public transport and all other facilities to reduce the need to travel.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lendlease [319]	Simon Zargar	dp9 Ltd (Simon Zargar) [3931]	Q07	<p>Support the development of Solihull Town Centre but need to ensure that its continued success is not detrimentally impacted by inappropriate development outside of centres in the Borough.</p> <p>The retail evidence base should be fully updated.</p> <p>Solihull Town Centre should continue to be the primary focus for retail and leisure development.</p> <p>Opportunity sites, and the introduction and addition of complementary town centre uses are supported.</p> <p>Support the principle of relocating the train station and improvements to north/south access to the High Street.</p> <p>Borough wide public transport accessibility proposals are welcomed but connectivity to Solihull Town Centre should also be improved.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q07	<p>Relocation of the railway station is something that may not reach its desired potential. Government needs to invest in public transport. To attract people to the town centre there must be a means of travel from the rural area.</p> <p>Car parking in the town centre needs to be improved. Station and some car parks are too far away. Suggest a park and ride that caters for residents not just visitors.</p> <p>Providing attractive gateways and urban design could cripple small businesses as rents increase.</p>
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q07	<p>Good principles, but not seriously considered in DLP.</p> <p>No consideration of the impact of disproportionate house building in an already congested and ill planned village centre.</p>
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q07	<p>Good principles, but again not seriously considered in the draft plan with no thought of the disproportionate building of houses on an already congested and ill planned village centre.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q07	<p>Agree in principle, particularly ambitions for Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>However, increasing residential capacity and the relocation of the train station closer to the town centre have been longstanding ambitions.</p> <p>Whilst these are supported they have not moved forward towards realisation and remain ambitions.</p> <p>Doubtful that 861 homes in plan period or 1400 homes overall is achievable.</p>
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q07	<p>Policy P2:</p> <p>Do not consider that the case for moving Solihull station to Monkspath hall has been made. Enormously expensive for no benefit, e.g. no direct train connection to Birmingham International or HS2. Journey from Monkspath Hall would be uphill and less accessible for the unfit, or those with buggies, luggage etc. Would result in loss of part of Tudor Grange Park and most of Monkspath Hall car park. General public do not feel there is an oversupply of parking in the town centre.</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q07	<p>Disagree about moving the train station, I don't see that it is significantly close to the town.</p> <p>Added bus lanes and changes to road furniture has slowed if not halted the flow of traffic.</p> <p>Removing the pedestrian crossings and adding invisible zebra crossings together with the u-turns outside the M&S carpark are not enhancing Solihull town centre.</p> <p>SHIRLEY TOWN CENTRE is already gridlocked during peak hours, Saturdays and the addition of the already approved houses is only going to make this worse.</p>
miss Stephanie Archer [3793]			Q07	<p>Over developing Solihull and reducing parking will not encourage people to come and shop in the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q07	We support the general thrust of P2 but believe that the same principles should apply to smaller settlements such as Balsall Common where projected housing growth will turn villages into towns. "Master plans" for such subsidiary town centre should also be developed, particularly Balsall Common. This is not an NDP issue. The housing choice is not an NDP issue so managing the consequences is not an NDP issue but an issue for SMBC
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q07	You are planning on building a very large number of additional housing in Balsall Common but have not considered the impact on the village centre. This must be included as part of the Policy if homes are to be built.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q07	No, moving Solihull railway station will take a considerable amount of time and expense for perceived little benefit. At present the current station location has a reasonable amount of parking and is easily accessible, with an equally accessible bus terminus. It is doubtful that a moved rail station could accommodate a co-located bus terminus and sufficient parking as the numbers catered for at the current location. see letter for full text
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q07	The Town Centre plan recently issued is at odds with some items in Policy P2 - suggest you are more open and honest.
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q07	For Balsall Common there needs to be a review of the centre and how people can access the facilities. Possibly developing a different facility either at the Station end of Station Road or possibly north of the village.
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q07	BC & Berkswell are both villages surrounded by Green Belt. not clear what specific proposals for BC village centre and infrastructure, in DLP. would like clarity.
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q07	Balsall Common is not listed as a town centre requiring a master plan. The proposed development and subsequent size of the residential area requires major change to the centre.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q07	We agree with Policy P2. It would allow the role of the centres to be strengthened as well as safeguarding their character and appearance. The introduction of residential growth within Solihull centre is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and the creation of sustainable places would go some way to assist the authority with the provision of their housing need in a sustainable location with good access to jobs, public transport and all other facilities to reduce the need to travel.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q07	<p>Agree that Solihull town centre would benefit from relocation of train station.</p> <p>Developments of Shirley High Street are welcome, but are hindered by busy traffic on A34.</p> <p>Support residential development close to Shirley High Street, but opportunities may be limited.</p> <p>Could review residential capacity on Powergen site.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q07	<p>There is no reference the requirement to develop Balsall Common centre. Proposed build will fundamentally change the the locality and will overwhelm existing shopping and associated provision. Recent residential infill has exacerbated the problems.</p> <p>As such the scale of development demands a strategic approach to the development of the centre and should be lead by SMBC (the local Balsall Parish Council having already shown itself as not up to the task given its recent actions in respect of the NDP).</p> <p>Policy P2 needs to reflect this strategic need.</p>
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q07	<p>If additional development is going to be delivered in Balsall Common, then Balsall Common will need an improved centre to meet the needs of the population - the current centre, in terms of facilities, traffic, shopping etc is hardly fit for purpose</p>
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q07	<p>If over 1000 new homes are built in Balsall Common it will need a master plan</p>
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q07	<p>Balsall Common town centre is not designated and must have a master plan to address it not being fit for purpose in its current state before 1300 new homes and 1000's of new residents results in unacceptable traffic congestion and fumes</p>
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q07	<p>I agree with the plan but would like to highlight that this work is highly likely to have an ongoing travel impact on local residents to Solihull town centre. The A41, Hampton Lane and Yew Tree Land junction is a pinch point for traffic especially in the mornings and evenings when people travel to and from work. If major work is to be carried out near the centre that will get worse. Also to add to this plans have been put forward for housing near this junction. I dread to think what my commute will be like!</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q07	Support.
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q07	Let's just get on with it now.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q07	Development of Balsall Common does require a masterplan.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q07	Balsall Common needs a plan for it's centre too
Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [3869]			Q07	Vision for expansion of town centre does not take into account the expectation that high street shopping will decline over the plan period and any expansion would further destroy the character of Solihull.
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q07	Balsall Common should be listed as a town centre requiring a masterplan. Now, even before new homes are developed, the centre suffers from significant traffic problems (speeding, congestion, parking problems) and too few facilities. If the number of homes planned for Balsall Common proceed, a master plan is vital to ensure that the area remains a pleasant, desirable and prosperous place.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q07	Potential relocation and development of new train station would be great waste of money and would reduce space available for badly needed housing. Much better solution would be to improve existing station and develop better pedestrian and cycling routes from the existing station to town centre. Also reduction of congestion in town centre should be prioritised by ensuring better public transport, cycling and pedestrian routes.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q07	Monkspath Hall Road should be allocated for housing and commercial premises. Relocating train station would be waste of money and use space which could be utilised for housing and commercial. No multistorey carpark should be built, it would increase congestion and pollution. Instead, cycle and pedestrian routes should be provided from the existing train station and between all areas.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
mrs jacqui gardner [3687]			Q07	Balsall Common seems to be ignored here, yet is in close proximity to the hubs mentioned. Strongly believe it should be included as the centre of Balsall Common is not sufficient for an extra 1350 families, the parking is very limited. If this number of houses is built, you need to consider creating a "second" town centre with adequate parking.
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q07	There is no reference to the requirement to develop Balsall Common centre. Housing proposals will fundamentally change the the locality and will overwhelm existing shopping and associated provision, whilst recent residential infill has exacerbated the problems. The scale of development demands a strategic approach to the development of the centre and should be lead by SMBC (the local Balsall Parish Council having already shown itself as not up to the task given its recent actions in respect of the NDP) and Policy P2 needs to reflect this strategic need.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q07	No comment
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q07	Solihull town centre is essential to Solihull and its residents.
Ms. Jill Smith [2921]			Q07	The roads are already unbearably choked, with no word of improving them or especially the dreadful island at the head of Blossomfield Road, Streetsbrook to Warwick Road and High Street which is an accident waiting to happen. Very bad idea re using the Monkspath Hall Road car park as a centre for development. You are trying to smash the heart if Solihull and make a nasty glitzy brash new thing that in no way considers people and helping them live and move better, eg. the costly car park at Solihull Hospital.
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q07	Natural England broadly supports Policy P2, in particularly where green infrastructure is a key consideration.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q07	<p>Note the Council's sequential approach to town centres.</p> <p>Note that proposals for main town centre uses elsewhere, will be considered in light of national planning policy.</p> <p>Whilst this approach is acknowledged, Policy P2 should also provide policy guidance to support the expansion of businesses which, like NGC, require support in the face of increasing competition and are typically located in out of centre locations.</p> <p>The plan could be positively prepared in this regard without affecting the underlying objectives of Policy P2 which seek to maintain strong, competitive town centres.</p>
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q07	<p>Agree with the Policy. Will strengthen the centres of towns, whilst protecting their characters.</p> <p>residential growth within Solihull Town Centre will accord with NPPF - and assist in provision of housing in a sustainable location.</p>
Paragon Finance (Mrs Tracey Caldicott) [3898]			Q07	<p>As a principal employer within Solihull Town Centre, concerned about the impact of the proposals on the business.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the identified town centre redevelopment sites should not impede staff and visitors from accessing the Paragon headquarters, or impact the business in terms of noise, pollution and disturbance.</p> <p>The identification of 51 Homer Road as a potential redevelopment site should not include the Paragon premises.</p> <p>Question where parking would be available should Monkspath Hall Road car park be redeveloped and the cost implications to employees of finding alternative parking.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q07	Agree with Policy P2. It would allow the role of the centres to be strengthened as well as safeguarding their character and appearance. The introduction of residential growth within Solihull centre is considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and the creation of sustainable places would go some way to assist the authority with the provision of their housing need in a sustainable location with good access to jobs, public transport and all other facilities to reduce the need to travel.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q07	<p>To look to maintaining town centres is necessary but beware the big city syndrome of replacing buildings of historical significance with modern glass structures and shopping malls. Birmingham is dominating some of the housing development and my experience of overspill areas it will ruin Solihull and its community.</p> <p>If housing of the magnitude proposed comes to Balsall Common our village centre needs to be fit for purpose but we have no mention in P2, probably because it is accepted that it has been made difficult by recent housing in the centre. The infrastructure will be overwhelmed by development.</p>
re West Mercia Police [684]	Ms H Winkler	re West Mercia Police (Ms H Winkler) [1910]	Q07	<p>Welcomes changes to the proposed wording with useful additions as follows:</p> <p>'...to create well designed streets with attractive active frontages which encourage vibrant and active street life and create characterful and well defined spaces and routes...The value of good urban design...the importance of creating legible, distinctive, flexible, attractive, safe and inclusive public realm throughout the town centre...'</p>
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q07	<p>The broad approach taken to developing Solihull Town Centre is probably right but the loss of parking facilities in Solihull Town Centre is worrying. The Local Plan should look at a scheme for Park and Ride in the life of the Plan and to look for sites in the Green Belt around the periphery. Sites at Ravenshaw, Widney manor, Damson Parkway and South Shirley come to mind.</p> <p>Apart from residential development, more hotels and employment sites are also needed in the centre.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Evans [2640]			Q07	7-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q07	Balsall Common centre has suffered from the loss of business premises, the loss of the Health Centre to a greenfield site on the edge of the village, inadequate parking, the lack of a bus station, and now a proposal to divert through-traffic. A comprehensive development plan is required to address all these issues.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q07	<p>Agree in principle, particularly ambitions for Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>However, increasing residential capacity and the relocation of the train station closer to the town centre have been longstanding ambitions.</p> <p>Whilst these are supported they have not moved forward towards realisation and remain ambitions.</p> <p>Doubtful that 861 homes in plan period or 1400 homes overall is achievable.</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q07	<p>Agree in principle, particularly ambitions for Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>However, increasing residential capacity and the relocation of the train station closer to the town centre have been longstanding ambitions.</p> <p>Whilst these are supported they have not moved forward towards realisation and remain ambitions.</p> <p>Doubtful that 861 homes in plan period or 1400 homes overall is achievable.</p>
Sharon Hardwick [3632]			Q07	Chelmsley Wood has no more space for housing. Develop the centre to bring in business but lack of space and school/health places means this area is full in terms of housing. Look elsewhere in Solihull where they clearly have more space. The area needs to be improved in terms of affluency, people in work etc and flooding the area with more housing without the infrastructure will cause more trouble including increased crime. To develop here means taking away what little green spaces the Chelmsley area has left.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull School [261]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q07	Existing land use plan on p.50 of DLP should be amended to explicitly show Solihull School as a significant large single use area. Solihull Town Centre Masterplan should be incorporated within this DLP to give it Development Plan status.
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q07	Concept of Policy P2 is worthy, but difficult to deliver mixed use and high density residential. E.g. apartment development requires significant capital as entire development must be completed prior to completion and occupation. Advise surplus contingency housing sites are identified due to risk of delivery in town centre. LPEG recommends 20% surplus.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q07	Agree in principle, particularly ambitions for Solihull Town Centre. However, increasing residential capacity and the relocation of the train station closer to the town centre have been longstanding ambitions. Whilst these are supported they have not moved forward towards realisation and remain ambitions. Doubtful that 861 homes in plan period or 1400 homes overall is achievable.
Teresa Meredith [4900]			Q07	Opposed to moving Solihull Station, as costly, totally unnecessary and money better spent on social care/education.
The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [2427]			Q07	The Theatres Trust is disappointing by the lack of cultural content in the plan. Cultural and community facilities play a key role in vibrant centres, support the day to day needs of local communities and help promote well-being and improve quality of life. Policy P19 (or P2) should cover community/social facilities with a definition for social infrastructure, resist loss of or change of use and support new community/social facilities or temporary uses to enhance well-being, vitality and viability and to properly reflect guidance in the NPPF, and major developments should incorporate opportunities for cultural activities.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]</p>		<p>Q07</p>	<p>Fully support Policy P2.</p> <p>More emphasis needed on connecting residential areas to local town centres, especially as 41% of all local trips are within 2 miles.</p> <p>Fully support importance of growth at Solihull Town Centre, but concerns about relocating train station:</p> <p>Could apply highway redesign and innovative measures to give the illusion that their stations are closer.</p> <p>Existing station also serves residential areas.</p> <p>Underused space around station could be reconfigured for interchange.</p> <p>Existing station well placed for growth at Homer Road/Lode Lane triangle.</p> <p>However, relocation of the station could provide excellent multi-modal interchange facilities, and improve connectivity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 8 – Scale and Location of Development (Town Centres)				
ALDI Stores Ltd [3933]	Gareth Barton	Turley (Gareth Barton) [3932]	Q08	<p>Only one of the six proposed Solihull Town Centre Masterplan Opportunity Sites allows any opportunity to accommodate retail development.</p> <p>It is important that the Local Plan allows sufficient flexibility for new retail investment to come forward on appropriate town centre sites.</p> <p>The Homer Road Civic Buildings site is well linked to Touchwood and would make a logical extension to the primary shopping area.</p> <p>Suggest the plan is amended to recognise that the two sites comprising the Homer Road Civic Buildings could come forward separately and that the former Magistrates Court site is identified as being suitable for a discount foodstore.</p>
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q08	no comment to make
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q08	<p>Question what the definition is for a town centre. Why not apply the principles to Balsall Common. There is an opportunity for a focus of retail activity and services for the local community around a much needed improved village centre.</p> <p>The growth proposed in Balsall Common is not to meet local needs but needs of the Borough and wider HMA. Growth will turn the village into a town.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd [3894]	Harriet Barber	Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd (Harriet Barber) [3895]	Q08	<p>Sapphire Court shown on Solihull Town Centre Masterplan to be located within an 'Area of Influence'.</p> <p>Concern no reference to 'Area of Influence' contained within Policy P2.</p> <p>Do not consider that development of wider area is dependent on relocation of train station.</p> <p>Periphery of Solihull Town Centre is predominantly residential and would be an appropriate, sustainable location for new housing, contributing towards meeting the housing need and would support the character and function of the Town Centre.</p> <p>Request that supporting text is amended to reflect this, and omit reference to the relocation of the train station.</p>
Chiltern Railways (Mr David Heathfield) [2998]			Q08	<p>Understand the benefits that a new station would bring to the town.</p> <p>Have following concerns:</p> <p>Uncertainty over future of current site could preclude investment in the meantime.</p> <p>Technical issues to overcome include:</p> <p>moving station further south could result in it being built on a slope. Could be overcome but additional cost implications and disruption;</p> <p>Cost of relocation in tens of millions of pounds;</p> <p>Urge for timely decision in order to mitigate risk of needed short and medium-term improvements.</p>
Colin Davis [3352]			Q08	<p>pointless moving the rail station and not the councils job to build a station. it will be decided by the rail and network company based on money and it doesnt seem to make economic sense</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q08	<p>I support the general approach presented in policy P2. The outline is along the right lines but there is very little detail provided with regard to the approach in all of the areas included. I am obviously aware that an Economic Plan for Shirley document exists. Should there not be some cross referencing?</p> <p>The plans for Solihull town centre seem to offer the opportunity for higher density residential space in a location with good transport connections.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q08	see response to Q7
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q08	does not consider that appropriate level of residential accommodation has been set for Solihull Town Centre, which will have an impact on the town centre
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q08	as per answer to q7
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q08	<p>Welcome part on Chelmsley Wood town centre.</p> <p>However, weak on detail - needs investment and modernisation. Is under-used, no night time economy and facilities are scarce.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q08	<p>- relocating Solihull station to south of the main centre and close to Touchwood Court should be progressed, along with some housing at the present station and bus station site.</p> <p>- a new station should be provided between Solihull and Olton at Wadleys Ro</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q08	<p>Concept of Policy P2 is worthy, but difficult to deliver mixed use and high density residential. E.g. apartment development requires significant capital as entire development must be completed prior to completion and occupation.</p> <p>Advise surplus contingency housing sites are identified due to risk of delivery in town centre.</p> <p>LPEG recommends 20% surplus.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q08	HHPC do believe the scale and location of development is correctly identified in the Local Plan. Developments such as Touchwood have been effective in raising the quality of the environment in these areas.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q08	HHPC do believe the scale and location of development is correctly identified in the Local Plan. Developments such as Touchwood have been effective in raising the quality of the environment in these areas.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q08	Without understanding the economic impact of other scales of development I can not comment.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q08	It is considered that the right scale and location of development has been identified for the main centres considered within Policy P2.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q08	Yes agree for Meriden.
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q08	see 7
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q08	Seems right
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q08	No, the scale for town centre development, both business and residential is a little too large to be accommodated by the town's main arterial routes. Some of the additional development would be best suited for North of the borough to help with the economic and employment prospects of the area. see letter for full text
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q08	The 3 centres of the TC do not need to expand to swallow up areas of Tudor Grange Park and a new station. NO !

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q08	It is considered that the right scale and location of development has been identified for the main centres considered within Policy P2.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q08	<p>Agree that Solihull town centre would benefit from relocation of train station.</p> <p>Developments of Shirley High Street are welcome, but are hindered by busy traffic on A34.</p> <p>Support residential development close to Shirley High Street, but opportunities may be limited.</p> <p>Could review residential capacity on Powergen site.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q08	<p>There is no reference the requirement to develop Balsall Common centre. Proposed build will fundamentally change the the locality and will overwhelm existing shopping and associated provision. Recent residential infill has exacerbated the problems.</p> <p>As such the scale of development demands a strategic approach to the development of the centre and should be lead by SMBC (the local Balsall Parish Council having already shown itself as not up to the task given its recent actions in respect of the NDP).</p> <p>Policy P2 needs to reflect this strategic need.</p>
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q08	Support
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q08	I don't really know. We will have a better idea if there is enough provision when the early phases are complete. If more is needed it will need to be provisioned.
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q08	The table is comprehensive.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q08	Considering the Shirley area and the A34, some development is needed. The Parkgate development has been at at great cost to retailers on the A34 and the decline of shops and businesses. Shirley has been neglected, sadly, and it looks unsightly. The Powergen site of course remains unsightly and it should be the first site to be developed. Unfortunately Shirley Park lost space so I hope no more will be taken. A 34 traffic management will need major improvements with extra cars in the area.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q08	agree with scale and location of development.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q08	It is considered that the right scale and location of development has been identified for the main centres considered within Policy P2.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q08	8-See previous answer to Q3
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q08	<p>Concept of Policy P2 is worthy, but difficult to deliver mixed use and high density residential. E.g. apartment development requires significant capital as entire development must be completed prior to completion and occupation.</p> <p>Advise surplus contingency housing sites are identified due to risk of delivery in town centre.</p> <p>LPEG recommends 20% surplus.</p>
Teresa Meredith [4900]			Q08	Opposed to moving Solihull Station, as costly, totally unnecessary and money better spent on social care/education.
Wendy Cairns [4226]			Q08	worrying that SMBC does not feel it is able to address to impact on Balsall Common centre. existing centre resources/infrastructure cannot meet needs of planned housing growth.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Question 9 – Policy P3 Provision of Land for General Business and Premises			
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>Q09</p> <p>Cumulative employment land supply is almost 300ha. However, two thirds of provision is within Sites 19 and 20. Site 19 is identified by a more specific need, and therefore falls outside general land supply.</p> <p>Next version of Plan needs to present a clearer justification on scale of development planned for, extent to which the identified supply will address needs, plus sufficient flexibility in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Methodology of translating employment forecasts to floorspace and land is not considered to be robust or appropriate. Serves to either suppress or mask the land requirements of some sectors, most notably B8 employment.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>Q09</p> <p>Should be recognition of potential need for additional flexibility in responding to the full need for employment land uses and in particular adequate long-term provision for B8 uses e.g. significant demand for logistics uses in this area.</p> <p>Should add more flexibility to Policy P3. Should confirm the employment land requirement but should also include flexibility to allow for development to come forward on non-allocated sites where there is a proven need for a specific type of business development to meet a strategic need, e.g. Industrial, inc. logistics.</p> <p>See Critique of ELR under Q23.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q09	<p>WMLC report suggests strategic employment sites (>25ha) is a prerequisite for growth in West Midlands. Two respondents to 'call for evidence' confirmed that lack of such available sites precludes them from operating in the WM.</p> <p>SMBC should ensure they do not restrict opportunities for this type of investment/development.</p> <p>WMLC suggest undertaking a strategic Green Belt review of West Midlands. Our view that site allocations should be based on sustainable locations rather than land that contributes the least towards purposes of Green Belt. As BVP and Fore are already allocated site, they are considered sustainable locations, obvious locations for future growth.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q09	<p>ELR is factually incorrect about Fore; does not capture current extant planning permission on site (PL/2002/02799/RMM). Outline planning permission (PL/1990/00280/OL) has now lapsed, so no further RM applications can be submitted relating to it.</p> <p>Future development can happen two-fold:</p> <p>Build out under 2002 application, but buildings are not of suitable design/floorplate for today's market:</p> <p>Submit a fresh planning application for new employment building. Difficult due to shape and extent of current allocation, and tightly drawn Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Request allocation be widened to include additional areas for carparking. Without this, deliverability of a meaningful amount of floorspace will be constrained.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q09	<p>Recommend type of preferred use is expanded to include B2 and B8 as well as B1, and incorporated in Policy P3 text.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref incorrectly assessed land at Fore; does not reflect information submitted to the Call for Sites, e.g., retail and leisure assessment. Suggest SHELAA is revisited and full site assessed for employment use. Currently not a robust evidence base on these sites for DLP.</p> <p>Extension of Blythe Valley Park and Fore, and preferred uses for Fore, have been overlooked by DLP.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q09	<p>Agree with Policy P3 and consider it will help the Council to meet its challenges and objectives in particularly in relation to securing sustainable economic growth as Challenge D.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q09	<p>Concern the Council has taken a precautionary approach to identifying land, particularly from the Green Belt for employment purposes. Suggest a plan, monitor, manage approach to avoid over-allocating land and unnecessary Green Belt loss.</p> <p>Employment Land Study used 2014 BRES data. Since updated with 2015 BRES data, which show 6% increase in job numbers in Solihull. Experian forecasts therefore underestimated future job growth.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q09	<p>No inclusion of parts of North Solihull other than Birmingham Business Park and NEC.</p> <p>Needs more focus on local economies at Chelmsley Wood TC and regeneration of village centres at Smith's Wood and Kingshurst. Plus industrial estates in Castle Bromwich and Marston Green.</p> <p>Not sustainable to rely on people travelling to high performing economic areas.</p> <p>Would strengthen local communities.</p> <p>Plan needs to account for local people able to safely walk/cycle to work.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q09	Yes.
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q09	<p>Welcome Policy P3.</p> <p>Criteria are broadly appropriate but would benefit from making specific reference to the need to demonstrate that the loss of employment sites would not have adverse impacts upon regionally and nationally significant employers.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q09	<p>I do not support policy P3 in the way it is presented. It currently focuses on the larger employment areas. There needs to be a parallel focus on the development of local employment opportunities where people live in terms of small and medium sized enterprise start up. We cannot totally rely on people travelling to high performing economic areas for work.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q09	<p>Policy P3 - impact on local road infrastructure is under-estimated. Particularly HS2 interchange. Added pressure on development of M42 access i.e. former Clock Pub roundabout development. There is no mention of monitoring the number of lorry movements daily on infrastructure. Routing agreements and size of vehicles ought to be restricted on rural roads and residential areas.</p> <p>More businesses create more road users, improvements in public transport are essential.</p> <p>In rural areas, digital connectivity and high capacity communication networks are key. However, getting a mobile signal in rural areas is a challenge.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q09	do not agree with this policy. the policy does not include the chelmsley wood, castle Bromwich, and NS Regeneration areas outside BBP/NEC as locations for employment. the policy as currently drafted is doing a disservice to addressing challenge A.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q09	Policy P3 doesn't include any areas in the north of the borough outside the existing business areas. It's important for tackling inequality that other areas are included. A reliance on people travelling long distances for employment is contrary to the aims of reducing the need to travel and exacerbated by the slow public transport links in much of this area. Transport companies whose primary objective is not the generation of profit are desperately needed in the Borough and the Council could consider assisting in their creation.
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q09	Agree with approach to encourage creation of new small and medium sized enterprises in both urban and rural areas to help facilitate growth in a broad variety of locations.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q09	Additional provision should be made in the policy for 'development that enables and supports the establishment of rural business and in particular those that make provision for leisure and recreational use of the countryside'. Fourth paragraph, p.60, should be amended to read: 'The Council will encourage the retention and appropriately sized expansion of small
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q09	The Plan seeks to protect existing business and employment premises but then allocates existing employment premises for housing without replacing them elsewhere. That idea should be forgotten.
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q09	Recommend specific reference to farms and rural businesses in Policy P3 to support their growth and development, particularly in green belt areas. Concerned that many thriving agricultural businesses in the area will be disadvantaged by the lack of specific support for the continued development of the rural economy in the current draft. The industry needs are evolving and therefore some future proofing should be built into the policy in order to ensure that it keeps pace with developments in the industry.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q09	Additional land form Green Belt is required for HS2 line, M42 junction and the new motorway service station development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q09	<p>Agree with much of P3 but there needs to be greater recognition of the need to create more employment in the north of the Borough. There is a danger of over emphasis on large concentrations of hi-tech employment at the expense of small scale start-ups requiring simple low cost premises. Some areas of North Solihull may be more suitable for such developments.</p> <p>Travel between north and south is still difficult for people without cars and it is essential that the imbalance between jobs in the north and south is reduced to assist in reducing unemployment in the north.</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q09	<p>Council should consider release or partial release of unviable or vacant land to stimulate economic growth and to release equity to re-invest in modern facilities.</p> <p>Would also provide opportunity for Starter Home exception sites.</p> <p>In accordance with Para. 22 of NPPF.</p>
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q09	You have not allocated enough land for employment if GBSLEP predictions are correct
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q09	<p>P3 doesn't take full account of the North of Solihull and the employment needs of that community. I'm also aware that some sites are sensitive to local concerns.</p> <p>Neither the Draft Local Plan Review or the Solihull Local Plan make these sites clear, so would not like to comment on their suitability</p>
Richard Evans [2640]			Q09	9-YES

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q09	The policy does not establish specific employment requirements for the UKC Hub area. Whilst we are supportive of the principle of significant economic growth for The Hub within the plan period, it would be helpful to establish the required quantum of employment development required. Furthermore, it is unclear as to the level of required employment land for the Draft Plan as a whole, across the plan period. As such, we would suggest that this policy requires greater certainty on the amount and type of employment provision required along with related infrastructure.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q09	Yes
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q09	development around the HS2 site is a must
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q09	Ambitious
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q09	Agree in principle. Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met. Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q09	Existing commercial land is the most appropriate land to develop.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q09	Strongly support.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q09	Yes please and as soon as possible. Lets connect better.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q09	The development around HS2 interchange is another infringement on the Green Belt and the Meriden Gap.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q09	It is important to ensure taht sites are made available to sustain the attractiveness of the Borough for people who live, work and invest in Solihull and secure sustainable economic growth.
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q09	Support the allocation of site SLP25 and confirm that no more than 3 ha of the site will be developed for employment. The majority of the site will be brought forward for residential development in line with the residential site allocation 11.
Chris Crean [3631]			Q09	The vision here is to be applauded BUT all of the sites identified are close to the Motorway networks and lend themselves to traffic generating development. This will result in ever more sprawl.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q09	Support
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q09	Natural England broadly supports Policy P3, in particularly when considering the criteria that there is no significant harm to the local environment, including landscape quality and character. Your authority should consider policy wording to add that where possible enhancement of the local environment should be taken into consideration.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q09	Releasing Green Belt for Sites 19 and 20 needs a joined-up approach to include provision of proposed southern Junction 6 access.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q09	Yes, this seems a sensible approach.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q09	Obviously there is no point creating homes development without jobs and all that is connected to provision I just hope you have this right.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q09	We agree with Policy P3 and consider it will help the Council to meets its challenges and objectives in particularly in relation to securing sustainable economic growth as Challenge D.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q09	We agree with Policy P3 and consider it will help the Council to meets its challenges and objectives in particularly in relation to securing sustainable economic growth as Challenge D.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q09	Agree with Policy P3 as it would help meet the challenges and objectives set outin the DLP and in particular challenge D

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q09	no specific comments to make
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q09	Agree.
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q09	<p>Concern the Council has taken a precautionary approach to identifying land. Suggest a plan, monitor, manage approach to avoid over-allocating land and unnecessary Green Belt loss.</p> <p>Employment Land Study used 2014 BRES data. Since updated with 2015 BRES data, which show 6% increase in job numbers in Solihull. Experian forecasts therefore underestimated future job growth.</p> <p>Should include a number of small scale sites for development, including those that support Airport, JLR etc. Range to types, sizes across the Borough.</p> <p>More difficult to regenerate older sites. Recycle vacant sites & identify replacements elsewhere.</p> <p>Policy P3 should align with UK Industrial Strategy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q09	Agree in principle. Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met. Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q09	Agree in principle. Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met. Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q09	Agree in principle. Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met. Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q09	Agree in principle. Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met. Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q09	<p>There is a shortage of employment sites within Solihull. The site adjoining Birmingham Business Park has been acquired and will be developed early. It should not be relied upon to be part of the supply of sites to meet economic growth needs over the Plan period.</p> <p>A substantial increase in employment land above that in the Draft Local Plan Review is necessary if Solihull is to make a proper contribution to achievement of the regional economic targets. The conclusions of the WMLC are highly pertinent and should be afforded significant consideration in subsequent drafting of the Local Plan Review.</p>
Undisclosed Client [4645]	Paul Rouse	Savills (Paul Rouse) [4647]	Q09	<p>There are shortages of employment land and buildings in all size categories.</p> <p>The land adjacent to Birmingham Business Park has been sold. The development capacity of this site is expected to be taken up very quickly and it should not therefore be regarded as providing capacity for the period of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan Review does not currently propose anything like a sufficient level of economic development to enable Solihull to meet its contribution to the WMCA and GBSLEP SEP targets.</p>
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q09	<p>The Employment Land Review (ELR) fell within the consultation period. While it is assumed that this evidence informed the draft Plan, the justification for Policy P3 is currently limited.</p> <p>The recommendations of the study have yet to be translated into the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Consequently, draft Policy P3 provides insufficient certainty over the level of economic growth needed within the Borough, including in response to the arrival of HS2.</p> <p>The ELR's recognition of the significant potential for economic development and job creation at Arden Cross needs to be specifically referenced and justified by Policy P3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 10 – Scale and Location of Development (General Business)				
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q10	The Green (former TRW site) at the moment has an open feel; the density of development will completely eliminate this. There is no additional public open space or public realm space identified in any of the plans. Instead, private countryside is replaced by development, private open land is replaced with high density development. The Stratford Road corridor will become a corridor of intense development with no opportunity taken to interrupt this at any stage.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q10	no specific comments to make
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q10	no specific comments to make
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q10	<p>The Employment Land Review (ELR) fell within the consultation period. While it is assumed that this evidence informed the draft Plan, the justification for Policy P3 is currently limited.</p> <p>The recommendations of the study have yet to be translated into the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Consequently, draft Policy P3 provides insufficient certainty over the level of economic growth needed within the Borough, including in response to the arrival of HS2.</p> <p>The ELR's recognition of the significant potential for economic development and job creation at Arden Cross needs to be specifically referenced and justified by Policy P3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q10	<p>Policy P3 fails to identify the total employment land required across the Borough over the plan period.</p> <p>There is a significant under estimation of the potential scale of employment land that will be needed within the Borough to meet the wider strategic economic objectives of the GBSLEP and the WMCA.</p> <p>It does not appear that the Employment Land Review has considered the level of economic growth identified in the Strategic Economic Plan, and by implication its impact on employment needs, which represents a deficiency that could affect the soundness of the LPR.</p>
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q10	Additional land form Green Belt is required for HS2 line, M42 junction and the new motorway service station development.
Chris Crean [3631]			Q10	The vision here is to be applauded BUT all of the sites identified are close to the Motorway networks and lend themselves to traffic generating development. This will result in ever more sprawl.
Chris Crean [3631]			Q10	Why are there no brownfield sites included and all of the sites on the M42 corridor? Are there no sites closer to where people currently live and work which could benefit from these policies? How will these developments curb sprawl and meet wider environmental commitments?
Colin Davis [3352]			Q10	I object to site 20 and that the land at damson parkway is being taken out of green belt.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q10	I do not support policy P3 in the way it is presented. It currently focuses on the larger employment areas. There needs to be a parallel focus on the development of local employment opportunities where people live in terms of small and medium sized enterprise start up. We cannot totally rely on people travelling to high performing economic areas for work.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q10	I do not support policy P3 in the way it is presented. It currently focuses on the larger employment areas. There needs to be a parallel focus on the development of local employment opportunities where people live in terms of small and medium sized enterprise start up. We cannot totally rely on people travelling to high performing economic areas for work.
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q10	do not agree with this policy. the policy does not include the chelmsley wood, castle Bromwich, and NS Regeneration areas outside BBP/NEC as locations for employment. the policy as currently drafted is doing a disservice to addressing challenge A.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q10	Answer as per question 9.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q10	Policy P3 doesn't include any areas in the north of the borough outside the existing business areas. It's important for tackling inequality that other areas are included. A reliance on people travelling long distances for employment is contrary to the aims of reducing the need to travel and exacerbated by the slow public transport links in much of this area. Transport companies whose primary objective is not the generation of profit are desperately needed in the Borough and the Council could consider assisting in their creation.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q10	P3 doesn't take full account of the North of Solihull and the employment needs of that community. I'm also aware that some sites are sensitive to local concerns. Neither the Draft Local Plan Review or the Solihull Local Plan make these sites clear, so would not like to comment on their suitability
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q10	as per response to Q9
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q10	No inclusion of parts of North Solihull other than Birmingham Business Park and NEC. Needs more focus on local economies at Chelmsley Wood TC and regeneration of village centres at Smith's Wood and Kingshurst. Plus industrial estates in Castle Bromwich and Marston Green. Not sustainable to rely on people travelling to high performing economic areas. Would strengthen local communities. Plan needs to account for local people able to safely walk/cycle to work.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q10	<p>No inclusion of parts of North Solihull other than Birmingham Business Park and NEC.</p> <p>Needs more focus on local economies at Chelmsley Wood TC and regeneration of village centres at Smith's Wood and Kingshurst. Plus industrial estates in Castle Bromwich and Marston Green.</p> <p>Not sustainable to rely on people travelling to high performing economic areas.</p> <p>Would strengthen local communities.</p> <p>Plan needs to account for local people able to safely walk/cycle to work.</p>
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q10	<p>Agree with much of P3 but there needs to be greater recognition of the need to create more employment in the north of the Borough. There is a danger of over emphasis on large concentrations of hi-tech employment at the expense of small scale start-ups requiring simple low cost premises. Some areas of North Solihull may be more suitable for such developments.</p> <p>Travel between north and south is still difficult for people without cars and it is essential that the imbalance between jobs in the north and south is reduced to assist in reducing unemployment in the north.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q10	<p>Policy P3 itself is a standard policy for employment land. Solihull is not short of employment floorspace and most expansion will be B1 uses.</p> <p>The table at para 165 includes two proposals for employment land on Green Belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Land at HS2 Interchange (Site 19) 140 ha * Land at Damson Parkway (Site 20) 94 ha <p>Neither of these proposals is justified by Policy P3, and neither is necessary for the employment needs of the Borough's residents. They should be removed from the section of the Plan relating to Policy P3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q10	Releasing Green Belt for Sites 19 and 20 needs a joined-up approach to include provision of proposed southern Junction 6 access.
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q10	<p>Concern the Council has taken a precautionary approach to identifying land. Suggest a plan, monitor, manage approach to avoid over-allocating land and unnecessary Green Belt loss.</p> <p>Employment Land Study used 2014 BRES data. Since updated with 2015 BRES data, which show 6% increase in job numbers in Solihull. Experian forecasts therefore underestimated future job growth.</p> <p>Should include a number of small scale sites for development, including those that support Airport, JLR etc. Range to types, sizes across the Borough.</p> <p>More difficult to regenerate older sites. Recycle vacant sites & identify replacements elsewhere.</p> <p>Policy P3 should align with UK Industrial Strategy.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q10	<p>Concern the Council has taken a precautionary approach to identifying land. Suggest a plan, monitor, manage approach to avoid over-allocating land and unnecessary Green Belt loss.</p> <p>Employment Land Study used 2014 BRES data. Since updated with 2015 BRES data, which show 6% increase in job numbers in Solihull. Experian forecasts therefore underestimated future job growth.</p> <p>Should include a number of small scale sites for development, including those that support Airport, JLR etc. Range to types, sizes across the Borough.</p> <p>More difficult to regenerate older sites. Recycle vacant sites & identify replacements elsewhere.</p> <p>Policy P3 should align with UK Industrial Strategy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q10	With respect to Hockley Heath, we wholeheartedly support the decision not to include site 165 in the Local Plan as this would significantly impact the useful Green Belt (as per SMBC's Green Belt assessment) to the north of Hockley Heath.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q10	Yes.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q10	<p>The sites indicated utilise existing and planned infrastructure improvement and represent the best effective use of existing general business sites. More could be said in relation to paragraph 174 (for example powers relating to business rate reduction to encourage utilisation of existing premises over newly built SME-level development of smaller office sites). Vacant small and medium sites (e.g. along Stratford Road, Shirley) are a barrier to creating vibrant communities in these areas as current policy encourages tenancies in the charity sector over other retail use.</p> <p>Support the omission of site 165 in the Plan given its Green Belt impact.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q10	<p>Cumulative employment land supply is almost 300ha. However, two thirds of provision is within Sites 19 and 20. Site 19 is identified by a more specific need, and therefore falls outside general land supply.</p> <p>Next version of Plan needs to present a clearer justification on scale of development planned for, extent to which the identified supply will address needs, plus sufficient flexibility in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Methodology of translating employment forecasts to floorspace and land is not considered to be robust or appropriate. Serves to either suppress or mask the land requirements of some sectors, most notably B8 employment.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q10	<p>Should be recognition of potential need for additional flexibility in responding to the full need for employment land uses and in particular adequate long-term provision for B8 uses e.g. significant demand for logistics uses in this area.</p> <p>Should add more flexibility to Policy P3. Should confirm the employment land requirement but should also include flexibility to allow for development to come forward on non-allocated sites where there is a proven need for a specific type of business development to meet a strategic need, e.g. Industrial, inc. logistics.</p> <p>See Critique of ELR under Q23.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q10	<p>WMLC report suggests strategic employment sites (>25ha) is a prerequisite for growth in West Midlands. Two respondents to 'call for evidence' confirmed that lack of such available sites precludes them from operating in the WM.</p> <p>SMBC should ensure they do not restrict opportunities for this type of investment/development.</p> <p>WMLC suggest undertaking a strategic Green Belt review of West Midlands. Our view that site allocations should be based on sustainable locations rather than land that contributes the least towards purposes of Green Belt. As BVP and Fore are already allocated site, they are considered sustainable locations, obvious locations for future growth.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q10	<p>ELR is factually incorrect about Fore; does not capture current extant planning permission on site (PL/2002/02799/RMM). Outline planning permission (PL/1990/00280/OL) has now lapsed, so no further RM applications can be submitted relating to it.</p> <p>Future development can happen two-fold:</p> <p>Build out under 2002 application, but buildings are not of suitable design/floorplate for today's market:</p> <p>Submit a fresh planning application for new employment building. Difficult due to shape and extent of current allocation, and tightly drawn Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Request allocation be widened to include additional areas for carparking. Without this, deliverability of a meaningful amount of floorspace will be constrained.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q10	<p>Recommend type of preferred use is expanded to include B2 and B8 as well as B1, and incorporated in Policy P3 text.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref incorrectly assessed land at Fore; does not reflect information submitted to the Call for Sites, e.g., retail and leisure assessment. Suggest SHELAA is revisited and full site assessed for employment use. Currently not a robust evidence base on these sites for DLP.</p> <p>Extension of Blythe Valley Park and Fore, and preferred uses for Fore, have been overlooked by DLP.</p>
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q10	<p>Welcome Policy P3.</p> <p>Criteria are broadly appropriate but would benefit from making specific reference to the need to demonstrate that the loss of employment sites would not have adverse impacts upon regionally and nationally significant employers.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q10	<p>Allocation of land at Damson Parkway is in the right location owing to its relationship with the existing JLR Solihull plant.</p> <p>Insufficient space at existing plant to accommodate a logistics operation centre of sufficient size to meet business requirements of JLR.</p> <p>Will prevent the need for parts and components to be driven to of-site storage facilities.</p> <p>Policy needs to remain flexible.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q10	Yes, this seems a sensible approach.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q10	Again, I don't have the ability to assess whether the scale is correct, I assume this has been considered via some economic modelling.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q10	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met.</p> <p>Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q10	Agree with Policy P3 and consider it will help the Council to meet its challenges and objectives in particularly in relation to securing sustainable economic growth as Challenge D.
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q10	Support the allocation of site SLP25 and confirm that no more than 3 ha of the site will be developed for employment. The majority of the site will be brought forward for residential development in line with the residential site allocation 11.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q10	<p>Policy P3 - impact on local road infrastructure is under-estimated. Particularly HS2 interchange. Added pressure on development of M42 access i.e. former Clock Pub roundabout development. There is no mention of monitoring the number of lorry movements daily on infrastructure. Routing agreements and size of vehicles ought to be restricted on rural roads and residential areas.</p> <p>More businesses create more road users, improvements in public transport are essential.</p> <p>In rural areas, digital connectivity and high capacity communication networks are key. However, getting a mobile signal in rural areas is a challenge.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q10	<p>Policy P3 - impact on local road infrastructure is under-estimated. Particularly HS2 interchange. Added pressure on development of M42 access i.e. former Clock Pub roundabout development. There is no mention of monitoring the number of lorry movements daily on infrastructure. Routing agreements and size of vehicles ought to be restricted on rural roads and residential areas.</p> <p>More businesses create more road users, improvements in public transport are essential.</p> <p>In rural areas, digital connectivity and high capacity communication networks are key. However, getting a mobile signal in rural areas is a challenge.</p>
Messrs Wheeldon & Gooding [3886]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q10	Entirely logical and justified, but must allow flexibility for businesses that may not be able to continue in this location to seek alternative premises.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q10	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met.</p> <p>Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q10	Support

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q10	Seems about right
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q10	Yes
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q10	Yes
Mr David Bird [3484]			Q10	Should the areas that are not greenbelt be developed first, for example 'The Green' should be used for housing since the report states there is no commercial interest being shown since 2005. This area already has a road infrastructure within the site and the 'green spaces are sterile of any wildlife as they are flat turf areas, it is also an area that has been plagued by travellers setting up camp.
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q10	You have not allocated enough land for employment if GBSLEP predictions are correct
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q10	No discussion of further expansion of the Airport, JLR other sites, New industrial opportunities, the Motorway services area applications. They are glaring omissions you have taken large areas of employment land at PUPRIM BLYTHE VALLEY and substituted housing !
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q10	We agree with Policy P3 and consider it will help the Council to meet its challenges and objectives in particular in relation to securing sustainable economic growth as Challenge D.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q10	Agree.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q10	Agree.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q10	The development around HS2 interchange is another infringement on the Green Belt and the Meriden Gap.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q10	<p>We currently have the current local plan out for review, a JLR plan out for review, the airport has been expanded and increased noise levels.</p> <p>Why hasn't all this been included in the same coherent plan.</p> <p>With the extension to JLR and proposed housing plan off Parkway what are the plans for supporting traffic.</p>
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q10	Ambitious
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q10	Strongly support.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q10	Support.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q10	development around the HS2 site is a must
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q10	Yes please and as soon as possible. Lets connect better.
Mrs Angela Faithfull [3566]			Q10	Can we keep some of the original features if there are any and transfer them to the new buildings?
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q10	It is important to ensure taht sites are made available to sustain the attractiveness of the Borough for people who live, work and invest in Solihull and secure sustainable economic growth.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q10	Need to ensure that sufficient employment sites are provided in rural areas to support objective to encourage small and medium sized enterprises in all areas of the Borough, including rural areas.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q10	Existing commercial land is the most appropriate land to develop.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q10	Existing commercial land should be used for development
Ms D Spavin & Mr S Milner [3883]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q10	logical and economically justified location for employment given proximity to JLR and BAairport.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q10	Ref Balsall Common, I fail to see how the Southside developments contribute towards place-making aspirations - given congestion and the elevated profile of the sites - not to mention removal of the playing-fields and allotments. Neither can I see that it discourages the of modes of travel other than cars, given its distance from rail stations and places of work The idea that by building on allotments and green play areas will "incorporate high quality design aspirations for both the development and public realm" is laughable or indeed "Contribute towards the strategic green infrastructure..."or "develop strong, vibrant and healthy communities!"
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q10	Natural England broadly supports Policy P3, in particularly when considering the criteria that there is no significant harm to the local environment, including landscape quality and character. Your authority should consider policy wording to add that where possible enhancement of the local environment should be taken into consideration.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q10	<p>In considering the location of development your authority should utilise our SSSI Impact Risk Zones which are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website.</p> <p>Other considerations include environmental constraints such as:</p> <p>Do they avoid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ï· designated sites/priority habitats ï· protected landscapes ï· Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land ï· areas at risk of flooding ï· brownfield sites of high environmental value
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q10	<p>Recommend specific reference to farms and rural businesses in Policy P3 to support their growth and development, particularly in green belt areas.</p> <p>Concerned that many thriving agricultural businesses in the area will be disadvantaged by the lack of specific support for the continued development of the rural economy in the current draft.</p> <p>The industry needs are evolving and therefore some future proofing should be built into the policy in order to ensure that it keeps pace with developments in the industry.</p>
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q10	<p>Agree with approach to encourage creation of new small and medium sized enterprises in both urban and rural areas to help facilitate growth in a broad variety of locations.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q10	Agree with Policy P3 as it would help meet the challenges and objectives set out in the DLP and in particular challenge D
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q10	no views on this question
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q10	Additional provision should be made in the policy for 'development that enables and supports the establishment of rural business and in particular those that make provision for leisure and recreational use of the countryside'. Fourth paragraph, p.60, should be amended to read: 'The Council will encourage the retention and appropriately sized expansion of small
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q10	Council should consider release or partial release of unviable or vacant land to stimulate economic growth and to release equity to re-invest in modern facilities. Would also provide opportunity for Starter Home exception sites. In accordance with Para. 22 of NPPF.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q10	We agree with Policy P3 and consider it will help the Council to meet its challenges and objectives in particular in relation to securing sustainable economic growth as Challenge D.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q10	Obviously there is no point creating homes development without jobs and all that is connected to provision I just hope you have this right.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q10	Obviously there is no point creating homes development without jobs and all that is connected to provision I just hope you have this right.
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q10	<p>There is a shortage of employment sites within Solihull. The site adjoining Birmingham Business Park has been acquired and will be developed early. It should not be relied upon to be part of the supply of sites to meet economic growth needs over the Plan period.</p> <p>A substantial increase in employment land above that in the Draft Local Plan Review is necessary if Solihull is to make a proper contribution to achievement of the regional economic targets. The conclusions of the WMLC are highly pertinent and should be afforded significant consideration in subsequent drafting of the Local Plan Review.</p>
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q10	<p>There is a shortage of employment sites within Solihull. The site adjoining Birmingham Business Park has been acquired and will be developed early. It should not be relied upon to be part of the supply of sites to meet economic growth needs over the Plan period.</p> <p>A substantial increase in employment land above that in the Draft Local Plan Review is necessary if Solihull is to make a proper contribution to achievement of the regional economic targets. The conclusions of the WMLC are highly pertinent and should be afforded significant consideration in subsequent drafting of the Local Plan Review.</p>
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q10	The Plan seeks to protect existing business and employment premises but then allocates existing employment premises for housing without replacing them elsewhere. That idea should be forgotten.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q10	9-YES
Richard Evans [2640]			Q10	10-See previous answer to Q3
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q10	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met.</p> <p>Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q10	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met.</p> <p>Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.</p>
Shirley Golf Club Ltd and IM Properties Ltd [4153]	Gary Stephens	Marrons Planning (Gary Stephens) [4152]	Q10	<p>- appreciate that the majority of economic growth will be achieved through the delivery of development within these broad use classes, other land uses can also contribute towards economic development and should be recognised within the Plan.</p> <p>- needs of the automotive retail sector should be addressed</p> <p>by this Plan (land use they do not often sit comfortably or succeed within town centre or business park. Stratford Road corridor given its characteristics, and this has created a critical mass of activity which makes this an attractive location for the sector)</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q10	<p>Concern the Council has taken a precautionary approach to identifying land, particularly from the Green Belt for employment purposes. Suggest a plan, monitor, manage approach to avoid over-allocating land and unnecessary Green Belt loss.</p> <p>Employment Land Study used 2014 BRES data. Since updated with 2015 BRES data, which show 6% increase in job numbers in Solihull. Experian forecasts therefore underestimated future job growth.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q10	<p>Risk that job growth underestimated and consequently insufficient sites have been allocated.</p> <p>Additional development and choice is required. Should include a number of small scale sites, including those that support Airport, JLR etc. E.g. SHELAA Site 80.</p> <p>SHELAA Site 80 compares favourably in SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal against Site 19 at UKC Hub. Could exclude HS2 safeguarded zone and overhead buffer line.</p> <p>More difficult to regenerate older sites. Recycle vacant sites & identify replacements elsewhere.</p> <p>Policy P3 should align with UK Industrial Strategy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q10	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Note that alternative uses may be allowed where specific criteria are met.</p> <p>Concern that employment sites are not sacrificed inappropriately due to the housing shortage.</p>
Undisclosed Client [4645]	Paul Rouse	Savills (Paul Rouse) [4647]	Q10	<p>There are shortages of employment land and buildings in all size categories.</p> <p>The land adjacent to Birmingham Business Park has been sold. The development capacity of this site is expected to be taken up very quickly and it should not therefore be regarded as providing capacity for the period of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan Review does not currently propose anything like a sufficient level of economic development to enable Solihull to meet its contribution to the WMCA and GBSLEP SEP targets.</p>
Undisclosed Client [4645]	Paul Rouse	Savills (Paul Rouse) [4647]	Q10	<p>There are shortages of employment land and buildings in all size categories.</p> <p>The land adjacent to Birmingham Business Park has been sold. The development capacity of this site is expected to be taken up very quickly and it should not therefore be regarded as providing capacity for the period of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan Review does not currently propose anything like a sufficient level of economic development to enable Solihull to meet its contribution to the WMCA and GBSLEP SEP targets.</p>
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q10	<p>The policy does not establish specific employment requirements for the UKC Hub area. Whilst we are supportive of the principle of significant economic growth for The Hub within the plan period, it would be helpful to establish the required quantum of employment development required. Furthermore, it is unclear as to the level of required employment land for the Draft Plan as a whole, across the plan period. As such, we would suggest that this policy requires greater certainty on the amount and type of employment provision required along with related infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 11 – Policy P4 Meeting Housing Needs				
Archdiocese of Birmingham (Rev Paul O'Connor) [3184]			Q11	Support from the Landowners adjacent to Bl Robert Grissold Catholic Church, Meeting House Lane for allocation of Barratt's Farm and a commitment to work with all parties to make it happen.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q11	- Agree with the policy but suggest minor amendments to clarify the wording of the sq/mtr threshold.
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q11	This level of requirement is likely to be excessive, and could prejudice the viability of allocated housing sites, especially where there are other significant costs associated with the delivery of development. Concerns over the evidence to support this level of requirement.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q11	The 50% target needs to be achieved to meet local housing needs in the village of Balsall Common. A higher percentage of smaller affordable housing should be constructed close to the railway station. Existing Local Plan Site 19 is an excellent location for such a development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q11	<p>Actual affordable housing need is 28.7% and not 50%.</p> <p>Provision of Starter Homes as additional to identified need for affordable housing will result in double-counting. Unsound.</p> <p>Concerned by absence of any viability testing of policy.</p> <p>Larger greenfield sites, with high infrastructure requirements, may not be able to deliver 50% affordable homes. Contrary to NPPF.</p> <p>Text should be amended to state 29% affordable dwellings should be provided.</p> <p>Should include starter homes in definition of affordable housing.</p> <p>Should include option for off-site contributions when on-site affordable provision is unviable or unfeasible.</p> <p>Include reference to Viability Assessments for planning applications.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q11	<p>There is a shortage of bungalows and other single storey accommodation with gardens for older people and disables people. A survey of need for such accommodation should be undertaken and the needs reflected in the housing mix policy.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q11	<p>- Whilst amendments will be made to the NPPF to reflect White Paper comments on repayment periods and the income caps as drafted, Policy P4 and the 20% Starter Homes requirement is considered to be premature and the policy should be amended to include fl</p>
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q11	<p>The Plan should incorporate an objective that future new build developments must contain a diverse spread of property sizes as well as any requirement for affordable properties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Codev Homes [4643]	Mr Michael Davies	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Q11	<p>The Government has decided that it will not implement a compulsory starter homes requirement of 20% as originally proposed. The Government intends to amend the NPPF to introduce a clear policy expectation that housing sites deliver a minimum of 10% affordable home ownership units. Policy P4 should be amended to reflect this change.</p> <p>It is suggested that the policy could simply propose to deliver affordable housing requirements in accordance with national guidance in place at the time of determination.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q11	<p>We are in agreement with Policy P4.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q11	<p>Need for affordable housing:</p> <p>DCLG document on affordable housing supply published 17/11/16 confirms that affordable housing delivery in 2015/2016 was 52% lower than previous year.</p> <p>Government White Paper acknowledge that housing is increasingly unaffordable.</p> <p>DLP confirms that house prices are high in Solihull's Mature Suburbs and Rural Areas; with a severe shortage of affordable homes and options for elderly and/or those wishing to downsize.</p> <p>Reflected in Challenge B.</p> <p>Reiterated in latest SHMA.</p> <p>SLP proposed 2 Rural Exception Sites.</p> <p>Allocated Rural Exception Sites will conform with NPPF.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q11	<p>Policy P4(A) - Supported insofar it confirms the threshold for sites which should provide affordable housing; in line with Government guidance and Court of Appeal judgement May 2016.</p> <p>Contradiction in wording, however, as Starter Homes is not included in Meeting Housing Needs SPD, but states that definition is set out therein.</p> <p>Needs to provide greater clarity on proportions of types of housing tenures to be included in definition of affordable housing.</p> <p>50% target needs to be tested through Viability Study.</p> <p>Support reference to provision of affordable housing developments on Green Belt land if meet local needs and is supported locally.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q11	<p>Policy P4(b)</p> <p>Imperative that DLP makes specific provision for affordable housing sites, particularly in the Rural areas, where provision is so lacking.</p> <p>Supported by NPPF Para. 54.</p> <p>Plan must provide greater support for rural exceptions in absence of viability testing for 50% target.</p> <p>Suggest proposed policy is not predicated on local Parish Council or Neighbourhood Forum support as such a clear need.</p> <p>Propose SHELAA Site 19 is put forward as a Rural Exceptions Site under this policy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q11	<p>Generally agree but concern that that there is an option for developers to avoid their contribution towards affordable housing in certain circumstances. This should be stressed as being very exceptional.</p> <p>I would like to have seen at least a suggestion that the council's own Solihull Community Housing might feature as an option for investment in some of the houses that are being planned for. I would also like to see the policy extended to explicitly cover the provision for people with disabilities.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q11	Agree with policy and welcome the clarity provided through it.
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q11	Starter homes and affordable homes are likely to reduce our housing list dramatically. Affordable housing should provide housing for downsizers thus enabling them to stay locally and releasing larger houses for larger families.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q11	Policy P4 is encouraging in its vision for mixed communities with a variety of housing types and tenures; such is essential for a balanced and functional community and should help tackle the housing pressures currently faced.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q11	<p>Concerned about what is included in the policy re 'affordable housing' and whether it is affordable for local people.</p> <p>would like to know what constitutes "objectives that need to be given a higher priority" over AHousing to be able to agree with that element of the plan.</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q11	Welcome clarity that all tenures will be required.
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q11	support
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q11	<p>Need to provide affordable housing and housing for the elderly.</p> <p>Development close to key economic asset is vital to attract range of employees.</p>
David Holtom [3685]			Q11	The provision of bungalows or sheltered accommodation for the large elderly population in Balsall Common may help with downsizing allowing the freeing up of large underused houses to be used for family homes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q11	I do not agree with policy P4 because i consider it incomplete - it makes no mention of provision for elderly people.
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q11	Homes for All would need to contain housing consideration for elderly residents, given the current and projected demographic. This point is ignored in the list of priorities.
Elizabeth Sands [4123]			Q11	The claim to be able to provide affordable housing in the area is false. Builders set the price of housing by reference to local levels. As an example, on the new development at Middlefield Springs, The cost of a very small 2 bedrooomed house with no garage is advertised as Â£310,000.
Elizabeth Yates [3274]			Q11	We build the smallest homes in Europe, to squeeze in as many homes as possible, It is well known that you would not be able to get a Fire Engine to homes in Dickens Heath because of traffic parked on the roads.
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q11	Accept that a range of housing will be need to be provided to meet the requirements of all those living in the plan area and the wider HMA. Suggest Policy P4c is amended to include reference to provision for higher value housing sites to support the economic strategy.
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q11	Support reference to Starter Homes. Policy should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate wider array of affordable housing products in the future. Meeting Housing Needs SPD is out of date and should be redrafted on latest evidence. SPD should not influence viability of schemes. 50% target is inconsistent with 28.7% in SHMA. Should be revised. Determine on site by site basis and not blanket policy approach.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q11	<p>Support need to provide affordable housing.</p> <p>Need to robustly test the viability of 50% so that it does not prejudice delivery of other necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Require significant additional evidence to justify increase from 40% to 50%.</p> <p>Approach on tenure and types of affordable housing is not supported by evidence in text; neither has impact on viability and deliverability been considered.</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q11	<p>50% affordable housing requirement too high, and much higher than other authorities in West Midlands.</p> <p>Could negatively impact housing delivery.</p> <p>Viability not yet been tested.</p>
Graham Brown [2506]			Q11	I agree with the Policy P4
Graham Jones [3354]			Q11	I do not object with the policy itself, but it has not been applied in the plan itself. For example, allocating 40% of new housing in Knowle to Affordable housing is far too high and does not meet the policy for a rural area. What is the point of asking if we agree with a policy if the policy is not applied?
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q11	Welcome the commitment in Policy 4 (B) for rural exception sites to focus on affordable housing for people with a local connection to the Parish.
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q11	Welcome the commitment in Policy 4 (B) for rural exception sites to focus on affordable housing for people with a local connection to the Parish.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]</p>	<p>Mr Stuart Field</p>	<p>GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]</p>	<p>Q11</p>	<p>Actual affordable housing need is 28.7% and not 50%.</p> <p>Provision of Starter Homes as additional to identified need for affordable housing will result in double-counting. Unsound.</p> <p>Concerned by absence of any viability testing of policy.</p> <p>Larger greenfield sites, with high infrastructure requirements, may not be able to deliver 50% affordable homes. Contrary to NPPF.</p> <p>Text should be amended to state 29% affordable dwellings should be provided.</p> <p>Should include starter homes in definition of affordable housing.</p> <p>Should include option for off-site contributions when on-site affordable provision is unviable or unfeasible.</p> <p>Include reference to Viability Assessments for planning applications.</p>
<p>Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]</p>			<p>Q11</p>	<p>HHPC does not consider the two criteria in Policy 4B Rural Exceptions are sufficient to override building on green belt land particularly given the deletions to green belt already proposed across the Borough. Policy encourages housebuilding decisions to be made on a standalone basis rather than considering developments in a wider area, and is inconsistent with our view that affordable housing, where required, should be integrated into communities and provided alongside a mix of housing types. HHPC would urge SMBC to include, as planning policy, provisions to ensure Affordable Housing remains affordable beyond the first tenancy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]</p>			<p>Q11</p>	<p>Disagree with the 50% affordable housing figure. The allowance for financial contributions where on-site provision is not feasible or viable gives too much leeway to developers meaning that affordable housing is being provided in concentrated sites rather than being spread equitably throughout new developments.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be integrated into communities by being part of a mix of housing provision not built 100% on one development which this policy may indirectly encourage.</p> <p>Policy 4B - do not consider these two criteria are sufficient to override building on green belt land. Should be integration with existing communities.</p>
<p>IM Land [3900]</p>	<p>Ms Kathryn Young</p>	<p>Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]</p>	<p>Q11</p>	<p>Recognise need for both affordable and market housing across the Borough.</p> <p>Support recognition of social and economic importance of housing to the Borough.</p> <p>Welcome inclusion of Vacant Building Credit, forms a valuable incentive for redevelopment of brownfield sites.</p> <p>Overriding concern is that P4 will threaten viability and deliverability of residential development:</p> <p>Untested and un-evidenced increase from 40% to 50%;</p> <p>Absence of upper limit on requirement;</p> <p>Ambiguity on wording;</p> <p>Untested proposed tenure split.</p> <p>Should not seek to dictate or negotiate types and sizes of open market housing; SHMA not provide necessary evidence. Existing SPD on weak evidence base.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q11	<p>Draft policy states that Council will take into account following factors:</p> <p>Site size - what does the flexibility entail? Will smaller sites be permitted to provide reduced affordable housing?</p> <p>Accessibility - does this suggest that sites with limited accessibility will be permitted to provide off-site contributions?</p> <p>Economics - agree with statement, but encourage use of term 'financial viability' instead.</p> <p>A range of house types and sizes - unclear how this will be applied, e.g. less AH in areas with higher proportion of AH in existing housing stock such as North Solihull?</p> <p>Support financial contributions in lieu - needs greater clarity.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q11	<p>Tenure mix is only set out in policy justification, not policy itself.</p> <p>If this is to allow flexibility, it should be stated within the policy that the affordable tenure mix will be set out within SPD.</p> <p>Unclear how Council has utilised SHMA to arrive at a division of 22% rented and 8% shared ownership. Should be further justified in text or explanatory note.</p> <p>Unclear if 'rented' is social and/or affordable.</p> <p>Recommend rented to incorporate affordable rent, to improve deliverability and provide choice.</p> <p>20% Starter Homes premature as Housing White Paper confirms Government will not introduce statutory requirement at this time.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q11	<p>Draft policy states that Council will take into account following factors:</p> <p>Site size - what does the flexibility entail? Will smaller sites be permitted to provide reduced affordable housing?</p> <p>Accessibility - does this suggest that sites with limited accessibility will be permitted to provide off-site contributions?</p> <p>Economics - agree with statement, but encourage use of term 'financial viability' instead.</p> <p>A range of house types and sizes - unclear how this will be applied, e.g. less AH in areas with higher proportion of AH in existing housing stock such as North Solihull?</p> <p>Support financial contributions in lieu - needs greater clarity.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q11	<p>Tenure mix is only set out in policy justification, not policy itself.</p> <p>If this is to allow flexibility, it should be stated within the policy that the affordable tenure mix will be set out within SPD.</p> <p>Unclear how Council has utilised SHMA to arrive at a division of 22% rented and 8% shared ownership. Should be further justified in text or explanatory note.</p> <p>Unclear if 'rented' is social and/or affordable.</p> <p>Recommend rented to incorporate affordable rent, to improve deliverability and provide choice.</p> <p>20% Starter Homes premature as Housing White Paper confirms Government will not introduce statutory requirement at this time.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q11	<p>Suggest SMBC consider opportunity for Private Rented Sector (PRS) development to come forward in Borough. As BCC have done, SMBC should also acknowledge difference in terms of viability in PRS schemes compared to open market housing.</p> <p>PRS schemes differ from traditional housing schemes as returns are long term and not short term; the impacts on viability should be included in viability evidence.</p> <p>P4 should specifically refer to taking account of specific characteristics of developments which look to longer term rather than short-term 'market' gains, when assessing viability and considering provision of affordable housing.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q11	<p>Recognise need for both affordable and market housing across the Borough.</p> <p>Support recognition of social and economic importance of housing to the Borough.</p> <p>Welcome inclusion of Vacant Building Credit, forms a valuable incentive for redevelopment of brownfield sites.</p> <p>Overriding concern is that P4 will threaten viability and deliverability of residential development:</p> <p>Untested and un-evidenced increase from 40% to 50%;</p> <p>Absence of upper limit on requirement;</p> <p>Ambiguity on wording;</p> <p>Untested proposed tenure split.</p> <p>Should not seek to dictate or negotiate types and sizes of open market housing; SHMA not provide necessary evidence. Existing SPD on weak evidence base.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q11	The total proposed housing numbers are grossly disproportionate to the size of the existing community and will have a very significant detrimental impact on the size, shape, character and environment of Berkswell / Balsall Common as a Rural Village. It is also noticed that while mention is made of affordable homes, no mention is made of homes for older members of the community.
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q11	Agree with need to provide affordable housing and housing for the elderly. May require additional allocations for elderly, e.g. nursing homes. Significant economic assets require suitable housing for future employees.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q11	I agree broadly with the policy and I'm particularly pleased to see the provision for self build.
John Grendon [4602]			Q11	Starter homes and lower cost housing are desperately needed to balance the aging / aged population that the borough is fast becoming
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q11	The Affordable Housing figure of 50% is too high and a potential impediment to housing delivery. The full implications of the housing white paper need to be assessed and would reserve judgement on a final policy.
John Robbins [4272]			Q11	Concerned about the nature of housing proposed in Shirley South area, as the government have stated that housing should concentrate on high density smaller, affordable homes, such as terrace, mews and flats. The footprint of these is much smaller than large detached houses and will require less land.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q11	The proposals to amend Policy P4 (a) to change the threshold to 11units or more is justified and consistent with the PPG and is supported given the Government's changes to national planning guidance in respect of thresholds at which affordable housing may be sought. This prevents contributions being sought for developments of 10 units or less.
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q11	Policy P4 should encourage the redevelopment of sustainably located brownfield sites. The affordable housing contribution required from previously developed site should be reduced to 40% to promote redevelopment.
Mark Taft [3595]			Q11	There seems to be no provision for a range of houses for people with disabilities.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q11	Any future development in Meriden should be in keeping with its character, heritage and setting within the surrounding countryside. In the 2016 Neighbourhood Plan survey 87% of residents said that between 11 and 50 dwellings should be the scale of development between now and 2028. Meeting housing demand is not just about meeting numbers, it's about tenures.
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q11	Proposed housing numbers in Balsall Common are grossly disproportionate in respect to the size of the existing community. Noted that while mention is made of affordable homes, no mention is made of homes for older members of the community.
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q11	The total proposed housing numbers are grossly disproportionate to the size of the existing community and will have a very significant detrimental impact on the size, shape, character and environment as a rural village. It is also noticed that whilst mention is made of affordable homes, no mention is made of homes for older members of the community.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q11	The Affordable Housing figure of 50% is too high and a potential impediment to housing delivery. The full implications of the housing white paper need to be assessed and would reserve judgement on a final policy.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q11	In general terms the approach is appropriate. However, the UK in particular and our area in general has an ageing population and no mention is made of 1. Collective homes for the elderly both "old age homes" and "nursing homes" 2. Single storey homes to encourage/assist the elderly remain independent for as long as possible As assessment of these needs should be made and planned for. The policy makes no provision for other (younger) disabled people who need one storey accommodation. This is a breach of the Disability Discrimination Act and must be rectified

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q11	There is a lot of focus about providing "affordable" homes but nothing on the type of housing. The population is getting older and so we need to consider the need for more bungalows or "elderly friendly" housing. This has additional benefits of incentivising the elderly to move to more suitable housing, freeing up bigger existing houses for younger families, in effect providing additional capacity.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q11	Yes
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q11	overall yes, some flexibility is always helpful
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q11	There is little point in attempting to address inequalities within the borough, these are normal market and economic forces that shape communities and will eventually override, including wiping out the value of building affordable housing in areas that do not require affordable housing, e.g. rural settlements and desirable community environments. These are aspirational environments and should be left as such.
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q11	It's all about Housing the Market for which you are trying to tamper.
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q11	-further 1150 houses is ridiculous. -800 new houses confined in between Station Road, Meeting House Lane and Waste Lane (Barratt's Farm), is not possible without easy access to facilities and the road network. -little employment within village and peopl
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q11	envisage affordable homes for local population rather than for private sale.
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q11	With an ageing population and a need to free up family homes lived in by one or two residents, provision should be made for the building of bungalows, of which there is currently a significant shortage. This would provide greater benefit by freeing up more accommodation.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q11	I agree that affordable homes must be provided but they must be low rise - ie if they are apartment blocks no more than 3 stories high, and not near existing properties.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q11	The proposals to amend Policy P4(a) to change the threshold to 11units or more therefore, in Cerda's view is justified and consistent with the PPG and is supported.
Mr James Lupton [3554]			Q11	I broadly support your policy, but would add the following. You say: The Borough definition of 'affordable' is set out in a Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Without searching around for this document, I would just like to comment that a definition of affordable that I as a pensioner would find useful would include the limit of 100sq m, either all on one level, or at most two (a 10m x 5m two storey block) + garaging and small garden. There must be widely available designs for this kind of space provision. Provision could be strictly monitored.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q11	<p>Agree with need to attract and retain younger people and families.</p> <p>Concerned how these needs may be met.</p> <p>Any significant concentration of affordable housing in one area would need to be closely examined.</p> <p>Issue of retaining 'affordable' housing that is for sale in perpetuity.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q11	<p>I recognize the need for affordable home provision in the Borough. The policy should clarify how it will be enforced as based on recent experience in my locality, it appears all too easy for developers to remove affordable home provision at a later stage. Affordable home provision in an affluent area such as Solihull will never be a commercially attractive proposition for commercial builders.</p> <p>In addition such properties should be built in close proximity to areas of employment opportunity to maximize affordability.</p> <p>The aim to build affordable houses in Balsall Common is inconsistent with current poor public transport provision.</p>
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q11	I do not agree that more affordable housing is required in Solihull. There are plenty of affordable homes currently on the market in the borough. I do believe that mortgage availability should be easier

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Matthew Taylor [2935]			Q11	In the allocation of houses there should be a fair distribution of sizes at all developments not limited to what the open market wants. The recent TW development in Knowle was disappointing in that only two 3 no. bedroom houses were available for general release on such a large site. The rest went to forms of social housing.
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q11	The proposed use of an SPD is inappropriate and matters should be addressed and tested through consideration of development plan policy, as contrary to Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework as would add financial burden.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q11	However many of the houses will be affordable only once, at the time of first sale, then sold on at significant profit. Other examples of affordable housing at the Crest Nicholson Site in Balsall Common have been diluted or avoided altogether
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q11	Balsall Common needs homes for older and younger residents
Mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q11	Do not agree with that policy.
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q11	Homes suitable for elderly including bungalows should be prioritised
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q11	The use of GreenBelt ? What is the point of greenbelt if it can just be used whenever more houses are required, nothing. Surely greenbelt should not be used for housing, no if's no but's. Starting to use greenbelt is just the thin edge of the wedge. JLR has already been granted greenbelt land, now it looks like housing can also claim greenbelt. A bit here, a bit there, 25yrs time nothing left. The alternative is simple we don't build all these new houses, we push back on the numbers. Why is the council/s agreeing to the numbers?
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q11	You have excluded any meaningful reference to properties for older residents downsizing to buy, bungalows, yet you acknowledge that the population is ageing. 50% Affordable homes in Balsall Common is a nonsense, basic market prices are so high that few are able to afford them, which is a shame as my children would like to live in Balsall Common but it is out of reach. I understand on a present development in Balsall Common the council has relaxed the demands on the developer because there are too few takers of the affordable homes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q11	<p>Need for affordable housing:</p> <p>DCLG document on affordable housing supply published 17/11/16 confirms that affordable housing delivery in 2015/2016 was 52% lower than previous year.</p> <p>Government White Paper acknowledge that housing is increasingly unaffordable.</p> <p>DLP confirms that house prices are high in Solihull's Mature Suburbs and Rural Areas; with a severe shortage of affordable homes and options for elderly and/or those wishing to downsize.</p> <p>Reflected in Challenge B.</p> <p>Reiterated in latest SHMA.</p> <p>SLP proposed 2 Rural Exception Sites.</p> <p>Allocated Rural Exception Sites will conform with NPPF.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q11	<p>Policy P4(A): Supported insofar it confirms the threshold for sites which should provide affordable housing; in line with Government guidance and Court of Appeal judgement May 2016.</p> <p>Contradiction in wording, however, as Starter Homes is not included in Meeting Housing Needs SPD, but states that definition is set out therein.</p> <p>Needs to provide greater clarity on proportions of types of housing tenures to be included in definition of affordable housing.</p> <p>50% target needs to be tested through Viability Study.</p> <p>Support reference to provision of affordable housing developments on Green Belt land if meet local needs and is supported locally.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q11	<p>Policy P4(b):</p> <p>Imperative that DLP makes specific provision for affordable housing sites, particularly in the Rural areas, where provision is so lacking.</p> <p>Supported by NPPF Para. 54.</p> <p>Plan must provide greater support for rural exceptions in absence of viability testing for 50% target.</p> <p>Suggest proposed policy is not predicated on local Parish Council or Neighbourhood Forum support as such a clear need.</p> <p>Propose SHELAA Site 19 is put forward as a Rural Exceptions Site under this policy.</p>
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q11	Generally support.
Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]			Q11	Building affordable housing is very important to me, but I do not believe that I will be able to afford anything in this area, as what you and I class as affordable seem to be a long way apart.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q11	<p>Homes for elderly should be a consideration, i.e. bungalows.</p> <p>Concerned that proposed 65 homes on a small piece of land adjacent to my property will result in high rise dwellings, and vulnerability.</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q11	We need more smaller homes for the young and elderly.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]			Q11	<p>Alternative New Site.</p> <p>Consider development a completely new area, such as Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Would add affordable housing for young and old to meet the requirements.</p>
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q11	<p>There is significant lack of affordable housing and housing suitable for older population. Proposed policy doesn't offer credible solution to address this.</p>
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q11	<p>Affordable homes must be provided but need to be in keeping with the surrounding properties (Foe example should not be more than 3 stories high)</p>
Mrs Jacqui Gardner [3687]			Q11	<p>The focus seems to be on affordable housing, however, what about building smaller houses/bungalows etc for those wanting to downsize but stay in the villages such as Balsall Common?</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q11	<p>B Rural Exceptions.</p> <p>The proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley are not consistent with the village, parish or neighbourhood plan, and furthermore there is not evidence that the proposed housing development at these two sites is supported by the Parish Council of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>As stated in para. 205, the two housing sites at west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley need to be assessed for their impact of development on the Green Belt and environmental considerations, and these two sites are not the most suitable sites in the village for housing development.</p>
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q11	<p>Disagree with some of the implications of this policy. Current approach not sustainable as affordable housing should be retained in perpetuity not resold at market value. Strongly encourage that affordable homes are provided within a mix of other homes and do not end up on concentrated estates such as the Waterloo development in Hockley Heath, and that developers are not allowed to make financial contributions to avoid providing affordable homes unless absolutely necessary. Criteria in 4B Rural Exceptions is insufficient to ensure protection for green belt and does not consider wider area. Agree with 4C Market Housing approach.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q11	Recognises need for affordable housing in Borough, but policy should clarify how it will be enforced as experience in Balsall Common suggests too easy for developers to remove provision as not commercially attractive, affordable housing should be located close to employment opportunities to maximize affordability, and provision in Balsall Common inconsistent with current poor public transport. No reference to new bungalows for older persons as important incentive for downsizing to encourage more efficient use of existing housing stock.
Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]			Q11	Note that plan does not mention bungalows or facilities for older residents.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q11	I agree that homes for all should be built but again, they should be spread out across the borough.
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q11	I fully support the ratio of 50%, the breakdown of how it is to be made up and the trigger point. However, I do not agree with the "get outs" offered within the draft policy as to economics, etc. We have had those kinds of get outs before and what it means is that developers have advanced them as arguments not to build affordable housing . We have areas of high cost housing in this Borough, so we need to help deliver a balanced community in the south of Solihull via affordable housing.
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q11	No mention of types of housing.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q11	While mention is made of affordable homes, no mention is made of homes for older members of the community.
Mrs Ruth Knowles [3413]			Q11	There is already sufficient family homes in Knowle and Dorridge. There is a shortage of bungalows for older people to downsize to, thereby releasing larger homes for families. There should be more sheltered accommodation.
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q11	<p>Support inclusion of rural exception sites.</p> <p>Need policy on homes for rural workers, especially due to HS2 impacts.</p> <p>Particular needs for farm workers not often met with off the shelf affordable homes.</p> <p>Do not have option to move home if family grows.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Ager [3055]			Q11	<p>In relation to Site 8 and 9 objection.</p> <p>The 50% affordable housing is pointless as being within such an affluent area they will never actually be genuinely affordable.</p> <p>Furthermore by insisting on such a high percentage of affordable housing it makes achieving the community benefits much less likely as developers will have to factor this in their appraisals.</p> <p>It would be better to have much less affordable housing to make the benefits stack up.</p> <p>Furthermore developers will not be able to provide the required type of housing under the starter home scheme.</p>
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q11	<p>amendments to Policy 4(a) to change threshold to 11 units or more, is justified and consistent with PPG</p>
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q11	<p>Recognise need for affordable housing, but challenge 50% requirement on 11+ units.</p> <p>Understand that standard and affordable housing need to be integrated, 50% seems excessive.</p> <p>May impact viability, could prevent development coming forward.</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q11	<p>Agree that definition of affordable housing should include social rented, affordable rented, intermediate tenure and Starter Homes.</p> <p>Object to level of affordable housing.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q11	<p>The proposals to amend Policy P4 (a) to change the threshold to 11 units or more is justified and consistent with the PPG and is supported given the Government's changes to national planning guidance in respect of thresholds at which affordable housing may be sought. This prevents contributions being sought for developments of 10 units or less.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q11	In Balsall Common we feel that not all categories quoted in the Local Plan are catered for e.g. Aged persons Bungalows. Maybe this area needs to be re-thought.
Ragni Gilbert [4613]			Q11	Affordable housing is needed in the area
Richard Evans [2640]			Q11	11-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q11	The shortage of land and the need for housing means that there should be a significant increase in density and the provision of smaller homes.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q11	The Affordable Housing figure of 50% is too high and a potential impediment to housing delivery. The full implications of the housing white paper need to be assessed and would reserve judgement on a final policy.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q11	The Affordable Housing figure of 50% is too high and a potential impediment to housing delivery. The full implications of the housing white paper need to be assessed and would reserve judgement on a final policy.
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q11	Concerned about the nature of housing proposed in Shirley South area, as houses in the South of the Borough command extremely high prices. Do not believe that the houses built will be affordable by the young people. They will be 3, 4, 5 bed houses with a small contingent of affordable houses that will probably be purchased by buy to let landlords. The government have stated that housing should concentrate on high density smaller, affordable homes, such as terrace, mews and flats. The footprint of these is much smaller than large detached houses and will require less land.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q11	<p>Definition of affordable housing in the SPD is both subjective and questionable.</p> <p>Proposed 50% target is unacceptable and entirely exceptional.</p> <p>Cannot compare level of affordable housing in Solihull with national averages as it is a rural area.</p> <p>Ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings in Solihull is lower than in Warwick, Stratford upon Avon and Bromsgrove.</p> <p>2015 data is out of date.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q11	Affordable housing policy for local needs on strategic sites in Dickens Heath Parish required.
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q11	Affordable housing policy for local needs on strategic sites in Dickens Heath Parish required.
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q11	<p>Increase to 50% affordable housing not justified in text.</p> <p>SHMA states need is 26.9% of new development.</p> <p>Viability assessment on policy not been carried out.</p> <p>Government attaches great importance to flexibility on Section 106 negotiations.</p> <p>Very strict mix for market housing proposals.</p> <p>Needs more evidence than the SHMA.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q11	<p>Support reference to Starter Homes. Policy should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate wider array of affordable housing products in the future.</p> <p>Meeting Housing Needs SPD is out of date and should be redrafted on latest evidence.</p> <p>SPD should not influence viability of schemes.</p> <p>50% target is inconsistent with 28.7% in SHMA. Should be revised.</p> <p>Determine on site by site basis and not blanket policy approach.</p>
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q11	<p>Welcomes allowance for flexibility to take into account specific circumstances and viability considerations. Housing mix also needs to take into account master planning and viability. The inclusion of rental housing for specific sectors is supported subject to recognition that provision is dependent on registered providers being willing to develop and manage.</p>
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q11	<p>Agree in principle with the policy.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q11	<p>Agree with Policy on the whole.</p> <p>Comment that Meeting Housing Needs SPD 2014 will need to be updated, and at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>In setting out development briefs, the Council should be working proactively with the landowners/developers and not producing them in isolation.</p> <p>This will ensure that developments are based on reliable and upto date market evidence.</p> <p>Would also note that SHMA should be upto date to include guidance on relevant housing mix; to ensure the right developments are approved in the right locations to meet local demand.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q11	Support the principle of Policy P4 but TW have concerns that "Contributions will be expected to be made in the form of 50% affordable dwelling units".
Terra Strategic [3918]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q11	50% affordable housing requirement too high, and much higher than other authorities in West Midlands. Could negatively impact housing delivery. Viability not yet been tested.
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q11	DLP should be clearer about its definition of affordable housing rather than deferring to a Supplementary Planning Document. No viability assessment has been produced. 50% level of affordable housing should be texted along with whole plan viability and CIL charging schedule rates and zones. 50% level should be justified as only 26.9% is required. According to Housing White Paper the 20% requirement for Starter Homes is no longer mandatory.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q11	<p>No mention in DLP Site 9 proposal for the inclusion of any additional accommodation for older people.</p> <p>Does not identify any future suitable provision for what is the largest sector of Knowle's population.</p> <p>Pepper-potting affordable houses around sites has an adverse impact on all residents. Partly due to poor management by RSLs or Housing Associations.</p> <p>Could resolve this by not pepper-potting homes, or by providing low cost market housing for rent or sale.</p> <p>Proportion of shared ownership should be for local people only.</p> <p>Densities are too high; need pre-1980s layouts. Would only require further 0.5% of Green Belt.</p>
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q11	<p>Government published their response to Starter Homes Technical Consultation on 07.02.17. Concluded they will not make 20% Starter Homes compulsory.</p> <p>Intended that NPPF will be amended to introduce clear policy expectation that 10% of new development is affordable housing.</p> <p>50% target is 10% higher than existing policy. No Viability work been undertaken yet.</p> <p>As not supported by Government expectations or viability testing then consider 50% is inappropriately high and should be revised to according to viability work.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q11	<p>The Hub can contribute to meeting wider housing needs, including the consideration of a more innovative range of options for delivery, including custom and self-build.</p> <p>The UGC will develop proposals for individual sites in the Hub and a specific approach to the planning and delivery of such sites might be required along with consideration of any proposals which offer different types of delivery models and potential house types and tenures aimed at specified and emerging market demands. Such demands could well be driven by the delivery of significant infrastructure, facilities and economic investment within the wider UKC area.</p>
West Midlands HARP Consortium [3204]	Meghan Rossiter	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Q11	<p>Policy 4a - amend definition of affordable housing to align with NPPF.</p> <p>Policy 4b - allow delivery of affordable housing through cross-subsidy where it can be demonstrated that affordable housing development cannot be achieved without an element of open market housing. Economic circumstances and reductions in Government subsidy have significantly reduced viability of 100% affordable housing developments.</p> <p>Remove reference for need of community support as often local objection.</p>
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q11	<p>Support the provision of an appropriate and viable mix of dwelling types, tenures and sizes in new developments.</p> <p>Unduly prescriptive and premature to precisely set the market housing mix on future developments or briefs.</p> <p>Requires more flexibility.</p> <p>Should recognise difference between need and demand. Actual demand is still for larger properties. Larger properties are more sustainable as more flexible living accommodation over time.</p> <p>Housing mix should be decided at planning application stage.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q11	Housing is needed throughout the Borough but the sites in Balsall Common are not likely to provide housing for local families within the Parish. The majority of housing will be for wealthy and middle class families who are looking for homes in the commuter belt to the motorways, Birmingham and London. Indeed, Christchurch Properties who are selling the land at Barretts Farm have identified that there are unlikely to be bungalows for the elderly and only token low cost housing for young starter families. Greenbelt land should therefore not be used by The Parish for development purposes.
Question 12 – Level of Affordable Housing				
Alan & Anita Heath [4628]			Q12	Balsall Common has already found great difficulty in selling the "affordable" housing on the site because of the price. Surely it is common sense to position "affordable housing" in an area with in the borough where the surrounding properties and therefore the new properties fall into a price range that make the price affordable, rather in an area like Balsall Common where the prices are not conducive the "affordable" market
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q12	<p>- note the AH level in the DLP but would like to have flexibility in its implementation. this is so that due consideration is given to on-site and enabling infrastructure policy.</p> <p>- suggest amendments to the wording of the policy</p>
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q12	SMBC must ensure this policy is strictly adhered to by developers.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q12	50% target could be achieved in Balsall Common by building smaller affordable housing in higher density developments close to the station. Need to recognise the limitations of the less accessible locations for affordable housing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q12	Do not support principle that Starter Homes should be over and above provision for other tenures of affordable housing, so policy text should include within definition. Where on site provision of affordable housing not viable should require viability statement rather than financial contribution.
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q12	P4 currently states that affordable housing will be required at 50%; split 30% traditional affordable/20% Starter Homes provision. However, in the light of the Government's White Paper the currently proposed split, set at 20% is not justified and further consultation with the development industry should be undertaken. Whilst amendments will be made to the NPPF to reflect White Paper comments on repayment periods and the income caps as drafted, Policy P4 and the 20% Starter Homes requirement is considered to be premature and the policy should be amended to include flexibility and an allowance for site by site negotiation.
Christine Taylor [3593]			Q12	comment on starter homes
Codev Homes [4643]	Mr Michael Davies	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Q12	A viability report has not been published to justify the 50% affordable housing target. Until this report is made available, we consider that the 50% target is not justified.
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q12	We are in agreement with the level of affordable housing being sought in Policy P4.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q12	I'm glad that the council is aiming for 50%. There is a clear need for this to be the goal and I hope that we are able to achieve as close to this in the total number of houses eventually built.
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q12	Agree with the level of affordable housing proposed.
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q12	It is an ambitious target but one I agree with to reduce ur housing list rather than just bring in more new residents.
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q12	Although not commenting specifically on the % of AH, the reponse does states there is a need to balance housing for first time buyers, families, single people and increasing older people.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q12	I'm glad that the council is aiming for 50%. There is a clear need for this to be the goal and I hope that we are able to achieve as close to this in the total number of houses eventually built.
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q12	Affordable housing needs are well documented.
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q12	The 50% affordable housing target is supported. Starter Homes should not be counted as 'affordable housing' as they will not be affordable under the standard definition; and they would be seen as part of the general housing market.
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q12	Affordable housing and for the elderly is important.
DR David Gentle [4632]			Q12	The stipulation of 50% affordable housing and, in particular, the requirement for rented accommodation, is out of keeping with the area and will have a detrimental effect on the profile and character of Knowle.
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q12	<p>measure of support for more affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>strong concerns expressed that 50% affordable housing proposed is felt to be too high particularly given the high numbers of houses proposed in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 62% of respondents thought that social housing for rent was not suitable for KDBH. - support starter homes and a lower percentage of other forms of affordable housing (priority to people with a proven local connection) approach of rural exceptions sites could be adopted for these allocations.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q12	<p>- measure of support for more affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>- strong concerns expressed that 50% affordable housing proposed is felt to be too high particularly given the high numbers of houses proposed in the area.</p> <p>- 62% of respondents thought</p>
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q12	<p>50% figure is too high.</p> <p>Will cause problems for viability and deliverability.</p> <p>Suggest 40%.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q12	<p>50% target is inconsistent with 28.7% in SHMA. Should be revised.</p> <p>Determine on site by site basis and not blanket policy approach.</p>
Gill Corns [4448]			Q12	<p>- measure of support for more affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>- strong concerns expressed that 50% affordable housing proposed is felt to be too high particularly given the high numbers of houses proposed in the area.</p> <p>- 62% of respondents thought</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q12	<p>50% affordable housing requirement too high, and much higher than other authorities in West Midlands.</p> <p>Could negatively impact housing delivery.</p> <p>Viability not yet been tested.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Graham Law [3875]			Q12	'Affordable Homes' invariably generate tenants of doubtful personal standards. It would appear that the inclusion of a substantial quantity of such houses is disproportionate to most sympathetic developments of this kind.
Graham Jones [3354]			Q12	The level of affordable housing should only be set at 40% for the houses completed over the period up to 2020. Beyond that the level should be set to 20%. Whilst there is an immediate need to increase the amount of affordable housing, there is no evidence that this will persist at the current level right up to 2033.
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q12	Should be amended to 29% and not 50%. See response to Q11.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q12	HHPC would urge SMBC to include, as planning policy, provisions to ensure Affordable Housing remains affordable (e.g. the "staircasing" out is prevented so that the unit is accessible beyond the first tenancy).
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q12	We acknowledge the need for some affordable housing within Solihull. However affordable housing (as defined in the SPD) in its current form is not a sustainable approach, i.e. market rates will prevail after the first occupant resulting in further need in future years. We need some affordable housing but providing a mix of housing that addresses the needs of a wider profile of household types, would encourage better rotation of starter homes and houses suitable for families. The policy should ensure affordable housing remains affordable.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q12	<p>Agree with extent of affordable housing threshold proposed by Council, i.e. 11+ residential units or 1,000+ sqm (GIA).</p> <p>Highly concerned with proposed increase in affordable housing requirement from 40% to 50%.</p> <p>Annual affordable requirement of 210 dwellings equates either to 31% or 28% of OAN.</p> <p>50% level has not been evidenced by SHMA or DLP.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Viability Study from CBRE (2012) is out-of-date.</p> <p>Viability evidence should be produced by next round of consultation.</p> <p>Policy should state an upper limit of 50% affordable housing.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q12	<p>Agree with extent of affordable housing threshold proposed by Council, i.e. 11+ residential units or 1,000+ sqm (GIA).</p> <p>Highly concerned with proposed increase in affordable housing requirement from 40% to 50%.</p> <p>Annual affordable requirement of 210 dwellings equates either to 31% or 28% of OAN.</p> <p>50% level has not been evidenced by SHMA or DLP.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Viability Study from CBRE (2012) is out-of-date.</p> <p>Viability evidence should be produced by next round of consultation.</p> <p>Policy should state an upper limit of 50% affordable housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q12	See Q11.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q12	I think the issue with affordable housing is not so much the proportion that is included but rather quality of the provision. Care should be taken that the units are not out of keeping with the market housing in the area. While new housing will undoubtedly be required, there seems to be little promotion of schemes to make better use of existing housing, such as the rent a room scheme. Similarly where the council has the authority, the tax and planning systems should encourage granny annexe arrangements which make better use of existing buildings and also save on care costs.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q12	The proposed 50% requirement is excessive and could undermine the viability of sites, which in turn will deter private residential development, risking the provision of any housing of any kind, let alone affordable. It is welcomed that the council repeat their "flexible approach" to the implementation of this policy and their commitment to considering the suitability of sites and the amount of affordable housing through negotiation and on a site by site basis. Reserve the right to comment further following publication of the viability report but would like to record initial concerns with this 50% target.
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q12	<p>measure of support for more affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>strong concerns expressed that 50% affordable housing proposed is felt to be too high particularly given the high numbers of houses proposed in the area.</p> <p>- 62% of respondents thought that social housing for rent was not suitable for KDBH.</p> <p>- support starter homes and a lower percentage of other forms of affordable housing (priority to people with a proven local connection) approach of rural exceptions sites could be adopted for these allocations.</p>
M Holden [4914]			Q12	Strongly object to high percentage of affordable housing in the plan. Shared ownership is fine, but not social housing, i.e. Council houses.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q12	The affordable housing contribution required on sustainably located brownfield sites should be reduced to 40% for the first five years of the Local Plan period to encourage the early delivery of such sites.
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q12	<p>Object to 50% affordable housing target.</p> <p>Should remove requirement to provide 20% starter homes in line with Government response to Technical consultation on 07/02/17.</p> <p>Government intends to amend NPPF to introduce a clear policy expectation that housing sites deliver minimum 10% affordable home ownership units.</p> <p>Target not supported by up-to-date viability evidence. Needs to be provided.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q12	Definition of affordable needs to be defined once and for all. Affordable housing needs to remain long term i.e. no scope for extensions to properties increasing value that makes affordable no longer affordable! Affordable housing excludes older people who wish to down size and are too old to get shared schemes. Bungalows or equivalent could help older people downsize and remain in Meriden.
Michael Doble [3296]			Q12	50% affordable housing is far too high and will only serve to lower the standard of the existing environment. I believe Government guidelines state that 25% affordable housing is a reasonable objective and see little need for this to be so excessively exceeded.
miss Stephanie Archer [3793]			Q12	Proposed level of affordable housing is too high, as some first time buyers like myself are looking for new build but will not be looking at the affordable housing option, so suggest consider every 6th house or around 18% as this still gives builders a mixture of plot sizes instead of building the remaining properties for larger families.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q12	The Policy is right but SMBC are poor at implementing it. No planning permissions should be granted for developments under the Plan unless the Developer can show that they have strong partners in place. The community should also not suffer because the developer has over paid for the land and claims they cannot meet the policy economically. Greenfield land sells for about Â£10 to Â£20,000 an acre before it is taken out of greenbelt. There is no Policy requirement that can make homes built on such land uneconomic unless the developer has overpaid.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q12	Yes

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q12	50% is too high. the worst case scenario is that some landowner s will withdraw their land. this will create imbalance because less favourable sites will have to be developed.
Mr D Gregory [3253]			Q12	Support for council owned properties, and to build for those who can not afford to buy.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q12	The building of affordable housing is required and this is not in doubt, however, putting affordable housing in every single development seems pointless and likely to erode the maximum value achievable in some developments. A more intelligent use of affordable housing should be urged, informed by local demographics, movements of people and employment etc, which would promote a far more holistic use of affordable dwellings across the borough.
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q12	Strongly agree with Policy P4. SMBC must ensure this policy is adhered to with measures to avoid escalation of property prices on subsequent sale of same(to keep them 'affordable')
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q12	Do you really know what "affordable" is? I think not! More rented Housing is needed.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q12	Yes I agree with 50%. Affordable housing presumably uses less land per house and this should be taken in to account when calculating how much land to release.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q12	Reserve the right to comment in further detail once the viability report which will test this target is produced but would like to record our initial concerns with this 50% target.
Mr John Outhwaite [3785]			Q12	I am clear that the plans for housing development, particularly affordable homes, are completely inadequate.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q12	Any significant concentration of affordable housing in one area would need to be closely examined.
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q12	But previous history tells us developers have not always adhered to agreements made during the planning process, and SMBC must do more to enforce this. A recent example is the present development along the Kenilworth Road, Balsall Common.
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q12	50% is excessive. 40% seems to have been working.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q12	I do not believe the level of affordable housing being sought is correct as i believe affordable housing should be kept to a minimum, i suggest easier mortgage availability
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q12	The level of affordable housing seems very high at levels and only justifiable in the exceptional circumstances of the London Housing Market. The actual level of the different types of affordable housing to be sought, including those emerging as a result of the recent White Paper, need to be tested in a robust way. This testing should be along two perspectives - (a) dimensioning need and (b) assessing viability for different classes of site. The testing results need to be spelt out in the reasoned justification and backed up by an appropriate evidence base.
mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q12	Partially agree with this policy, but property should be occupied by owner of the property, or tenant of the property, owned and managed by a housing association or local authority. So often now low cost housing is built ,and bought by a private landlord who then charges the tenant an excessive rent, to pay the landlords mortgage on that property.
Mr Stanley Silverman [3021]			Q12	<p>the cost of housing is prohibitive and is blighting the lives of many people below the age of 40 who continue to live with their parents or in student style multiple occupation dwellings. This plus the needs of the elderly who whilst fit are seeing their incomes fall and maybe living many years alone.</p> <p>The % of affordable housing and houses suitable for the elderly needs to be increased to at least 60%. Plus the option for developers to wriggle out of this obligation by paying for affordable housing elsewhere must be scrapped</p>
Mr W A Wood [3664]			Q12	Object to 50% affordable housing on Site 16 as would have a significant and detrimental effect on property values in such a high profile area.
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q12	There are simply some areas in the borough where 50% affordable housing will be too expensive both for local residents and others to consider for purchase. A better way of meeting this situation is needed so the balance may have to be addressed in other ways. I not sure how but I guess developers have to be encouraged to reduce their profit take or build more affordable homes in locations where the land is cheaper and ideally nearer to areas of employment.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q12	Affordable housing requirement should be reduced from 50% to 40% on new developments.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q12	affordable housing should be of a quality that gives enough space for car parking and gardens and places for the bins and not squashed in

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Deborah Chard [3418]			Q12	The inclusion of affordable housing/housing association use in the development of site 18 is not appropriate in this prestigious location.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q12	There is significant lack of affordable housing and proposed approach is unlikely to materially change the situation.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q12	Not qualified to make an opinion. Affordable housing should use less land per unit which, presumably, has been taken in to account when calculating how much land is needed.
Mrs J A Edwards [4593]			Q12	concerned that half of the proposed new homes will be housing association houses
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q12	The percentage is too high for Solihull. Providing a mix of housing that addresses the needs of a wider profile of household types, e.g. elderly, single persons etc., would encourage better rotation of starter homes and houses suitable for families.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q12	Affordable housing might be the plan but in reality anywhere on the green belt is not affordable housing. The houses on the new developments on the edge of Dickens Heath are hardly affordable and the same goes for the house to be built in Tidbury Green. Housing or apartments for the elderly should really mean affordable.
Mrs Linda Edwards [3814]			Q12	We know with the ever extending population more housing is needed. But where to put them is the main concern.
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q12	I want to see the affordable housing actually delivered in the stated ratios, and not reduced, removed or money contributions in lieu because of economic arguments advanced by Developers. I feel it is particularly important to see it delivered in the south of Solihull, where there is a lack of balance in the community. The lack of reasonably priced housing means that many businesses cannot find local people to fill vacancies, meaning that workers drive in from other places. Also, families worry about reasonably priced homes for young people and specialist homes for older people to downsize to.
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q12	Whilst housing will be affordable in first instance, land prices are likely to rise to 1-2million GBP per hectare once residential use. On resale these houses won't be affordable as will be sold presumably at full market value. They may well be sold at a discount in the first instance, but long term they won't be affordable so doesn't address the problem long term.
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q12	Question whether a 50% level realistic given evidence that existing sites with a lower percentage requirement have often found it difficult to secure affordable housing. When dealing with other site constraints it will be increasingly challenging to profitably develop some proposed sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q12	<p>- measure of support for more affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>- strong concerns expressed that 50% affordable housing proposed is felt to be too high particularly given the high numbers of houses proposed in the area.</p> <p>- 62% of respondents thought</p>
Nick Ager [3055]			Q12	<p>The level of affordable housing at 50% is too high. For a location like Knowle the 50% affordable housing is pointless as being within such an affluent area they will never actually be genuinely affordable. Furthermore by insisting on such a high percentage of affordable housing it makes achieving the community benefits much less likely as developers will have to factor this in their appraisals. It would be better to have much less affordable housing to make the benefits stack up. Developers will not be able to provide the suitable housing types with under the starter home scheme.</p>
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q12	<p>50% requirement for AH is excessive and could seriously undermine viability of site, which in turn will deter private residential development, risking provision of housing.</p> <p>Welcome the 'flexibility in DLP on taking a site by site approach/discussion to level of affordable housing, but reserve right to make more comments once viability for their site had been undertaken.</p>
Pat Milnes [3430]			Q12	<p>Balsall Common has never been abundant with affordable housing and to see 50% of the proposal catering for this is really pleasing.</p>
Pauline Daniels [3674]			Q12	<p>Support need for affordable housing but too many large unaffordable houses are being built. Housing provision should focus on need for elderly persons retirement properties, which would free up substantial numbers of family homes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q12	<p>Object to level of affordable housing sought.</p> <p>Increase from 40% to 50% is likely to be a viability exercise for all schemes.</p> <p>Up-to-date viability assessment should be published for comment.</p> <p>Level of affordable housing and tenure split must reflect evidence in viability assessment as well as SHMA.</p> <p>Must consider how level of affordable housing could prejudice realisation of other planning objectives.</p> <p>Should the Council's development brief for each site allocation include details of likely market housing, then this needs to be evidenced by SHMA in combination with commercial knowledge of local market.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q12	The proposed 50% requirement is excessive and could undermine the viability of sites, which in turn will deter private residential development, risking the provision of any housing of any kind, let alone affordable. It is welcomed that the council repeat their "flexible approach" to the implementation of this policy and their commitment to considering the suitability of sites and the amount of affordable housing through negotiation and on a site by site basis. Reserve the right to comment further following publication of the viability report but would like to record initial concerns with this 50% target.
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q12	The stipulation of 50% affordable housing and, in particular, the requirement for rented accommodation, is out of keeping with the area and will have a detrimental effect on the profile and character of Knowle.
Rebecca Billingsley [3219]			Q12	Do not agree with the level of affordable housing to be delivered in the area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Evans [2640]			Q12	12-The principle of 50% affordable housing is laudable but judging by past local developments around Balsall Common this is never realised. The current Elysian Gardens Development is a case in point. The proportion of larger 2-5 bedroom detached houses always seem to dominate these development I suspect so the land owners and developers and landowners can maximise their profits.
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q12	The affordable housing provision should be greater than 50% for all sites - which would require development of an individual house to be "affordable".
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q12	<p>Disagree with 50% affordable housing, it is exceptionally high.</p> <p>Target average of 19 affordable homes per acre is unjustified.</p> <p>Government announced that new housing developments no longer need to include a proportion of social or affordable housing.</p> <p>Rationale to increase 40% to 50% appears to be predicated on national average, but no evidence to support this.</p> <p>Large difference between shortfall of 1-2bed properties in Dickens Heath compared to Knowle/Dorridge/Bentley Heath. Does not justify allocations south of Shirley and none in Dorridge.</p> <p>Proposed level of affordable housing will not 'Sustain the attractiveness of the Borough.'</p> <p>50% target contrary to Policy 4b.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q12	<p>50% target is inconsistent with 28.7% in SHMA. Should be revised.</p> <p>Determine on site by site basis and not blanket policy approach.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q12	Richborough Estates Limited welcome the realism about the effect of affordable housing on the viability of developments but consider that the quantum of affordable housing should be reduced to 40% and it should be an 'up-to' figure. Further thought should be given to the delivery of some types of affordable housing.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q12	<p>Recognise that Solihull is an affluent area of West Midlands; market prices can be out of reach for some residents.</p> <p>Borough has previously struggled to meet affordable housing needs of the population.</p> <p>Understand the increase to 50% affordable housing it to accommodate provision of starter homes as well.</p> <p>Welcome opportunity to allow for negotiations on level of provision of affordable housing, should this have an impact on the viability of each individual development.</p> <p>Welcome opportunity to provide for affordable housing through off-site financial contributions.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q12	The requirement for 50% affordable housing has not taken into account viability and delivery of development within the Borough as there is no strategic viability assessment produced as part of the evidence base. It is therefore not in accordance with the NPPF and White Paper (2017).
Terra Strategic [3918]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q12	<p>50% affordable housing requirement too high, and much higher than other authorities in West Midlands.</p> <p>Could negatively impact housing delivery.</p> <p>Viability not yet been tested.</p>
Terry Corns [4446]			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - measure of support for more affordable housing for local people. - strong concerns expressed that 50% affordable housing proposed is felt to be too high particularly given the high numbers of houses proposed in the area. - 62% of respondents thought

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q12	50% level should be justified as only 26.9% is required. According to Housing White Paper the 20% requirement for Starter Homes is no longer mandatory.
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q12	Government published their response to Starter Homes Technical Consultation on 07.02.17. Concluded they will not make 20% Starter Homes compulsory. Intended that NPPF will be amended to introduce clear policy expectation that 10% of new development is affordable housing. 50% target is 10% higher than existing policy. No Viability work been undertaken yet. As not supported by Government expectations or viability testing then consider 50% is inappropriately high and should be revised to according to viability work.
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q12	see letter
Wendy Cairns [4226]			Q12	50% affordable housing may be achievable in other parts of the borough, but may not be in BC going by recent developments. Would like to see provision for bungalows and similar designs that would be attractive to older people looking to downsize.
West Midlands HARP Consortium [3204]	Meghan Rossiter	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Q12	Concerned that income to be spent on rent is set at 35%. Should be 25%, or 386 dwellings per year.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q12	<p>SHMA states affordable housing need is 26.9% of proposed housing requirement.</p> <p>50% affordable housing target therefore excessive.</p> <p>Recent Housing White Paper confirms that starter homes will not be an additional requirement over and above the affordable homes requirements as currently suggested in DLP.</p> <p>Viability caveat is welcome.</p> <p>SMBC need to demonstrate viability of delivering all of policy objectives plus CIL before setting the affordable housing target.</p>
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q12	<p>Affordable housing is clearly needed throughout the country. However, most young starter families are likely to want to be in larger towns with greater facilities and transport links than those in Balsall Common. The proposed development in Balsall Common is likely to attract middle class commuter families.</p>
Question 13 – Self and Custom Build Housing				
Ann Parker [4362]			Q13	<p>In addition, the government states that the housing contracts should go to smaller companies using innovative methods, and promote self build and housing associations. Is this in the plan?</p>
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q13	<p>Option 1 is the preferred as this is felt to be the more appropriate route for delivering the types of dwellings needed.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q13	<p>In relation to the proposed options for the delivery of self and custom build housing (Policy P4D), Option 1 is considered to be the most feasible and deliverable. The size and nature of plots that self-builders are likely to require will be more suited to smaller sites and not those typically built by volume housebuilders.</p>
Charlotte Street [4615]			Q13	<p>Preferable to Site 4 in Dickens Heath, but only if suitable infrastructure was provided to prevent exacerbating traffic etc issues in Dickens Heath village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q13	We are in agreement that a percentage of self and custom housebuilding should be included in development proposals.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q13	I have a preference for Option 2.
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q13	prefer option 2, it is safer a option to pursue for the council
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q13	prefer option 2
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q13	Prefer Option 2. Safer for Council to ensure delivery.
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q13	Prefer Option 2 with respect to self-build.
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q13	Support provision in the right location under the right planning conditions.
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q13	Concerned about suggested figure of 5% of self-build on development sites. Would be detrimental to release of land and could cause problems in terms of delivering the overall requirement. Suggested that the reference to a % of self-build sites be deleted.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q13	<p>Advise Option 1.</p> <p>5% significant proportion of larger sites.</p> <p>Renders delivery more difficult in masterplanning process. Less efficient use of land. Less design consistency.</p> <p>Sites currently being promoted have been negotiated on existing planning policies and values.</p> <p>Proposed policy change of Option 2 would have an impact on values and potentially affect the deliverability of the site.</p>
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q13	<p>Levels of need identified by Council's self-build register have not been outlined.</p> <p>Formal requirement that sites of 100+ dwellings provide 5% self/custom build is likely to be problematic, and could allocate far more land than is required.</p> <p>Potential negative impact on site delivery, build-out rates and overall viability.</p> <p>Suggest allocating specific sites, e.g. on public sector land.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q13	<p>We understand that the Council is required to keep a register of individuals interested in identifying sites that would allow for self or custom housebuilding. By its nature we would expect that individuals requirements may be quite unique and therefore may not fit within allocated sites especially those identified for a large number of houses. We would therefore favour the Council identifying a number of smaller sites that would allow for this type of build in pockets across the Borough.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q13	<p>We understand that the Council is required to keep a register of individuals interested in identifying sites that would allow for self or custom housebuilding. By its nature we would expect that individuals requirements may be quite unique and therefore may not fit within allocated sites especially those identified for a large number of houses. We would therefore favour the Council identifying a number of smaller sites that would allow for this type of build in pockets across the Borough. A big decision for pt2 of Q15, I'm sure this will be discussed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q13	<p>Variant of Option 2 would be preferable.</p> <p>Variation recommended by IM would be for developers of allocated sites to make a 5% contribution to Self and Custom Build on larger residential sites of 500+ units or via voluntary agreement between developer and SMBC on sites falling below this threshold.</p> <p>Only 91 people on register.</p> <p>5% of larger units would yield 109 plots, i.e. a 20% buffer.</p> <p>More practical to deliver serviced plots on larger sites. Where impractical could supply commuted sum.</p> <p>Should prepare viability evidence for policy.</p> <p>Plots should be marketed for 12 months, but returned to developer if unused.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q13	<p>Variant of Option 2 would be preferable.</p> <p>Variation recommended by IM would be for developers of allocated sites to make a 5% contribution to Self and Custom Build on larger residential sites of 500+ units or via voluntary agreement between developer and SMBC on sites falling below this threshold.</p> <p>Only 91 people on register.</p> <p>5% of larger units would yield 109 plots, i.e. a 20% buffer.</p> <p>More practical to deliver serviced plots on larger sites. Where impractical could supply commuted sum.</p> <p>Should prepare viability evidence for policy.</p> <p>Plots should be marketed for 12 months, but returned to developer if unused.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q13	Provision of self and custom build housing has created considerable problems in other authorities, e.g. control of design and implementation. Support provision in the right location and under the right planning conditions.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q13	Option 2 seems better as this would offer a wider variety of locations.
John Robbins [4272]			Q13	The government states that housing contracts should go to smaller companies using innovative methods, and promote custom build and rural housing sensitive to their settings, which would help to deliver smaller more affordable homes. Is this in the plan?
M7 Real Estate Ltd (Mr Ben Hooton) [3591]			Q13	Option 2 is not appropriate as carving out plots from larger development could constrain or limit the effective delivery of these sites and make it difficult to put in place management strategies for public open space and other shared services/facilities. Option 1 is preferred.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q13	We support self and custom build if they fit in to the character of the local area.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q13	Given that SMBC are proposing mainly large sites allocating dedicated sites for self build might be the only way ahead. Large builders will find reasons not to meet the policy guideline as they do with most other policies such as affordable housing.
Mr Bob Holtham [3530]			Q13	Self/Custom Build sites should not be aggregated to one site alone. Self/Custom Build can add to the variety and design quality of the Borough. A number of independent sites should be allocated for up to 20-30 dwellings each and Policy should encourage Self/Custom build of individual dwellings on infill or small greenbelt sites within or adjacent to Rural Settlements where this accords with the Parish or Neighbourhood Plan.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q13	Option 1 preferred As someone who has their name on the Self Build Registrar, option 1 is more likely to appeal to the self-build community and is the option I choose. see full text in letter

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q13	flexibility is always an advantage
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q13	Given the demographics of the Borough the age mix needs to be considered more.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q13	Both options have merit and it is suggested that a combination of both approaches would allow for the most flexibility in delivering housing for this part of the market. It is submitted that the land to which this representation relates could be suitable for allocation to Solihull's custom house building register.
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q13	I believe self and custom house building will impact the look of the area and will not be in keeping with the established borough of Solihull
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q13	Option 2 is favoured but the amount that is sought should reflect the evidence of demand for custom housing - as is required under the legislation. The reasoning for this view stems from the fact that larger sites can accommodate the necessary flexibility for meeting the vicissitudes of the custom house building process.
Mr Richard Ward-Jones [2919]			Q13	It is unclear precisely what Option 1 will achieve. Clarification ought to be provided - what does this mean for the individual? It does not appear to be an either / or choice - both options should be considered as part of the council's provision of plots for self build homes. Those individuals interested in self build may be seeking first choice on individual plots, or a list of plots available. Will there be any priority given to planning requests for those building self build homes, in order to encourage more building?
Mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q13	Not in favour of the policy as I understand it.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q13	There should be more focus on incorporating custom and self build into development sites, also increased use of green belt for one off self builds.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q13	The number on the Self and Custom Housebuilding Register imply that there is not a great need within the Borough. However any such builds should blend in to the existing communities
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q13	As in previous response.
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q13	I prefer Option 2 as it potentially means more sites available for self and custom housebuilding and would break up new estates with more interesting and individual new homes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q13	subject to demand and viability, there may be an opportunity to provide a number of self build plots.
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q13	Consider it is more appropriate to allocate specific sites for new build, rather than obliging developers to provide 5% of their open market dwellings as self-build. We would advise that smaller sites accommdoting ca. 20 self-build homes would be more appropriate.
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q13	The government states that housing contracts should go to smaller companies using innovative methods, and promote self build and housing associations, which would help to deliver smaller more affordable homes. Is this in the plan?
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson- Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson- Gallego) [2508]	Q13	Advise Option 1. 5% significant proportion of larger sites. Renders delivery more difficult in masterplanning process. Less efficient use of land. Less design consistency. Sites currently being promoted have been negotiated on existing planning policies and values. Proposed policy change of Option 2 would have an impact on values and potentially affect the deliverability of the site.
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q13	The principle of the Local Plan Review including a policy to promote custom and self-build plots is supported by Richborough Estates Limited and Option 1 is to be preferred, as isolated plots on larger sites difficult to manage and may incur higher costs, may affect viability or provision of affordable housing and the desirability and viability of sites with only 45% market housing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q13	<p>Option 1 is most appropriate.</p> <p>Would allow for such custom development to be delivered in the most appropriate location which is agreeable to the Council.</p> <p>Would object to the progression of Option 2 as this would place an unnecessary burden on major developments from coming forward; fail to see how this could reasonably be attained.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q13	<p>Support option 1.</p> <p>Object to the requirement that developers will be expected to supply 5% of dwelling plots for sale to self-builders for of more than 100 dwellings as this wouldn't enable a comprehensive and holistic development in terms of delivery and design. It would also provide numerous health and safety issues trying to work with numerous individuals and their associated contractors which would ultimately slow down delivery.</p>
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q13	<p>HBF preference is for Option 1.</p> <p>HBF would be opposed to alternative.</p> <p>If the Council decides to pursue this alternative option then it should be justified by robust evidence.</p>
Trevor Meredith [3270]			Q13	<p>do not see why the options in the DLP should with 'either/or', and do not think that landowners/developers will be willing partners for self-build, so do not agree that policy for self build as clear as it could be.</p>
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q13	<p>Support Option 1.</p> <p>Option 2, if progressed, should only be on a 'seek to negotiate' basis rather than prescriptive.</p> <p>Needs robust evidence of need.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 14 – Number of New Homes				
Andrew King [2922]			Q14	Far too many houses proposed east of Balsall Common which is highly unfair to our already busy and stretched village, the schools can't cope, we don't have the roads capable of such an increase in houses and we don't have adequate facilities as it is. Please reconsider and spread the building of so many houses to other parts of the borough and share the burden. I understand houses need to be built, but I highly contest the number of them on our beautiful green belt farm land.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q14	see answer to Q15
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q14	Support that the Borough will meet its own housing need whilst also addressing the acknowledged shortfall of housing across the HMA. However, the future relationship between continued economic growth of the Borough and the pressure it exerts on the demand/need for housing is of critical importance within Solihull. The consideration of supergrowth in the evidence base does not reflect the developing vision for the area. No evidence for the 2000 shortfall figure. Commuting patterns indicated that Solihull should take a greater share of the shortfall than already planned.
Arden Wood Shavings Ltd [3899]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q14	The housing requirement figure of 15,029 additional homes does not respond sufficiently to the unmet need from the Greater Birmingham housing market area. Whilst the distribution of the full shortfall of 37,900 has yet to be established, other authorities within the housing market area consider the contribution in the Draft Local Plan of 2,000 houses is inadequate. Further work is yet to take place to establish the distribution of the unmet need and is likely to report in Autumn 2017. The Local Plan Review should allow flexibility to address this without further Plan or Green Belt review.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q14	Accept conclusions for the borough as a whole but question the distribution and phasing of housing.
Barratt Developments [3775]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q14	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Not produced a HMA-wide SHMA.</p> <p>Evidence that 2000 figure for HMA shortfall is not agreed.</p> <p>Lack of clarity over mechanism for agreement of distribution of HMA shortfall.</p> <p>37,900 shortfall.</p> <p>Solihull well placed to take further growth:</p> <p>Economic growth,</p> <p>Public transport links,</p> <p>Lack of Absolute constraints,</p> <p>Attractive and aspirational housing market.</p> <p>SHMA has taken insufficient account of different needs of population; underestimates level of housing required to support economic growth ambitions; inaccurate conclusion about multiple jobs, % of HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Housing requirement in Policy P5 should be increased to at least 25,023 or 1,317 p.a.; including 36% of HMA shortfall.</p>
Barratt Developments [3775]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q14	same as rep ID 2564

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>There are insufficient numbers with no agreement of numbers to meet HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Question whether other local planning authorities in the HMA will agree to this considering their own capacity to accommodate further housing.</p> <p>The Draft LPR needs to provide for greater clarity in the event that there is a need to accommodate more housing to make up for the HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Need more housing allocations removed from Green Belt or boundaries amended to provide for safeguarded sites in the event that the allocations do not deliver as anticipated and to meet requirements beyond the plan period.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q14	<p>Not in a position to comment, but the spatial distribution is inappropriate with too much housing development concentrated in Balsall Common. The level of housing provision is unsustainable, it is located in the Meriden Gap, public transport is poor, there is limited access to employment opportunities and lack of social and community facilities.</p> <p>Some new housing could be accommodated, but not at the level proposed. Site allocation 1 should be deleted.</p>
Birmingham City Council (Waheed Nazir) [3971]			Q14	<p>The provision of 2,000 dwellings is an important contribution to meeting the HMA shortfall. However, question the justification and evidence base for this figure.</p> <p>Concern that at present the Draft SLP does not adequately address the housing shortfall arising from the Birmingham Development Plan and progress on this issue prior to the submission of the Plan will be important in demonstrating that the Duty to Co-operate has been met.</p> <p>The SA should consider other reasonable alternatives e.g. 2,000-4,000 dwellings and higher contributions.</p> <p>Unclear what the Objectively Assessed Need is given PBA recommendations and SLP housing land provision target.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Birmingham HMS consortium [4585]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q14	<p>Disagree with findings in SHMA, demographic OAHN and proposed contribution to HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Conclusions:</p> <p>Higher demographic starting point should be 710 to 799 dpa.</p> <p>To support baseline economic growth scenario a minimum of 858 dpa is required.</p> <p>To support UKC Hub scenario a minimum of 1,041 dpa required.</p> <p>Higher market signals uplift required.</p> <p>Consequently the OAHN for Solihull should be between 20,437 and 22,400.</p> <p>Serious concerns about 2000 contribution to shortfall - no technical approach has been identified.</p> <p>Should be significantly higher.</p> <p>Recommend Solihull progress a MoU with Birmingham and follow methodology of other HMAs e.g. Warwickshire and Oxfordshire.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]</p>			<p>Q14</p>	<p>Contributions from LPAs to the HMA shortfall needs full support of all GBHMA authorities.</p> <p>Should be based on a robust and thorough apportionment methodology, i.e. Strategic Growth Study.</p> <p>2000 figure received some but not full support.</p> <p>Strategic Growth Study underway; essential that all of GBHMA receive same level of scrutiny.</p> <p>Need for strategic Green Belt Review in WM Land Commission report.</p> <p>Align contribution with Solihull's economic aspirations.</p> <p>PBA Stage 3 Report recommended locating shortfall within easy reach of Birmingham and lesser extent Solihull.</p> <p>OAN figure not defined in DLP.</p> <p>Unclear how 2,000 dwellings has been included within the 15,029 figure.</p>
<p>Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]</p>			<p>Q14</p>	<p>this Council believes that the number of houses in these combined proposals is excessive and impacts too severely on Burton Green.</p> <p>In total, 1,970 houses are proposed to be built in a supposedly rural area and on green belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cannock Chase District Council (Clare Eggington) [2371]			Q14	<p>Support provision to meet Solihull's own housing needs.</p> <p>Object to presenting 2,000 to meet HMA shortfall as a maximum.</p> <p>HMA have not yet decided distribution of shortfall and Duty to Cooperate is on-going. No apparent mechanism for future flexibility, this is essential.</p> <p>Such flexibility is obvious for employment growth agenda, including Policy P17 and Green Belt release.</p> <p>Concern this will create unwelcome precedent and increase housing pressure in Zone of Influence surrounding the Cannock Chase SAC. Mitigation strategy underway.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q14	<p>the housing split (figures in the DLP) do not sum and clarification is considered necessary, particularly on how the published split of the housing target fits into the wider overall housing target for the Plan period.</p> <p>It is also considered that the housing requirement in Policy P5 should be expressed as a minimum.</p> <p>consensus must be reached between Solihull and the HMA authorities as to how the Birmingham shortfall will be distributed.</p> <p>additional housing site allocations should be identified in order to provide flexibility for a scenario where Solihull is required to meet a higher proportion of this shortfall.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q14	<p>Policy P5, as drafted in respect of proposals for phasing of the residential allocations is considered unsound. It is not justified and will not be effective in bringing forward housing to address the historic shortfall in delivery in Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Codev Homes [4643]	Mr Michael Davies	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Q14	<p>Clarification is sought on the proposed Objectively Assessed Housing Need and why the Scope, Issues and Options requirement of 13,500 dwellings has been altered other than to accommodate the additional 2,000 dwellings to assist with the wider HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Question how the HMA shortfall figure of 2000 dwellings has been established.</p> <p>Object to a phasing designation for each allocation. It should be recognised that the housing allocations set out in the adopted plan will all be required to meet the housing target so it should not be a policy requirement to restrict the point at which they are delivered.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q14	We agree
Colin Davis [3352]			Q14	i object to taking extra from birmingham
Copt Heath Golf Club [3026]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	while a reasonable number of housing has been submitted, this is falling short of what should be the number in order to meet the OAHN for the HMA.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>Unclear if proposed 2,000 additional units (arising mainly from Birmingham's housing needs) will be sufficient to address the wider HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Proposal of 2,000 dwellings to contribute to HMA shortfall has not been agreed; may well be subject to pressure from other local authorities to increase.</p> <p>Contrary to NPPF Para. 47.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q14	<p>There is a clear acceptance generally by residents that is a pressing need for more houses to be built, particularly in the affordable category.</p> <p>It is a pity that no phasing of the development of the proposed sites is included in the document. Inclusion at this stage would have served to provide residents with a better understanding of the implications of the changes.</p>
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q14	<p>Whilst I know that the number of houses is a political matter, my personal opinion, and what I reliably believe the majority of residents share, is that there is a clear acceptance over the pressing need for houses. Solihull will have to do its bit for the needs of the community in terms of building houses. As mentioned previously, it is less a case of "how many" as it is "where and who benefits".</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q14	Dire housing shortage in UK.
Coventry City Council (Planning Policy Officers) [2112]			Q14	<p>Support the provision of new housing across and appreciate the current challenges regarding the levels of unmet need from Birmingham that should be accommodated in the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA).</p> <p>Given the pressures across the GBHMA and the Coventry and Warwickshire HMA, Solihull should continue to ensure that the needs of the GBHMA are met within its own area. The Council should ensure that every reasonable step has been taken to explore and positively plan for unmet need from Birmingham and other GBHMA authorities at a level that is justified and supported by evidence.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q14	<p>the Draft Plan overprovides seriously</p> <p>A better figure would therefore be 4,654 dwellings to be added to the provision already made in the adopted Local Plan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q14	Birmingham overspill is 37,900 - see Inspector's report. 2,000 figure from Solihull is insufficient. Re-base the plan period until 2035. OAN uplift should be 20%
Daron Gay [4545]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	Housing numbers proposed in the Local Plan still falls somewhat short of what should be provided in Solihull to meet OAHN requirement for the Birmingham HMA.
David Sunner [3946]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	The Council has put forward a reasonable case for the housing numbers proposed but it still falls short of what should be provided in Solihull in terms of meeting the Objectively Assessed Housing Need requirement for the Birmingham HMA. Most of site allocations are large sites but the Council is relying too much on volume house builders to deliver. The Housing White Paper highlights the need to release more small and medium sized sites.
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q14	Balsall Common is already struggling to cope with the current population. Increasing this by 800+ homes will lead to increased congestion, reduction of services, and a fall in the quality of life of residents.
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q14	The Neighbourhood Forum does not wish to challenge, at this point in time, the stated need for new allocations of land to accommodate the 6150 homes in the borough over the Plan period.
Dr Victor Hu [3661]			Q14	I recognise that there is a pressing need for further affordable housing. I am strongly supportive of the building of a new Arden Academy in Knowle and support the building of 750 new houses on the old school site. Unfortunately, I missed participating in the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum review. I do not agree with their conclusion that, "The scale of 750 houses is not justified by the Council's evidence base: nor is it justified by the need to fund the new Academy. On this basis, the NF objects to the proposed allocation."
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q14	The housing number for Balsall Common is excessive and all Borough wards should have been expected to take some housing. The overwhelming majority of residents in Balsall Common wish the village to remain as such.
Elizabeth Sands [4123]			Q14	lack of evidence in the Plan for urgent need for more homes in Knowle.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Eric McClenaghan [4555]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	Housing numbers proposed in the Local Plan still falls somewhat short of what should be provided in Solihull to meet OAHN requirement for the Birmingham HMA.
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q14	The Neighbourhood Forum does not wish to challenge, at this point in time, the stated need for new allocations of land to accommodate the 6150 homes in the borough over the Plan period.
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q14	<p>Disagree with housing number.</p> <p>Strategic Housing Needs Study (2015) is significantly out of date.</p> <p>Apparent that no account has been taken of overspill from the Birmingham Local Plan.</p> <p>Proposed 2000 figure is a significant under-estimate of actual housing needs in area.</p> <p>New SHMA for whole HMA should be undertaken.</p> <p>Given Solihull's strategic location and importance to wider regional economy, it should take a much more significant proportion of the unmet need of the wider HMA.</p> <p>Suggest a figure of 20% should be tested.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q14	<p>Unclear how figures 12,094 and 14,278 are reconciled.</p> <p>Unclear how 2,000 of neighbouring unmet need is provided given only 700 dwellings is added.</p> <p>Policy should include tables from Housing Background paper.</p> <p>10% uplift should not be used to offset neighbouring need.</p> <p>No agreement on apportionment of Birmingham's unmet housing need across the HMA.</p> <p>Starting point for OAN should be 2014-based population and household projections.</p> <p>Wider HMA OAN should be updated likewise.</p> <p>Support providing for 2011-2014 gap.</p> <p>Apply 3% vacancy rate.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q14	<p>Should plan to address market pressure by location.</p> <p>Housing and jobs out of balance.</p> <p>Consider need to attract workers from elsewhere.</p> <p>Lack of 500 dwelling uplift for UKC is unjustified.</p> <p>Higher housing requirement means more affordable housing.</p> <p>Housing type and tenure should be indicative, not prescriptive.</p> <p>See Q.23 for summary on alternative SHMA using Chelmer model.</p>
Gill Corns [4448]			Q14	<p>The Neighbourhood Forum does not wish to challenge, at this point in time, the stated need for new allocations of land to accommodate the 6150 homes in the borough over the Plan period.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q14	<p>SHMA (2016) significantly underestimates OAN:</p> <p>Would not support proposed levels of employment growth.</p> <p>Suppressed household formation.</p> <p>Market signals adjustment is insufficient to address chronic affordability issue.</p> <p>Need to take implications of Housing White Paper into account through next stages.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence of Duty to Cooperate on addressing HMA shortfall.</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q14	<p>We consider that the Solihull Local Plan Review should seek to accommodate a significantly larger proportion of Birmingham's shortfall than 5% of 37,900.</p> <p>This is due to Solihull's proximity to the city, extensive shared boundary, established travel-to-work patterns and complementary nature of housing and employment provision.</p> <p>Edge of the conurbation offers the most obvious and sustainable option to meet Birmingham's shortfall.</p> <p>Solihull not meeting HMA responsibilities.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q14	<p>No evidence is presented that the HMA shortfall which forms part of the total housing need has been properly examined and audited by the Council. Solihull should not accept making up the shortfall unless the measures taken to bring into use brown-field sites for new housing have been tested and challenged.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]</p>	<p>Mr Stuart Field</p>	<p>GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]</p>	<p>Q14</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>Not produced a HMA-wide SHMA.</p> <p>Evidence that 2000 figure for HMA shortfall is not agreed.</p> <p>Lack of clarity over mechanism for agreement of distribution of HMA shortfall.</p> <p>37,900 shortfall.</p> <p>Solihull well placed to take further growth:</p> <p>Economic growth,</p> <p>Public transport links,</p> <p>Lack of Absolute constraints,</p> <p>Attractive and aspirational housing market.</p> <p>SHMA has taken insufficient account of different needs of population; underestimates level of housing required to support economic growth ambitions; inaccurate conclusion about multiple jobs, % of HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Housing requirement in Policy P5 should be increased to at least 25,023 or 1,317 p.a.; including 36% of HMA shortfall.</p>
<p>Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]</p>			<p>Q14</p>	<p>The number of homes being planned is based on current projection need and therefore difficult to challenge. It is encouraging that development is to be phased to ensure no excessive supply. However, Policy needs to include reviews and to be written to ensure that if projected demand does not materialise the number can be reduced. The impact of Brexit, HS2 etc really cannot be accurately predicted between now and 2033. HHPC would urge SMBC to commit to a review of the SHMA in five years.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q14	The number of homes being planned is based on current projection need and therefore difficult to challenge. It is encouraging that development is to be phased to ensure no excessive supply. However, Policy needs to include reviews and to be written to ensure that if projected demand does not materialise the number can be reduced. The impact of Brexit, HS2 etc really cannot be accurately predicted between now and 2033. HHPC would urge SMBC to commit to a review of the SHMA in five years.
Howard Farrand [3273]			Q14	accepts the need for additional housing within the borough and country, but does not state at what level this should be at.
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q14	Aware of critique Barton Willmore have made of the SHMA methodology: No positive adjustment to address household suppression in younger households; Not adequately addressed fact that housing has become absolutely less affordable over long-term; Not adequately addressed balance between job growth and population growth; Target should be increased to a minimum of 890 homes p.a., and exceeding 1,000 homes p.a. to support UKC Hub scenario. Need to reconsider role in accommodating Birmingham's shortfall; 6% is insufficient. North Warwickshire report states Solihull provides the largest single inflow of people commuting into Birmingham, and should take a greater share. (NW taking 10%).
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q14	Additional representations have been made by Turley on behalf of IM on this matter. Conclusion is that insufficient housing is allocated in DLP.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q14	<p>Part of consortium which has instructed Barton Willmore to critique SHMA methodology:</p> <p>No positive adjustment to address household suppression in younger households;</p> <p>Not adequately addressed fact that housing has become absolutely less affordable over long-term;</p> <p>Not adequately addressed balance between job growth and population growth;</p> <p>Target should be increased to a minimum of 890-987 homes p.a., for OAN, 12.5% higher than currently provided for. Housing numbers exceeding 1,000 homes p.a. would be required to support UKC Hub scenario.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q14	<p>Recommend that Solihull progress an MoU with Birmingham on accommodating shortfall; including an evidenced justification of the scale required based on the socio-economic links between the two authorities.</p> <p>Need to reconsider role in accommodating Birmingham's shortfall; 6% is insufficient.</p> <p>North Warwickshire report states Solihull provides the largest single inflow of people commuting into Birmingham, and should take a greater share.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q14	<p>Should use 37,900 and not 37,500 figure for HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Solihull in particular will have to continue to make appropriate provision for Birmingham overspill. 2,000 contribution is unreasonable and insufficient.</p> <p>Plan should be extended to at least 2035.</p> <p>OAN uplift should be 20% and not 15% (sic).</p> <p>Should use the most up-to-date data.</p> <p>Not taken sufficient account of interlink between provision of new employment and provision of housing; housing should be significantly above the balancing requirement.</p> <p>Not accounted for underprovision in current Local Plan.</p> <p>Will therefore require further housing allocations to meet need.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q14	<p>The revision to the draft plan has been triggered by the rapid growth in Birmingham that cannot be provided for within the borders of Birmingham. Ideally the number would be lower and only have to cater for the planned growth within the Solihull area. Ultimately this seems to be a failure of national policy to encourage growth where it can be accommodated which is beyond the scope of the local plan.</p>
Jo Hayes [3874]			Q14	<p>uncertainty over Brexit - reassessment of numbers</p>
John & Sue McMahon [3408]			Q14	<p>Recognises the need for SMBC to provide more housing in the borough</p>
John Maguire [3543]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q14	<p>Solihull have failed to meet the housing target in the current Local Plan and the draft Local Plan Review must both address this shortfall, provide an appropriate housing target for Solihull MBC and also provide for an agreed proportion of Birmingham's unmet need. Policy P5 as currently drafted will not allow sufficient housing land to come forward in Solihull to meet actual targets.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q14	Concern that the full OAHN presented in the SHMAA provides an underestimate of housing need in the Borough in accordance with current guidance. The SDLP is therefore not planning for the correct number of homes to meet housing need and the housing target should be increased.
John Robbins [4272]			Q14	Object to the borough taking an additional 2000 houses from the Birmingham shortfall. There are many brownfield sites and public open spaces that should be used before green belt which should be a last resort. Urge that these houses are pushed back to Birmingham City Council.
Johnnie Arkwright [3903]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q14	15,029 is insufficient, and should be a minimum figure. Need OAN for whole of HMA. 2,000 contribution is not evidenced. No justification for discounting the 10% market signals figure. Local Plan should provide flexibility for numbers to change (i.e. increase) once HMA OAN is established.
Judith Stanley [3431]			Q14	Accept the need for more housing.
Kay Agostinho [3266]			Q14	appreciates the need for new housing Solihull, but does not comment on whether the number identified in the DLP is at the right level.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q14	No formal agreement of how the unmet needs of Birmingham will be dealt with. Discussions with Birmingham policy officers have indicated that the direction of travel indicated by the Solihull Draft Plan and supporting documents, to provide land to accommodate 2000 homes is INCORRECT. Informally we have been advised that this number is considerably higher, and the council should be planning for a minimum of 6000 new dwellings.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q14	The Neighbourhood Forum does not wish to challenge, at this point in time, the stated need for new allocations of land to accommodate the 6150 homes in the borough over the Plan period.
Landowner Land at Birmingham Road Meriden [4529]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>Unclear if the proposed additional 2,000 units will be sufficient to address the HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Unclear whether the other local planning authorities, (in particular Birmingham) comprising the HMA will agree to this level of provision having regard to their own capacity to accommodate further housing.</p> <p>Need to provide greater clarity in the event further housing land needs to be allocated for HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Needs more Green Belt release and safeguarded sites.</p>
landowners land Balsall Common [3754]	Mr Roy Hammond	Howkins & Harrison (Mr Roy Hammond) [3714]	Q14	agreed
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>Unclear if proposed 2,000 additional units (arising mainly from Birmingham's housing needs) will be sufficient to address the wider HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Proposal of 2,000 dwellings to contribute to HMA shortfall has not been agreed; may well be subject to pressure from other local authorities to increase.</p> <p>Contrary to NPPF Para. 47.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lichfield District Council (Mr Ashley Baldwin) [3469]			Q14	<p>Welcome commitment to meet own OAHN (Objectively Assessed Housing Needs).</p> <p>2,000 contribution to HMA shortfall is considered pre-emptive; HMA-wide strategic assessment required before setting a ceiling on provision.</p> <p>Fails to meet NPPF and Duty to cooperate.</p> <p>Local Plan Review should commit to meet the findings of work currently being undertaken across the HMA.</p>
Lioncourt Strategic Land [3843]	Robert Gardner	GVA (Robert Gardner) [3700]	Q14	<p>OAN calculation inadequately reflects the significant employment growth/job creation that is expected to occur in the Borough during plan period.</p> <p>Additional housing proposed to meet the HMA shortfall is insufficient. Does not reflect significance of Solihull as location of employment growth.</p> <p>Policy P5 should be amended to read:</p> <p>Allocate land for 25,023 dwellings, or at least 1,317 p.a.</p> <p>Council accommodate 36% of 37,900 shortfall across HMA.</p> <p>25,023 is full OAN for the Borough, including justifiable contribution to HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Summary table of allocated sites and Appendix C should be amended to include land at Tidbury Green Farm.</p>
M Dunn [4139]	Toby Haselwood	Sworders (Toby Haselwood) [2641]	Q14	<p>It is not necessarily disputed that the number of homes proposed to be built over the plan period is not correct in terms of required numbers, but it is clear that to ensure that the plan is sound, specifically in term of delivery, the number of smaller site allocations should be increased to ensure more reliable delivery.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q14	<p>Para. 211 should be amended to state shortfall is 37,900.</p> <p>2,000 figure cannot be relied upon until HMA enters into a MoU.</p> <p>Housing figure should be increased due to uncertainty around Birmingham shortfall and use of lower end of SHMA requirement range.</p> <p>Sites in the SHLAA should be allocated through the Plan.</p> <p>Densities per site should be agreed through concept masterplans rather than a blanket 36dph.</p> <p>Phasing of sites should be dependent on the market.</p> <p>Not releasing sites until their phased designation is not positive planning and is contrary to Para.'s 14 and 157 of NPPF.</p>
Mark Taft [3595]			Q14	<p>Whilst the need for new housing is recognised, it cannot be right that 41% of all new houses is proposed to be located on Green Belt land within the Shirley area. Oppose the provision for housing to meet Birmingham's needs, given the large areas of brownfield sites in the city, which should be resisted because of the impact on the Green Belt and the national imperative to protect it.</p>
Mark Thompson [3446]			Q14	<p>We appreciate that the council has been directed by central government to have a five year housing plan but the sheer volume of new development around south Shirley is far too high.</p>
Mary Davis [3297]			Q14	<p>know that development has to go ahead, but it should be someplace else than on this site,</p>
McLean Estates Limited (Mr N McLean) [2241]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	<p>The Council has put forward a reasonable case for the housing numbers proposed but it still falls short of what should be provided in Solihull in terms of meeting the Objectively Assessed Housing Need requirement for the Birmingham HMA. Most of site allocations are large sites but the Council is relying too much on volume house builders to deliver. The Housing White Paper highlights the need to release more small and medium sized sites.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q14	<p>Yes numbers approximately right, if building the right number of houses to address the needs of older people, single people, not just family housing.</p> <p>Also not convinced that Birmingham has explored all their brownfield sites before coming into Solihull. We are not convinced that Birmingham explored their options. Has Solihull explored all their brownfield sites? Being part of the Combined Authority does not mean that a local authority can off load its quota to neighbouring local authorities.</p>
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q14	<p>Concern that the full OAHN presented in the SHMA provides an underestimate of housing need in the Borough in accordance with current guidance.</p> <p>The SDLP is therefore not planning for the correct number of homes to meet housing need and the housing target should be increased.</p> <p>Further work being carried out by broader HMA will need to be taken into account.</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q14	<p>However I question where they are being built and if there are sufficient A and B roads to deal with the increase in traffic, together with sustainable travel.</p>
Mr & Mrs G P & M P Troth [3398]			Q14	<p>Agrees with the need to provide more housing in Solihull, but does not mention anything about the numbers.</p>
Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	Paul Watson	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	Q14	<p>OAN for Borough is questionable.</p> <p>Contribution to Birmingham's housing needs is inadequate in terms of justification and quantum.</p>
Mr & Mrs Martin & Claire Calkeld [3217]			Q14	<p>understand the need to build housings, but do not this that Shirley is the place to do so, and the 2550 is too high a number to be delivering in this area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q14	If the greenbelt policy is to mean anything then SMBC should only really be planning to meet its local need. The purpose of greenbelt is well known and specified in the NPPF. Allowing too many additional houses to come from the HMA simply overrides greenbelt policy. The balance seems right
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q14	Yes
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q14	not enough
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q14	the number of homes to be built will always include some guesswork. this looks about right
Mr D Everitt [4441]			Q14	The current Local Plan and the number of houses required was based on population growth partly fuelled by immigration which under Brexit should no longer occur and therefore is flawed. Until new information on the likely future housing requirements post Brexit is obtained these plans should be put on hold.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q14	Solihull's overall plan for housebuilding in the review period appears excessive. Let us not forget the borough is aspirational versus its neighbours and at this rate of growth it would appear supply far outstrips demand and thus feeds inward migration rather than supporting resident population growth in a sustainable manner.
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q14	Given that if you consider the available statistics there will be a surplus North Solihull and a shortfall South
Mr G E Leighton [3320]			Q14	object to the planned level of housing
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q14	I disagree. I do not know how many new homes are required. However, releasing Green Belt at this time, when the report itself says that the number assumed for windfall sites is "cautious" is wrong. The allocation of 1150 in Green Belt in Balsall Common is also premature when the planning department officials admit they have not looked for any Brown field or heavily developed Green field sites in the village. Several such sites were identified in the Sites for Consideration exhibition on 20/08/16 but these have been ignored.
Mr Graham Roderick [3521]			Q14	recognises that the council has to provide a solution to the identified housing shortage.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q14	<p>Not aware that any Memorandums of Understanding have been signed with surrounding authorities in relation to agreeing how the unmet needs of Birmingham will be dealt with.</p> <p>Consider the number of homes to accommodate the shortfall in the wider HMA will need to be considerably higher, and the council should be planning for a minimum of 6000 of Birmingham's overspill.</p>
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q14	Disagree with concentration, size and distribution of the developments, rather than overall numbers.
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q14	<p>The projected housing totals for Balsall Common are disproportionate compared to other areas in the Borough (such as Dorridge) which already possess more well developed infrastructure.</p> <p>There is no reference to new build for older members of the of the community (e.g.bungalows). This should be included as it could form part of an important incentive for downsizing leading to more efficient use of existing housing stock.</p> <p>More encouragement of smaller scale developments would allow them to be blended into existing communities as opposed to large estates which tend to dominate or become isolated from existing provision.</p>
Mr M Khan [4149]	Atief Ishaq	Planning Design & Build (Atief Ishaq) [4116]	Q14	<p>- proposed Sites allocated for Housing delivery areas while are supported fail to consider other opportunities to aid delivery of much needed housing.</p> <p>- site assessments within the Draft plan is to narrow and selective</p>
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q14	I have heard from more than one source that the Council considers it 'will be lucky if it gets away with' making provision for only 2000 from Birmingham. Clearly the reason we are going through this expensive and time-consuming exercise is because the Council has repeatedly tried to 'get away with' unrealistically low numbers. The Council should not treat the Green Belt like a sweetie jar which it can routinely dip into. GB boundaries are only supposed to be changed in exceptional circumstances, so the Council should make much greater provision and safeguard land not currently required. At least 10,000.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Martin Archer [3315]			Q14	object to the level of development in Knowle as it is too much and requires infrastructure such as road improvements, parking improvements, but believes that no transport assessment has been carried out to identify this. Site 9 should have approx 300 homes and site 8 should have 300 homes on them as the appropriate number of new housing
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q14	I believe that the number of new homes planned is excessive and should be capped at 3000 and in particular the larger proposed sites of 500 homes plus
Mr Matthew Taylor [2935]			Q14	I agree so long as the balance in tenure and size is right. There are people in the local and surrounding areas who may own their own homes but are priced out of buying larger properties. 3 bedroom properties are still family homes and should be open to families who currently own in the area.
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q14	Seeking to practicably address Birmingham's unmet housing need as well as Solihull's requirements must be seen as a priority. It will be necessary to identify further sites for development within the Borough and further Green Belt releases. Particularly given that no agreement for the distribution of Birmingham's unmet need has been finalised.
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q14	Solihull have failed to meet the housing target in the current Local Plan and the draft Local Plan Review must both address this shortfall, provide an appropriate housing target for Solihull MBC and also provide for an agreed proportion of Birmingham's unmet need. Policy P5 as currently drafted will not allow sufficient housing land to come forward in Solihull to meet actual targets.
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q14	Proposed wider housing market area provision should be increased from 2000 to 7500 or 20%, as Borough is natural choice of search for Birmingham based households and unrealistic proportion will result in distortion of housing market whereby migrants seek dwellings as close as possible to work and social connections and a less sustainable pattern of development.
mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q14	The proposed housing developments for Knowle ,Dorridge and Bentley Heath are completely in excess for the current roads, schools, doctors surgeries, public car parking, and rail station parking and involve further erosion of the green belt in the area. The whole of the present infrastructure would need to be up graded.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q14	<p>1. Too many homes are being targeted at Balsall Common. 1,150 represents a 25 per cent increase on the present number.</p> <p>2. In that number there is no mention of building bungalows - a particular interest in the Balsall Common area because of the ageing population.</p>
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>There are insufficient numbers with no agreement of numbers to meet HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Question whether other local planning authorities in the HMA will agree to this considering their own capacity to accommodate further housing.</p> <p>The Draft LPR needs to provide for greater clarity in the event that there is a need to accommodate more housing to make up for the HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Need more housing allocations removed from Green Belt or boundaries amended to provide for safeguarded sites in the event that the allocations do not deliver as anticipated and to meet requirements beyond the plan period.</p>
Mr Stephen Carter [2941]			Q14	<p>I object to the large swathe of South Shirley that is being looked at. It is being overly targeted for development. Any resident of Blackford Rd, Tamworth Lane or Dog Kennel Lane will find their lives dramatically and negatively affected by the increase in traffic, noise, loss of rural feel and loss of value of current property prices. A development only of the TRW site would be the best possible outcome with regards to affect on the current residents lives</p>
Mr Steven Rushton [3211]			Q14	<p>Unless there are clear plans to increase employment and wealth generation in proportion to the number of new houses being built the result will be a decrease in the overall standard of living and quality of the borough. The revised plan includes disproportionately more incremental houses than employment opportunities.</p>
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q14	<p>We should be planning to build the number that can be built with out allocating green belt. The use of green belt, or as it is put in this document, the RELEASE green belt shouldn't even be a last resort.</p> <p>Also the figures given for housing requirements going forward would push Solihull well past what traffic is could deal with, it could be argued we are already at that point.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]			Q14	The allocation of 2000 houses from Birmingham should not be built in Solihull until Birmingham has developed all of its brownfield sites.
Mrs Irene Thompson [4127]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	the housing numbers in the DLP fall short of what it should be providing to meeting the OAHN and HMA shortfall.
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	Unclear if proposed 2,000 additional units (arising mainly from Birmingham's housing needs) will be sufficient to address the wider HMA shortfall. Proposal of 2,000 dwellings to contribute to HMA shortfall has not been agreed; may well be subject to pressure from other local authorities to increase. Contrary to NPPF Para. 47.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q14	505 dwellings in excess of requirement is a contingency of only 3.36%. Should be at least 5% and preferably 10%.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q14	too many houses are suggested for Knowle you need to put long stay parking near the village so workers can park and walk to their jobs. The Mind Horticultural site should not be allowed to be swallowed up more homes should be put nearer the JLR and HS2 site not in the outlying villages
Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]			Q14	Why have Solihull got to take some of Birmingham's allocation, when they have so many brownfield sites, many used as cheap car parking?
Mrs Angela Stuart-Smith [3749]			Q14	The number of houses across the borough will turn each individual community into one large massed conglomeration from north to south and east to west. What happened to 'Urbes in Rure' ?
Mrs Christine Baker [3080]			Q14	I agree that more housing needs to be built

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Denise Horton [3158]			Q14	Whilst I appreciate that there is a need to provide more housing across the country, I object to the number that are proposed within the Solihull area. My main objections are based on concerns for the infrastructure to support this amount of development: the roads around the area are currently at saturation point, along with school, hospital and health facilities. This development would also be destroying significant pockets of green belt which support varied wildlife and provide green spaces for the current residents. More traffic fumes will also have a negative impact on the health of current residents.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q14	Shortage estimated as over 30000, table of proposed sites shows approx 15000.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q14	Possibly However, releasing Green Belt when the report states that the number assumed for windfall sites is "cautious" is wrong. In Balsall Common the allocation of 1150 in Green Belt in is premature when the planning department officials admit they have not looked for any Brown field or heavily developed Green field sites in the village. Several such sites were identified in the Sites for Consideration exhibition on 20/08/16 but these have been ignored.
Mrs J A Leighton [3321]			Q14	41% of the number that Solihull has to be built is unacceptable.
mrs jacqui gardner [3687]			Q14	Not unless you improve the infrastructure of Balsall Common, by means of larger town centre, better parking, extending current primary school, improving local recreational facilities and amenities.
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q14	The proposed housing site west of Dickens Heath does not represent sustainable development as the existing services, facilities and infrastructure within the rural village of Dickens Heath can not accommodate an additional 700 homes. This proposed new housing site should be removed from the schedule contained in the Draft Local Plan. The proposed housing site south of Shirley should also be removed from the schedule contained in the Draft Local Plan due to the loss of open countryside between the rural village of Dickens Heath and Shirley, and Dickens Heath would lose its distinct rural village character.
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q14	The projected housing totals for Balsall Common are disproportionate compared to other areas in the Borough (such as Dorridge) which already possess more well developed infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q14	I feel there are too many homes planned in Solihull when other towns and Birmingham could build more on brown sites.
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q14	I am not in a position to challenge the overall numbers, so I support the new allocations total of 6150 and other figures for UK Central and windfall sites. However, I am in disagreement with where the Plan suggests the new allocations homes should be built.
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q14	Too many houses proposed relative to Solihull population vs UK population.
Mrs T Hughes [3209]			Q14	agrees that new houses have to be built, but does not comment on whether the LP figures are the right ones.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q14	Agree the need for affordable housing - but to note that the developer has said that only 40% of the Frog Lane development will be 40%... and as ever this always gets eroded. Also... affordable housing needs to be a lot closer to amenities such as shops, services and railway stations - not in a place where car ownership is essential.
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q14	The Neighbourhood Forum does not wish to challenge, at this point in time, the stated need for new allocations of land to accommodate the 6150 homes in the borough over the Plan period.
Nick Ager [3055]			Q14	I believe that there are an excessive number of new homes being proposed which will have a significantly detrimental impact on the Green Belt in Solihull and Knowle ruining its rural character. The number of new homes proposed for Knowle, particularly in the Arden Triangle is vastly excessive for the size of the village.
Nigel & Robin Tarplin [4326]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	Should contribute more housing to meet the Birmingham HMA shortfall.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>North Warwickshire Borough Council (Mr M Dittman) [3848]</p>			<p>Q14</p>	<p>Note the DLP indicates a modest contribution to Birmingham's shortfall.</p> <p>Wish to raise major concerns that 2000 dwellings does not significantly or sufficiently address neither the scale of the shortfall, nor the clear and significant links and relationships between Solihull and the Greater Birmingham area.</p> <p>No clear rationale on how 2000 figure arrived at.</p> <p>Particularity relevant given:</p> <p>North Warwickshire's proposal of testing 3790 dwellings in their Local Plan to address shortfall;</p> <p>Comparative infrastructure and services available in both authorities;</p> <p>Significantly higher levels of commuting traffic, and travel to work relationships between Solihull and Birmingham, both local and strategic.</p>
<p>Nurton Developments [390]</p>	<p>Ms Caroline Chave</p>	<p>Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]</p>	<p>Q14</p>	<p>There is no evidence to support the contribution of 2,000 dwellings towards meeting unmet needs in the housing market area and there is no agreement over this figure with the other HMA authorities. As such, the duty to co-operate is not met.</p> <p>The windfall supply included in the overall housing supply is not justified.</p> <p>A 5 year supply of housing is not demonstrated.</p> <p>Housing supply should be frontloaded in order to address the 'gap' since 2011.</p> <p>The backlog arising in the 'SHNS gap' should be addressed in the 5 year supply.</p> <p>The DLP should look to address long-term need post-2033.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q14	in the absence of a formal agreement across the HMA, the 2,000 that Solihull is including in the overall number for the plan is an underestimation of what will be required. the borough should be planning for a minimum 6,000 additional houses for the wider HMA shortfall. if not, there is a risk the LP will eventually end up being challenged leading to another early review.
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	Unclear if proposed 2,000 additional units (arising mainly from Birmingham's housing needs) will be sufficient to address the wider HMA shortfall. Proposal of 2,000 dwellings to contribute to HMA shortfall has not been agreed; may well be subject to pressure from other local authorities to increase. Unclear whether other planning authorities will agree to this level of provision. Contrary to NPPF Para. 47.
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd [400]	Mr Will Charlton	Brooke Smith Planning (Mr Will Charlton) [3646]	Q14	Understood that provision of 2000 homes is likely to fall short of that required to be provided within the Borough. During the plan period need for housing within Solihull and the wider area is likely to change. DLP needs to be able to take into account potential changes with regards to housing needs and targets with allowance made for subsequent reviews of allocations and Green Belt boundaries. This should include land around the village of Hampton-in-Arden, as a sustainable village.
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q14	Disagree with accommodating teh HIMA wide shortfall. Should not be the responsibility for Solihull. Have been advised that Birmingham has many brownfield sites that could be available but are dragging their heels. Can they not be legally forced to make this land a priority before encroaching on Green Belt?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q14	<p>Disagree with housing numbers.</p> <p>Starting point for FOAN should be 1,185 dwellings p.a.</p> <p>Base date for provision should be 2011.</p> <p>Take account of CLG-2014 household projections.</p> <p>SHMA should not use actual prices rather than indexed prices to compare affordability.</p> <p>Affordability uplift should be greater than 10%.</p> <p>Should provide for more of HMA shortfall, and reflected in Green Belt Review.</p> <p>Phasing is likely to impede delivery.</p> <p>Encourage higher densities, e.g. 45dph, where possible.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q14	<p>No formal agreement of how the unmet needs of Birmingham will be dealt with. Discussions with Birmingham policy officers have indicated that the direction of travel indicated by the Solihull Draft Plan and supporting documents, to provide land to accommodate 2000 homes is INCORRECT. Informally we have been advised that this number is considerably higher, and the council should be planning for a minimum of 6000 new dwellings.</p>
Peter Bray [4040]			Q14	<p>I have no conception of the number of houses that are needed so I cannot help. If you read the press it is for a multitude of reasons, increased aged population, young people who cannot get a step on the ladder, low wages, greedy developers, the natural increase in the population and so on. There will be many who cannot afford</p> <p>to buy and those that feel they can they have a shock coming when interest rates are increased. It is so unfair I feel for them. Can you ever get this right with your vision alone. I think not.</p>
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q14	<p>The proposed excessive housing allocation for Knowle is in complete conflict with the evidence base.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q14	The densities quoted for the two sites are too high, particularly as this presumably average figure takes into account the school and club playing fields.
Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Mr Charles Robinson	DLP Consultants (Mr Charles Robinson) [3608]	Q14	The figure of 2000 houses does not properly reflect the quantum of housing likely to be required to be provided within Solihull to meet needs arising from the two adjacent HMAs. Before these housing figures are confirmed Solihull should adopt an approach such as that applied by North Warwickshire Council- when a higher figure has been used for the purpose of the Local Plan Review. It is considered that a figure of at least 4000 houses should be applied.
Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Mr Charles Robinson	DLP Consultants (Mr Charles Robinson) [3608]	Q14	The figure of 2000 houses does not properly reflect the quantum of housing likely to be required to be provided within Solihull to meet needs arising from the two adjacent HMAs. Before these housing figures are confirmed Solihull should adopt an approach such as that applied by North Warwickshire Council- when a higher figure has been used for the purpose of the Local Plan Review. It is considered that a figure of at least 4000 houses should be applied.
Red Elk Holdings [4470]	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Q14	The Draft Local Plan does not make provision for specialist accommodation for elderly people, despite such a requirement being identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
Redditch Borough Council (Ruth Bamford) [3925]			Q14	<p>Birmingham shortfall is 37,900 not 37,500 as per the Inspector's Report.</p> <p>2000 figure received some but not full support from other HMA authorities. Need to take full account of Strategic Green Belt Review.</p> <p>Lack of evidence for testing 2000 figure.</p> <p>Strong links between Birmingham and Solihull, including travel to work patterns.</p> <p>Birmingham and Solihull form core of the LEP.</p> <p>PBA Stage 3 Report does not provide a OAN figure for the HMA.</p> <p>OAN figure not defined clearly in DLP.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q14	Housing numbers fall short of what should be provided.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q14	14-NO-Why should we have to take on a proportion of Birmingham's number of development in the HMA. If you travel by train in from Berkswell to New Street there are plenty of unused brown field sites to be seen, are these not an option as green belt is cheaper to develop.
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q14	The housing target should just meet local needs. Excess requirements should be met in the rural expanses in neighbouring counties, who are expected to have a "duty to cooperate". Solihull should not cater for Birmingham overspill. Solihull Borough has essentially reached capacity in terms of housing provision, and a Predict and Provide policy will lead to a continuous decline in the quality of the environment and to the detriment of residents.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q14	<p>Concern that the full OAHN presented in the SHMA provides an underestimate of housing need in the Borough in accordance with current guidance.</p> <p>The SDLP is therefore not planning for the correct number of homes to meet housing need and the housing target should be increased.</p> <p>Further work being carried out by broader HMA will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Agree with inclusion of windfalls (para. 219).</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q14	<p>Concern that the full OAHN presented in the SHMA provides an underestimate of housing need in the Borough in accordance with current guidance.</p> <p>The SDLP is therefore not planning for the correct number of homes to meet housing need and the housing target should be increased.</p> <p>Barton Willmore study recommends 987dpa as baseline scenario and 1,076-1,179 as UKC scenario. Due to suppression of household formation rates for younger people and need to balance housing and economic growth.</p> <p>HMA shortfall in addition to this.</p> <p>Further work being carried out by broader HMA will need to be taken into account.</p>
Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	Mr Miles Drew	GVA (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	Q14	<p>Insufficient homes identified.</p> <p>Propose Policy P5 is amended to read '...allocate land for 25,023 dwellings to be delivered within the plan period. The annual housing provision target is at least 1,317 homes per year.'</p> <p>Propose Para. 211 is amended to include reference to SMBC accommodating 36% of wider HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Propose Para. 214 is amended to read housing land provision target for 2014-2033 is 25,023.</p>
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q14	<p>Object to the borough taking an additional 2000 houses from the Birmingham shortfall. There are many brownfield sites and public open spaces that should be used before greenbelt which should be a last resort. Urge that these houses are pushed back to Birmingham City Council, as there are many brownfield sites used as car parking and also overgrown areas and grassed areas devoid of wildlife. Please ensure that Birmingham City Council fully research and address all of their brownfield sites before Solihull rolls over and gives away our green belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Shirley Golf Club Ltd and IM Properties Ltd [4153]	Gary Stephens	Marrons Planning (Gary Stephens) [4152]	Q14	- development of land adjacent to Stratford Road could make a meaningful contribution to housing supply - uncertainty at this stage as to whether the proposed allocations are capable of meeting the requirements of paragraph 47 of the Framework, and it i
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q14	Can understand how target of 6,150 has been derived. Believe it is too many homes to preserve the attractiveness of the region, and many of the other objectives set out in the DLP.
Simon Heath [3403]			Q14	Fully aware of the need for additional housing provision both local and throughout the country. The proposals will go some way to alleviating the need, but sites 11, 12 and 13 will come at a cost to the quality of life of existing residents of Shirley.
Simon Rogers [4011]			Q14	I understand the commitment Solihull Council has to provide additional housing and in principle I have no firm objections.
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q14	Agree with need to build 6150 extra homes.
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q14	Agree with need to build 6150 extra homes.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>South Staffordshire Council (Andy Johnson) [2375]</p>		<p>Q14</p>	<p>Welcome Solihull's commitment to meet its own housing need.</p> <p>NPPF clear that HMA need should be met in full.</p> <p>2,000 contribution is only 5% of shortfall.</p> <p>Evidence on household formation and movement to work patterns, suggest Solihull should make a much higher contribution.</p> <p>GBHMA currently working on evidence to investigate potential spatial options across HMA to meet shortfall,</p> <p>This should be referenced and findings identified in Local Plan Review.</p>
<p>South Staffordshire Council (Andy Johnson) [2375]</p>		<p>Q14</p>	<p>Welcome Solihull's commitment to meet own OAHN.</p> <p>NPPF makes clear that HMA housing need should be met in full, includes 14 local authorities.</p> <p>2,000 figure would only represent 5% of shortfall.</p> <p>Evidence relating to movement of households and traffic to work patterns between Birmingham and Solihull would indicate far higher contribution from SMBC.</p> <p>Emerging Plan should acknowledge work in Strategic Growth Study being carried out for HMA.</p> <p>May result in higher figure and need to modify emerging Plan or carry out an immediate review.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q14	<p>2,000 contribution to GBHMA shortfall not fully justified in text.</p> <p>Refers to Barton Willmore analysis of Solihull's housing need; recommends a minimum of 890 dpa for Solihull's OAN.</p> <p>Concerned that housing and economic needs are not aligned.</p> <p>Solihull should seek to provide a higher proportion of GBHMA shortfall due to location and housing and economic linkages.</p>
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q14	<p>the DLP figure is lower than evidence produced by Barton Wilmore. DLP will be open to challenge (again) if it takes forward its level of housing contributing (2000) to HMA shortfall and OAN.</p> <p>the DLP figure of 2,000 is 'a direction of travel' and no evidence to support that this is the final figure.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q14	<p>Alternative 'policy off' Chelmer model work been undertaken. Demographic scenarios are consistent with SHMA suggesting a need of ca. 12,000 dwellings. In order to meet economic needs an additional 8-12K homes are recommended to OAN.</p> <p>Not propose additional market uplift to this economic uplift. Need to consider Cambridge Econometrics job growth data.</p> <p>8-12K does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2011-2014 shortfall. - Additional housing required to enable economic growth at UK Central which is over and above the baseline economic forecast. - Additional uplift for Birmingham's unmet need. <p>Consider the LPEG recommendation to allocate an additional 20% of the dwelling requirement.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q14	Richborough Estates Limited consider that the density of development is a matter for master planning to address and that no artificial constraints should be imposed on delivery of housing sites.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q14	<p>Concern that the full OAHN presented in the SHMA provides an underestimate of housing need in the Borough in accordance with current guidance.</p> <p>The SDLP is therefore not planning for the correct number of homes to meet housing need and the housing target should be increased.</p> <p>Further work being carried out by broader HMA will need to be taken into account.</p>
Stratford on Avon District Council (John Careford) [4666]			Q14	The contribution of 2,000 homes towards the Greater Birmingham HMA shortfall is welcomed. However, further technical work looking at how the shortfall should be accommodated across the HMA is being undertaken. Whilst the results of this work are not yet known, given the strong relationship of Solihull to Birmingham and the fact that Solihull Borough is fully within the Greater Birmingham HMA, it is highly likely that Solihull Borough will be required to make further and significant provision towards contributing to the HMA shortfall. The Draft Local Plan should therefore make further provision to meeting these needs.
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q14	<p>DLP has been published in advance of the satisfactory resolution of the apportionment of meeting the needs of Birmingham, nor indeed any proper consideration of this important strategic issue.</p> <p>Therefore not possible at this stage to identify the full housing needs across the housing market area in compliance with paragraph 159 of the Framework.</p> <p>Not taking 'fair share' of HMA shortfall; should be regional decision.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tamworth Borough Council (Mr Sushil Birdi) [3842]			Q14	The needs arising from the HMA require a co-ordinated and comprehensive approach to ensure that all available options are considered and tested. The full and active involvement of all authorities is essential to arrive at an agreed position that is both valid and justified. The rationale and reasoning for the proposed number of additional dwellings to contribute to the wider HMA shortfall is not provided. It is important to reinforce the approach that sustainable locations, where appropriate infrastructure exists or can be provided, should be prioritised to avoid undue additional pressure being placed on releasing less sustainable sites for development.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q14	<p>SHMA has broadly followed PPG but underestimated headship rates for younger persons and affordability constraints. Therefore OAN should probably be higher.</p> <p>Housing requirement conflates market signals and unmet housing need. Keeping both separate takes total housing requirement to 16,277 dwellings.</p> <p>Using evidenced based metrics on population share, migratory and commuting relationships it is clear that Solihull has the strongest relationship in HMA with Birmingham, with a minimum of 24.7% being a 'fair share' of need accommodated. This equates to 9,361 homes of Birmingham's 37,900 unmet housing need. Even if discount 2,654 this amounts to 6,707 units.</p>
Terra Strategic [3918]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q14	<p>We consider that the Solihull Local Plan Review should seek to accommodate a significantly larger proportion of Birmingham's shortfall than 5% of 37,900.</p> <p>This is due to Solihull's proximity to the city, extensive shared boundary, established travel-to-work patterns and complementary nature of housing and employment provision.</p> <p>Edge of the conurbation offers the most obvious and sustainable option to meet Birmingham's shortfall.</p> <p>Solihull not meeting HMA responsibilities.</p>
Terry Corns [4446]			Q14	The Neighbourhood Forum does not wish to challenge, at this point in time, the stated need for new allocations of land to accommodate the 6150 homes in the borough over the Plan period.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>Unclear if proposed 2,000 additional units (arising mainly from Birmingham's housing needs) will be sufficient to address the wider HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Proposal of 2,000 dwellings to contribute to HMA shortfall has not been agreed; may well be subject to pressure from other local authorities to increase.</p> <p>Contrary to NPPF Para. 47.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>Unclear if the proposed additional 2,000 units will be sufficient to address the HMA shortfall Unclear whether the other local planning authorities, (in particular Birmingham) comprising the HMA will agree to this level of provision having regard to their own capacity to accommodate further housing.</p> <p>Need to provide greater clarity in the event further housing land needs to be allocated for HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Needs more Green Belt release and safeguarded sites.</p>
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q14	<p>Number of concerns about Council's proposed housing requirement figure:</p> <p>SHMA report is not an OAHN for whole HMA. Council acknowledges there is no OAHN for wider HMA, and that the SHNS (2015) is out of date as it relies on 2012 SHNP;</p> <p>Assessment of worsening market signals, affordable housing need, and supporting economic growth have been calculated for Solihull only, not wider HMA;</p> <p>No evidence to justify 2000 dwellings;</p> <p>No justification for discounting the 10% uplift for worsening market signals from this unmet need;</p> <p>Proposed uplift of 10% is overly conservative;</p> <p>No adjustment to support HS2 Hub economic growth.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q14	<p>Contend that 15,029 dwellings is based on under estimation of the OAHN.</p> <p>Known that alternative OAHN calculations range up to 23,700 dwellings for Solihull excluding any unmet needs from elsewhere in the HMA.</p> <p>Council should reconsider its housing requirement based on a full OAHN for the HMA.</p> <p>Housing requirement should be expressed as a minimum.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q14	<p>Unclear if proposed 2,000 additional units (arising mainly from Birmingham's housing needs) will be sufficient to address the wider HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Proposal of 2,000 dwellings to contribute to HMA shortfall has not been agreed; may well be subject to pressure from other local authorities to increase.</p> <p>Contrary to NPPF Para. 47.</p>
Tracey & Spencer Clark [3441]			Q14	<p>Appreciate that adequate Housing is required to meet the needs of our local community and understand why the proposed site 16 would accommodate this need.</p>
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q14	<p>TfWM understands the need to meet the Borough's assessed housing needs and provide more housing, as the population projections state around 22,900 more people will live in Solihull over the next 20 years.</p>
Trustees of the Berkswell Estate [629]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q14	<p>Housing numbers proposed in the Local Plan still falls somewhat short of what should be provided in Solihull to meet OAHN requirement for the Birmingham HMA.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q14	<p>Apparent from Housing Topic Paper that lower range in SHMA has been adopted in DLP, and not been justified.</p> <p>Council has changed position from SLP 2013 when it stated it could not meet its own needs.</p> <p>Lack of MoU between HMA authorities on meeting shortfall.</p> <p>No evidence provided on Solihull's contribution of 2000.</p> <p>Housing land supply should not include SHELAA.</p> <p>No evidence provided on 36dph densities.</p> <p>Any phasing should be flexible as market conditions can change.</p> <p>Council will require more robust evidence on OAN before Examination.</p>
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q14	<p>The Hub Growth and Infrastructure Plan demonstrates a larger capacity for growth than is currently outlined in the Draft Local Plan. This would contribute towards the objectively assessed need of the Borough and the unmet need of the wider HMA.</p> <p>The overall number of dwellings (1000) should be greater and the HGIP sets out a figure of at least 1500 homes over the plan period, rising to 3-4000 beyond 2032.</p>
Wendy Stilgoe [2973]			Q14	<p>Why oh why has it been decided by Solihull Council to build yet more houses than first mooted, indeed, right up to Holly Lane.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q14	<p>SHMA is not an OAHN for Greater Birmingham HMA.</p> <p>GBHMA Stage 3 Report uses 2012 SNHP therefore is not up-to-date.</p> <p>Housing and Employment strategies must be properly aligned - no adjustment to support economic growth generated by HS2 Hub in Solihull.</p> <p>Assessment of worsening market signals, affordable housing need and supporting economic growth should have been calculated for the whole HMA.</p> <p>10% uplift to address affordability is too conservative.</p> <p>No evidence to justify 2,000 dwellings to meet HMA needs; meagre amount.</p> <p>Not yet been a positive outcome to Duty-to-Cooperate engagement.</p> <p>Discount of 10% uplift from HMA shortfall is illogical.</p>
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q14	<p>Housing is needed throughout the borough. However, this needs to be evenly placed and Greenbelt land should be avoided when there is considerable brownfield land throughout the borough. The number of proposed sites on Greenbelt land is outrageous and clearly does not take into account local residents opinions, rural or wildlife issues. I strongly object to the 800 proposed houses on Barrett's Farm and further 350 houses throughout the village. As these will not provide for the local community but for commuters. Nor does the village have the infrastructure or transport links to accommodate such a huge number of houses.</p>
Question 15 – Location of New Homes (General)				
A G Douglas [4827]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirements. No reason to build on Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Aidan Blanco [3056]			Q15	Proposing 1100 homes for Balsall Common (30% increase on the current population) will have a fundamental and irreversible impact on the village and change the way we live. Most of us chose to live in Balsall Common due to it's village status. Adding 1100 homes will not only add unprecedented pressure on an already creaking infrastructure but have a negative impact on the current population of the village. 1100 homes is too much for the village and a short term move by Solihull Council to push the housing shortage issue onto an easy target such as Balsall Common.
Alan Dick [3322]			Q15	not against the need for additional housing in BC
Alan Douglas [4166]			Q15	The national housing scarcity could be solved if town centres used the mostly empty floor space above retail shops for new homes.
Alastair McCulloch [3624]			Q15	Two of the sites in Balsall Common at Frog Lane and Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Rd are not within walking distance of most local facilities and have very limited access to public transport. Sites which can provide better options in this respect should if possible be preferred.
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q15	A piecemeal approach on the edge of existing settlements will add pressure on existing transport links and infrastructure. In Shirley, some of the sites identified make an important contribution to ensuring that, absent all but one small park, there is some easy access to open space.
Andrew Hawtin [3370]			Q15	Balsall Common sites - Response via Oakes Farm survey
Andrew Hodge [3103]			Q15	Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development. There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.
Andrew King [2922]			Q15	Object to proposal to build an unreasonable amount of houses east of Balsall Common, all on green belt land, when there is sufficient brown belt land within the borough. Over 1000 houses is far too much in an already busy village and will bring too much construction, destroying valuable green belt and coinciding with the nearby HS2 line. I understand houses need to be built, but it is the sheer volume which is wrong. Please reconsider the building of so many houses in our village and protect our valuable green belt.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andy & Rachel Bennett [4580]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate number of homes South of Shirley.</p> <p>Should be more smaller sites than fewer large sites as per Government recommendations.</p>
Andy Wilson [3394]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Angela Chandler [3319]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on</p>
Ann Ward [4831]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q15	<p>Housing sites to the south of Balsall Common have low accessibility and will poorly integrate into the existing community. Site 1 is closer to the railway station but this does not meet high frequency criteria.</p> <p>New housing in Balsall Common can only be considered after the construction of HS2 is completed. It will have poor accessibility before then.</p> <p>There is inequity between the level of housing proposed in Balsall Common and Knowle and Dorridge which has the infrastructure and facilities of 2 small towns.</p>
BC BARRAGE (BC Barrage) [3479]			Q15	<p>Makes no sense to build on the south side of Balsall Common. It will exacerbate existing congestion hotspots.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q15	<p>Welcome release of land from Green Belt for housing.</p> <p>Concerned that insufficient land allocated.</p> <p>Object to inclusion of Sites 1, 2 and 3 ahead of SHELAA site 142, land at Grange Farm, Balsall Common.</p> <p>Concerned that scoring of sites is erroneous.</p> <p>Disagree with findings in GBA, Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Character Assessment in relation to SHELAA Site 142.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>There are too many large sites, concentrated in too few areas. This will disproportionately affect existing services and facilities and contradicts the Councils' guiding principle of 'designing and integrating new developments into existing communities'. A mix of different sized sites dispersed more evenly would be more in line with national economic, social and environmental sustainable development objectives.</p> <p>Housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and viability is questionable, particularly for Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Illogical that there are no sites in Dorridge having regard to facilities and transport connections.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q15	<p>Balsall Common is the wrong location for such significant new housing development. The quantum of proposed new housing being directed to the village (19%) is wholly disproportionate, unsuitable and unsustainable. Whilst the village can accommodate some new provision, site allocation 1 makes it too much and it is unacceptable to build on the site for other valid planning reasons, not least the prejudicial effect it would have on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, the adverse effect on the character of the countryside and the rural setting of Balsall Common and other settlements in the area.</p>
Catherine Langton [3384]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Celia Scottow [3148]			Q15	Over 80% of the new homes will be on Green Belt and the proposed plans concentrate 2550 homes into a very small area of countryside around South Shirley while ignoring smaller logical infill sites elsewhere, such as in Dorridge. It appears that locating 600 new homes in Site 13 is a simple option, using green field space without investigating other possible options, and I am very concerned that once again South Shirley will be losing more of its pleasant characteristics for the benefit of other areas of Solihull.
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q15	Any development on Riddings Hill, allocated in the SLP2013 will result in a significant decrease to the already low levels of light available to adjacent north facing properties in Watson Way and would therefore have a detrimental impact on right to light and general well-being.
Chelmsley Wood Town Council (Miss Karen Stevens) [3772]			Q15	Although Town Council supports the local plan, it's concerned about the amount of housing being built in North Solihull as all green spaces are being lost and the existing education infrastructure is being stretched. It is also concerned about the inclusion in the SHELAA Volume B of sites 53 and 221 and strongly opposes any house building on either of these sites. Bluebell recreation ground (53) includes allotments and community garden. The allotment site is held on a long term lease by Chelmsley Wood Town Council as is site 221, the Chelmsley Wood Town Council Offices.
Chiltern Railways (Mr David Heathfield) [2998]			Q15	<p>Support new housing in locations with access to railway stations.</p> <p>In areas where large new housing allocations are provided we support the provision of bus links, cycle paths and pedestrian access from houses to stations.</p> <p>Recommend use of developer funding to improve amenities to Chiltern railway stations. Happy to help with specifications.</p> <p>Where residential development is planned next to the railway, we would caution that there will inevitably be noise and vibration from passing trains. Although Chiltern Railways cease operation during the night, it is likely that freight trains and maintenance vehicles will continue to run. Needs to be mitigated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Brittain [3166]			Q15	<p>Object to the proposed housing expansion within Balsall Common. Balsall Common is a village location and the proposed housing expansion plans are too large for the village to cope with as regards infrastructure, schooling and local services.</p> <p>Windmill Lane and Kenilworth Road and other roads in the village will become gridlocked with cars. There needs to be some consideration for residents that are also facing the prospect of having to deal with the disruption of HS2 which will further burden village residents with more erosion of the little bit of countryside that we currently have left.</p>
Christine Stajka [3707]			Q15	alternative to using green belt to deliver homes is to improve/make better use of town centres/brownfield land in urban areas, including Dorridge.
Christopher Kershaw [4986]			Q15	There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q15	We are fully in agreement with the principles of sustainable urban extensions to address local housing needs and also the provision of community services and facilities.
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15	No.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Insufficient housing land provided, more Green Belt release required, or at least provide safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Too many large sites in too few areas have been proposed, contrary to Government's commitment to delivery across range of site sizes.</p> <p>Will result in disproportionate pressure on services and facilities, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Better to distribute housing across Borough, particularly close to public transport.</p> <p>Many proposed sites will result in displacement of community facilities, e.g. sport pitches. VSC for outdoor sport and recreation in Green Belt would be difficult to prove if alternative GB sites available that do not require loss of such facilities.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Rural Exception Sites:</p> <p>None in the DLP, in spite of a continuing and increasing need for affordable housing.</p> <p>A larger site than currently proposed as a Rural Exception Site has been assessed for open market housing, whilst promoting the site as Rural Exception Site in DLP under the supporting text of Policy P4.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>22% increase in dwellings in Knowle. Overconcentration of growth in rural village.</p> <p>Will have significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure.</p> <p>Difficult to assimilate new and existing communities at that scale.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions in recent years, which undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p> <p>Smaller-scaled development in Knowle/Dorridge could allow improvements at the school via CIL/S106s, and wouldn't require a rebuild.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong location adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Scale of development equals a 39% increase in village population.</p> <p>Development south of settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>Proposed allocations do not accord with sustainable development principles of the NPPF and therefore unsound.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Policy P5: Policy justification should include identified part of SHELAA Site Ref:64 in the summary of allocated sites as a Rural Exception Site and within Appendix C, for housing development in first 5 years of plan period.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Policy P5: Contend that windfall supply will not continue at past rates. Insufficient grounds for continuing with such a high windfall allowance. Furthermore, such sites are unlikely to contribute to affordable housing due to lower site size.</p> <p>Absence of evidence to support record of delivery on Rural Exceptions Sites, therefore more should be allocated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth in south-west of Borough with sites 4, 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>800 more dwellings than Dickens Heath (1,642 units).</p> <p>Land to south of Sites 12 and 13 has no clear defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Significant extension to Shirley area.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence of settlements in Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Majors Green and Whitlocks End.</p> <p>Adverse impact on existing communities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Landscape character in this area sensitive to change (LCA, 2016), cannot accommodate development of this scale.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Limited available land resource in Solihull Town Centre. Brownfield development dependent on masterplanning.</p> <p>Concern the scale of housing will jeopardise the ability of the centre to adapt to changing and expanding needs of new and existing businesses, retail and community facilities.</p> <p>Calls into question the viability, achievability and deliverability</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Many of the proposed Housing Allocations on non-Green Belt sites in the urban area will result in the loss of existing employment, retail and community use land, sports and recreation facilities and open space. The housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and issues of viability remain to be proven.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15	<p>Biggest concern is the use of Green Belt land, particularly the corridor along the southern edge of Shirley and in the gap to Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Unfair that 41% of new dwellings are in this area.</p> <p>Concern about the loss of amenity land generally and sporting facilities. The plan does not discuss the implications of this.</p> <p>Blythe Ward already has significant new development. A better balance should have been provided across the Borough.</p> <p>There are no sites in Dorridge and Hockley Heath Ward.</p>
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q15	<p>Two Balsall Common sites in the south are poorly located for Doctors surgery, railway and local shops. Brownfield sites should be utilised before green fields.</p> <p>local transport is not frequent and not up to the standard of other areas. The local facilities need improvement. the shops and car parking are severely restricted. present parking is dangerous Congestion on the roads is recognised as severe in the Solihull Connected document. The majority of traffic goes north developments in the south of the settlement will aggravates the situation.</p>
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q15	<p>I am concerned as to the accessibility of certain sites that seem favoured. Relaxing the criteria does not make poor accessibility any better.</p>
Councillor K Meeson [2178]			Q15	<p>housing should be built on brownfield land in Birmingham before greenbelt is considered.</p>
Councillor M Allen [2632]			Q15	<p>Concentrated development in Shirley appears unfair. Over 40% of proposed new houses will be around Shirley which already has less green space than any other area. Question whether brownfield sites across the West Midlands Combined Authority Area have been considered.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15	<p>Broadly support the policy of concentrating housing on larger sites such as those proposed in Knowle where this means that this will justify the provision of improved community facilities as part of the development.</p> <p>I have concerns about the large scale development of Balsall Common given its relative isolation and poor public transport links to Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Alternative location - review of NEC car parking land.</p>
Councillor T Hodgson [2532]			Q15	<p>The proposed allocation of sites is disproportionate with over 40% of the allocations being located in the B90 Shirley postcode in the Shirley South and Blythe wards. If this is adopted in the final plan, the impact on infrastructure in this area will be profound. This has not been properly thought through.</p> <p>It is notable that there are no sites put forward in the Dorridge and Hockley Heath ward. Not including sites in the Dorridge and Hockley Heath ward would be a missed opportunity in an established community, and is at odds with what has been proposed for Knowle.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15	<p>The Council is not proposing new housing in the right locations. The policy is to develop a few large housing locations and not to seek small sites. This is the wrong policy for the reasons set out in the 'Main Issues' part of this response, at page 4-6 above, under D:</p> <p>The Plan's preference for a few large greenfield sites for the additional housing proposed, and its failure to examine and propose instead a large number of small sites adjacent to or fitted into the existing urban pattern of development</p>
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q15	Should make further allocations and identify reserve sites in sustainable locations such as Dickens Heath/Tidbury Green.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Daron Gay [4545]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15	<p>Most housing sites are large scale. Consider Council is relying too much on volume housebuilders performing and delivering such sites to meet annual targets.</p> <p>Recent research indicates more small and medium sites should be allocated to deliver housing by smaller building companies.</p> <p>Housing White Paper suggest 10% of allocation are 0.5ha or less.</p> <p>Should be preference for small/medium sized allocations.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of proposed housing in Blythe ward and parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>
David Langton [3382]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Munton [3378]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
David Sunner [3946]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15	<p>There are 2 major faults with the way in which new housing is proposed and located:</p> <p>1) concentration on a small number of large housing sites instead of a range of different sized sites.</p> <p>2) disproportionate amount of additional housing proposed in the Local Plan Review is proposed to be located in Blythe Ward - Parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. 45% of all the proposed additional housing would be sited in these two parishes.</p>
David Acton [3396]			Q15	<p>Objection to site 88 Widney Manor Road being excluded as allocated site. The assessment undertaken related to the wrong site.</p> <p>The site is not part of a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The site is clearly part of the perimeter of Bentley Heath settlement.</p> <p>The site should be included as a housing allocation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Harvey [3379]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
David Miller [3454]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Derek Forsythe [4121]			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do not consider that the level of green belt land being allocated for housing is right. - Consider spreading the development sites more equally around the whole of the Borough rather than concentrate on Shirley and Dickens Heath areas.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Diane Langton [3380]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Diane & Andrew Cunningham [2975]			Q15	<p>Oakes Farm Scheme as an alternative to site 2.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
dominic Chapman [3836]			Q15	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Solihull should not be taking part of Birmingham's housing allocation.</p> <p>Lots of brownfield sites in Birmingham.</p> <p>Better of character that makes Solihull desirable.</p> <p>Disproportionate number of homes South of Shirley.</p> <p>Lack of plans for infrastructure to accommodate new development.</p> <p>Land owners and developers sitting on thousands of planning permissions.</p> <p>Suburban sprawl will waste land and perpetuate.</p> <p>Need proper place-making.</p> <p>Densities proposed too high.</p>
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q15	<p>Balsall Common is already an overcrowded town, experiencing the strain on local resources (schools, traffic and public transport) of its current population. If the intention is to build 1350 more houses this will only increase the difficulties the residents already face. Whilst the borough needs homes, they also need to be located where the jobs are. This will not be in Balsall Common, as there is limited employment opportunities in the town.</p>
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q15	<p>Barratt's farm is prone to flooding; the land owners proposed development plans do not take HS2 into consideration; low cost/high density housing residents will have limited employment opportunities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dominique McGarry [4414]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q15	Vacant office space and shops vacant for over a year in Solihull should be converted into dwellings to enable impacts of housing site 9 to be reduced.
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q15	Knowle village should not be included. 1050 homes is 6.8% of new homes total and 17% of new site allocation. This is wholly inappropriate for a village location. The influx of 2000+ more people into the village centre conservation area with their cars would ruin the village irreversibly. Intrusion into the Green Belt is unacceptable. There are already built on areas in Solihull centre which could have change of use from commercial these should be used first. This is not sympathetic expansion of rural villages as quoted earlier in the document.
Dr & Mrs Robert & Jennifer Leeming [2933]			Q15	Call for sites ref 240 - object to Wootton Green Lane /Kenilworth Road being proposed as an alternative site.
Dr A Jickells [2008]			Q15	Developments should be spread across Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath, not all focussed on Knowle, which does not have services to support this development, and would put at risk its unique character.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
DR David Gentle [4632]			Q15	<p>The DLP is as far away as possible from the views of residents, as reflected in the Neighbourhood Forum survey. Whilst it may have been impossible to accommodate the view about total numbers, there is serious conflict with regard to the size and location of sites, the appropriateness of the housing mix and the need to address the impact on local services and infrastructure. 98% of residents wanted sites on green belt to be less than 500 houses and 96% wanted them to be less than 100 houses.</p>
Dr I G Beasley [4055]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Edward Tan [4658]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate amount of additional housing proposed for Blythe Ward. This is excessive and places an excessive burden on a small area. It is noted that there are no proposals at all in Dorridge and Hockley Heath, despite a number of locations suggested for development in the call for sites exercise.</p> <p>There should be a preference for small/medium sized housing allocations rather than the almost entirely proposed large housing locations dominated by a few main house builders. This would allow development to be absorbed into local communities more easily.</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Elizabeth Sands [4123]			Q15	<p>A number of points made as to why development in the Knowle area is not in keeping with the challenges, vision and strategic objectives as set out in the DLP.</p> <p>Specific points on housing include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals to add on to existing villages and rural sites is taking an inappropriate short term view. - New housing needs primarily to be sited with ready access, preferably by public transport, to areas of high employment proposals
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q15	Object to the use of green belt land for housing, as brownfield sites should be used, more housing provided in units such as flats, which have a greater capacity in a smaller land area rather than in low-height, individual houses, and more housing should be developed in the north of the borough.
Elizabeth Yates [3274]			Q15	Alternative sites - look at the areas east of Shirley, Hampton in Arden, Knowle, Dorridge There is ample land on Widney Manor Road behind Solihull Sixth Form with direct access to Solihull and the M42.
Elta Estates (Helen Lavery) [3169]			Q15	Why are more suitable brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common, and other parts of the Solihull Borough such as Dorridge and areas closer to NEC and Airport not being considered?
Emily Evans [3371]			Q15	alternative site -Oakes Farm

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Eric McClenaghan [4555]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15	<p>Most housing sites are large scale. Consider Council is relying too much on volume housebuilders performing and delivering such sites to meet annual targets.</p> <p>Recent research indicates more small and medium sites should be allocated to deliver housing by smaller building companies.</p> <p>Housing White Paper suggest 10% of allocation are 0.5ha or less.</p> <p>Should be preference for small/medium sized allocations.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of proposed housing in Blythe ward and parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>
Father Peter Thomas [2991]			Q15	<p>Understand the need for new housing and that Balsall Common should take some of these. However, national planning guidelines were being ignored by SMBC that is:- a. the preference to use brownfield sites where possible, b. place new housing close to amenities such as doctors surgeries, shops, frequent public transport. There are brownfield sites closer to the amenities mentioned to the north of Balsall Common that could be used but are not included in the proposals. I therefore find it difficult to justify using greenbelt land in preference to the brownfield sites.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q15	<p>Need to ensure that:</p> <p>Housing sites offered are capable of being delivered within the plan period;</p> <p>A range of sites to meet all sectors of the market, including higher value dwellings is provided for. Important to attract new businesses and an appropriate workforce.</p> <p>Reliance on major urban extensions is treated with caution due to need for extensive infrastructure to bring them forward.</p> <p>Brownfield sites insufficient.</p> <p>Green Belt release is not left until the later periods of the plan. Should be released early on to ensure delivery of sites over whole plan period.</p> <p>Review of Green Belt goes up to 2050.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15	<p>Generally agree with housing supply assumptions.</p> <p>SLP sites should be re-evaluated, as some sites not likely to come forward.</p> <p>Windfall supply is over generous.</p> <p>Land for 20% over OAN should be allocated in line with LPEG recommendations.</p> <p>Considered correct OAN is 20,000-24,000.</p> <p>Should not apply phasing to sites, market is very tight with low vacancy rate.</p> <p>A number of sites are preferable to those chosen for allocation in terms of SHELAA, Green Belt, Sustainability Appraisal and other scores:</p> <p>I.e. SHELAA Sites 195, 196, 197, 199.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Georgina Joyce [4627]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Gilly Dale [2985]			Q15	<p>Several potential sites (some partially brownfield) were identified to the north of Balsall Common which scored more highly than Frog Lane in terms accessibility. Why were they excluded? These need to be considered.</p> <p>I should like to understand the justification for why SMBC is proposing the Frog Lane development, given that it scored below other local sites and other brown field sites in Solihull that are served by much better access and local amenities. Dorridge, for example, scores very highly on accessibility and other assessments and out of 32 potential sites offered had none included in the proposal.</p>
Gina Ready [3393]			Q15	<p>Why concentrate development on South Shirley when there are Green Belt sites around the Dorridge/Knowle and other areas?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q15	<p>Broadly support approach of spreading housing sites and different sizes.</p> <p>Consider further allocations will be required as OAN is underestimated and apportionment of HMA shortfall has not concluded.</p> <p>Unclear how Green Belt sites have been chosen from SHELAA and Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Agree that some windfall may come forward, but amount in DLP is overestimate.</p> <p>Release of large amounts of Green Belt will discourage recycling of brownfield land at previous rates. Not sustainable over 15 years of Plan.</p> <p>Need far greater detail on housing trajectory in next stage of Plan.</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q15	<p>Agree with mix of urban and rural sites, but more should be allocated as housing figures are underestimated.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q15	<p>The plan targets a small number of communities with large numbers of new houses, many driven by the convenience of builders. For example, Knowle has been allocated over 1000 new homes, a 25% increase on the current stock. No community should be required to suffer such an increase and there should be a cap of 10% at most applied to allocations in individual communities.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q15	<p>The criteria used to identify locations for new development need to be toughened up so that easy solution are not prioritised.</p> <p>The housing shortage is going to give developers massive windfall profits and the Council should insist that development priority should be given to more difficult and perhaps more costly brown field sites.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Heart of England School (Mrs Anne Lycett) [3805]		Q15	<p>In relation to Site 2.</p> <p>Case for releasing Holly Lane playing fields for residential development and HoE adopting Balsall Common Primary School's playing fields, if that school relocates:</p> <p>Would join to existing main playing fields of HoE;</p> <p>Holly Lane has no changing facilities;</p> <p>Remove safeguarding issues of travel between sites;</p> <p>Playing fields not fully utilised due to lack of proximity;</p> <p>Cost to school of maintenance and repair at Holly Lane;</p> <p>HoE working closely with Local Sports Association to jointly propose an all-weather pitch for community use;</p> <p>Provide space for Post-16 centre;</p> <p>Opportunity to improve sports facilities and Performing Arts facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Helen Young [3390]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q15	<p>Welcome release of land from Green Belt for housing.</p> <p>Concerned that insufficient land allocated.</p> <p>Object to inclusion of Site 8 and 9 ahead of SHELAA site 104, land at Blue Lake Road, Dorridge.</p> <p>Concerned Site 19 will not deliver sufficient homes.</p> <p>Concerned that scoring of sites is erroneous.</p> <p>Disagree with findings in GBA, Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Character Assessment in relation to SHELAA Site 104.</p>
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q15	<p>We support SMBC's decision, as evidenced in the Topic Papers paragraphs 417-422, that Hockley Heath is not suitable for growth, and would reiterate our intent to review this as part of the broader Neighbourhood Plan development process. Bringing sites back into the LP as a result of the consultation process would be wholly inappropriate, given the evidence and conclusions within the evidence base.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q15	<p>Any indications of development within the greenbelt or rural exception should be included in the proposed final phases of the plan. This would afford them the maximum protection and ensure they were only developed if absolutely necessary, where there is no change in demand and insufficient windfall sites.</p> <p>Support SMBCs decision that Hockley Heath is not suitable for growth. Bringing sites back into the LP as a result of the consultation process would be wholly inappropriate, given the evidence and conclusions within the evidence base.</p>
Hopcraft Ray [4018]			Q15	Unfair allocation on area south of Shirley
I Black [4824]			Q15	There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirements. No reason to build on Green Belt.
Iain Baker [3139]			Q15	South of Shirley - The size and concentration of this proposal is totally in appropriate. Instead of these large development proposals the council would be better off agreeing a larger number of smaller developments spread around the borough to include such areas as Dorridge where there are no new estates proposed.
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q15	<p>As part of aspiration to delivery development tin accessible locations, particular consideration should be given to existing transport hubs, e.g. Earlswood.</p> <p>Settlements that perform well against accessibility criteria should be afforded significant weight when seeking to allocated development.</p>
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q15	Solihull MBC have failed to follow their own Policies in establishing the appropriateness of the chosen sites and yet proposals for a new village on a brown field site development to the north of the region have been ignored.
J & A Creba [4753]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Griggs [4755]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>
James Langton [3383]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Jason Edwards [4655]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jean Fleming [3444]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Jennifer Archer [4016]			Q15	<p>The intensity of development in the Shirley area is too much.</p> <p>All sites around the Borough need to be scaled down to lessen the effect on the local community and the road network. Share developments, rather than concentrate them in one area.</p> <p>A more logical location would be the north of the Borough which needs investment to take advantage of Metro links.</p>
Jo Hayes [3874]			Q15	Create a whole new settlement on a more sustainable site
Jo Hayes [3874]			Q15	Green Belt, Road infrastructure, other infrastructure, school provision, sports clubs and a number of other reasons are all given as reasons support the objection to this site.
John & Jennifer Fearn [4714]			Q15	<p>The concentration of 2000 plus homes in South Shirley/Dickens Heath leaves minimal/no space between the settlements.</p> <p>Free pedestrian access to open space for recreation is essential in built up areas. Substantial investment in infrastructure requires immediate action. Any development must give priority to local families.</p> <p>Carefully planned, linked green open spaces reduces urban sprawl.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John A MacDonald [4723]			Q15	Disproportionate amount of houses in a small area around Shirley, which is also Green Belt.
John Maguire [3543]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q15	it is evident that further land will need to be identified for housing to meet the full need, once fully identified through the Local Plan Review process and joint working, particularly with Birmingham City Council. The site promoted in these representations would assist in meeting the Solihull housing need and also the Government's direction in the White Paper stating that local planning authorities will need to provide 10% of housing targets as smaller size allocations.
John Scottow [3147]			Q15	Over 80% of the new homes will be on Green Belt and the proposed plans concentrate 2550 homes into a very small area of countryside around South Shirley while ignoring smaller logical infill sites elsewhere, such as in Dorridge. It appears that locating 600 new homes in Site 13 is a simple option, using green field space without investigating other possible options, and I am very concerned that once again South Shirley will be losing more of its pleasant characteristics for the benefit of other areas of Solihull.
JT & DA Cleland [4891]			Q15	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q15	The expansion of Balsall Common by 1350 homes (including those already planned) plus windfall is too great without considerable investment in infrastructure, transport, facilities, environment. The impact is disproportionate and locations in other settlements eg Dorridge should be considered. A limit of 25-30% should be applied to this category of settlement, to include any development specified in neighbourhood plans. The impacts of HS2 construction needs to be assessed, managed and planned in conjunction with the housing development proposed.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Karen Munton [3377]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Karen Bell [4586]			Q15	<p>There are other locations within Borough more suited to housing growth than Balsall Common, with some villages where little or no development is planned, whilst Balsall Common has been identified for far more than it can accommodate.</p>
Karen Trueman [4652]			Q15	<p>Object to all sites where this would include the loss of sporting facilities.</p>
Kelly Moseley [3128]			Q15	<p>Received a letter about planning a new housing estate. I do not think that it should be here at all. Already a struggle as it is for shops, schools, doctors and road space. Plus there is hardly any greenery left. Really not happy even about the thought of more houses around here. [site not specified]</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15	<p>Generally agree, although some comments on individual allocations. Agree with SA methodology which explains how the distribution strategy has been formulated. Gravely concerned that the additional provision for the HMA shortfall is only 2000. No acceptable explanation has been offered as to why option C - provision of local need plus 4000 wider HMA option was discounted. Unconvinced that 4000 is high enough to adequately address the high unmet need from the wider HMA.</p> <p>Whilst the methodology for the SA appears to be reasonable, the scoring system is complicated and it is considered that some non-allocated sites score better.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
L J Crumpton [4987]			Q15	There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
landowners land Balsall Common [3754]	Mr Roy Hammond	Howkins & Harrison (Mr Roy Hammond) [3714]	Q15	Q15 - partially disagree - see letter
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	Policy P5: Policy justification should include SHELAA Site Ref:1017 in the summary of allocated sites and within Appendix C, for housing development in first 5 years of plan period.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	Many of the proposed Housing Allocations on non-Green Belt sites in the urban area will result in the loss of existing employment, retail and community use land, sports and recreation facilities and open space. The housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and issues of viability remain to be proven.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Insufficient housing land provided, more Green Belt release required, or at least provide safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Too many large sites in too few areas have been proposed, contrary to Government's commitment to delivery across range of site sizes.</p> <p>Will result in disproportionate pressure on services and facilities, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Better to distribute housing across Borough, particularly close to public transport.</p> <p>Many proposed sites will result in displacement of community facilities, e.g. sport pitches. VSC for outdoor sport and recreation in Green Belt would be difficult to prove if alternative GB sites available that do not require loss of such facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth in south-west of Borough with sites 4, 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>800 more dwellings than Dickens Heath (1,642 units).</p> <p>Land to south of Sites 12 and 13 has no clear defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Significant extension to Shirley area.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence of settlements in Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Majors Green and Whitlocks End.</p> <p>Adverse impact on existing communities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Landscape character in this area sensitive to change (LCA, 2016), cannot accommodate development of this scale.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>22% increase in dwellings in Knowle. Overconcentration of growth in rural village.</p> <p>Will have significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure.</p> <p>Difficult to assimilate new and existing communities at that scale.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions in recent years, which undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p> <p>Smaller-scaled development in Knowle/Dorridge could allow improvements at the school via CIL/S106s, and wouldn't require a rebuild.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong location adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Scale of development equals a 39% increase in village population.</p> <p>Development south of settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>Proposed allocations do not accord with sustainable development principles of the NPPF and therefore unsound.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Limited available land resource in Solihull Town Centre. Brownfield development dependent on masterplanning.</p> <p>Concern the scale of housing will jeopardise the ability of the centre to adapt to changing and expanding needs of new and existing businesses, retail and community facilities.</p> <p>Calls into question the viability, achievability and deliverability.</p>
LAYCA - Lighthall Area Community Centre (John Shaw) [4678]			Q15	<p>Object to the concentration of development around south Shirley. Should consider a wider distribution of new homes.</p>
Leighton Jones [3252]			Q15	<p>The impact on Knowle of the two major developments will be massive. Each of them will lead to gridlock on roads, particularly Knowle High Street which is a Conservation Area and has a narrow twisting road. There are no sensible alternatives for the large proportion of new residents who will need to access Solihull by car.</p>
Lioncourt Strategic Land [3843]	Robert Gardner	GVA (Robert Gardner) [3700]	Q15	<p>Insufficient land allocated. Need to release more Green Belt land.</p> <p>Proposed amendment - Additional Green Belt land should be released. Such land should be located within sustainable locations, including land to the east of Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Land at Tidbury Green Farm should be included in the list of proposal allocations.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lizzie Fenton [4905]			Q15	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
M Black [4823]			Q15	There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirements. No reason to build on Green Belt.
M J Beasley [4051]			Q15	Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria. Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities. Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated. Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.
Margaret Chadderton [4743]			Q15	Unfair that so many houses will be in the Shirley area. Other areas of Solihull should take their fair share.
Mark & Nathalie Fitch [3336]			Q15	Comments on Balsall Common sites and the need to have infrastructure in place prior to development taking place as this would enable the developments to be more acceptable to the local communities.
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15	Consider the Council has overestimated capacity on Sites 4, 5, 9, 11, 18 and 19 resulting in 1,242-1950 shortfall. Winterton Farm could accommodate approx. up to 600 dwellings to meet this shortfall.
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q15	Objection to Sites 2 and 3, Balsall Common.
Mark Thompson [3446]			Q15	The sheer volume of new development around south Shirley is far too high. Therefore we would like to question why other areas seem to have "ring fenced " and be exempt from such a huge volume of development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Martyn Hanson [4718]			Q15	Object to the sheer number of houses proposed around the Shirley area and the increase in traffic that will result. There will also be increases coalescence of settlements in the vicinity.
Matthew Becker [3402]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
McLean Estates Limited (Mr N McLean) [2241]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15	<p>There are 2 major faults with the way in which new housing is proposed and located:</p> <p>1) concentration an a small number of large housing sites instead of a range of different sized sites.</p> <p>2) disproportionate amount of additional housing proposed in the Local Plan Review is proposed to be located in Blythe Ward - Parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. 45% of all the proposed additional housing would be sited in these two parishes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Melanie Hughes [4657]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q15	<p>Residents who attended Parish Council drop in sessions on the local plan seemed happy with the proposals for Meriden. Support for LPR site allocation 10. The site of the former garage on the north side of Birmingham Road, already has planning permission for housing. The adjacent land currently used for caravan parking and part of the adjoining field could form an attractive small housing development near the centre of the village, local shops and transport. Its accessibility and proximity to shops and other facilities would make it an ideal location for more older persons' accommodation in the village.</p>
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q15	<p>As mentioned throughout this response, SMBC have failed to follow their own policies in establishing the appropriateness of the chosen sites. However proposals for a new village on a brown field site development to the north of the region have been ignored, as have potential sites to the south/east of Solihull towards Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes which are closer to the new HS2 interchange.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Doble [3296]			Q15	<p>1050 new homes in Knowle is disproportionate compared to elsewhere in the Borough. It will destroy the village atmosphere and make it little more than part of the Birmingham urban sprawl. Homes should be built to the West in Bentley Heath to relieve pressure on Knowle village, allowing convenient highway connections to Solihull and access to Widney Manor railway station.</p> <p>All possible sites have not been fully considered, including those in Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath. Future planning applications on these sites will be difficult to refuse as they are more suitable, and pressure on local facilities will increase.</p>
Miss Elizabeth Adams [3492]			Q15	<p>The housing proposal for the Shirley area will have huge implications with green spaces, traffic congestion (already a problem in the area) and demand on schooling.</p> <p>There are masses of wildlife in the area and a thorough review needs to be undertaken to ensure endangered species such as great crested newts are not affected.</p>
miss Stephanie Archer [3793]			Q15	<p>Object to level of housing proposed for Shirley especially around Tanworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane and Dickens Heath which fails to consider the long term impacts such as damage to the drainage systems.</p> <p>As an alternative, consider a mixture of development sites scattered around Solihull, still providing the open space for people to use. IE don't build on Allocation 13 but move this site further round to the edge of Woods christmas tree farm where access is directly off a main road further out of Shirley but also closer to the stations.</p>
Mr & Mrs Bird [5004]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.</p>
Mr & Mrs James Murtagh [3164]			Q15	<p>Shirley & Dickens Heath sites objection.</p> <p>The proposed plans for building houses at these locations will create major traffic problems amongst other concerns ie schools, hospitals, local amenities etc. etc.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Philip & Sharon Lapworth [2949]			Q15	It is also noticeable that there is no provision within the plan for development within the confines of Dorridge, which has superior access to shopping facilities, amenities and schools whilst maintaining direct access to London and Birmingham.
Mr & Mrs . Taylor [4990]			Q15	There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Mr & Mrs D & K Tomkins [4757]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>
Mr & Mrs M Mladenovic [4754]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>
Mr & Mrs N & L Treadwell [4764]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs R & B Ethell [4763]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>
Mr & Mrs T & L Baines [4760]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>
Mr . King [4989]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.</p>
Mr Adam Hunter [3332]			Q15	<p>Concern over dickens Heath development allocation 4 from a house bordering development.</p>
Mr Adrian Baker [3433]			Q15	<p>Supports Other Sites</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q15	<p>Proposed locations do not comply with the NPPF, the greenbelt analysis, sustainable locations/transport policies. The greenbelt analysis is flawed, as land to the east of Balsall Common in the narrowest part of the greenbelt has a higher value than other greenbelt. Similarly the land between Dickens Heath and Shirley. Land close to the urban core with all its facilities and a new settlement in north Berkswell are better alternatives, and how can SMBC justify not building in Dorridge with its 3 trains per hour but can in Balsall Common where there is no 30 minute service.</p>
Mr Andrew Dean [3073]			Q15	<p>The proposed site(s) at Wooton Green Lane present a better balance of development across the village.</p> <p>Access to jobs and the railway is better.</p> <p>Impact on through traffic would be reduced.</p> <p>Impact on surrounding existing properties would be less.</p> <p>Sites offer potential for small supporting retail development at the north end of the village around the existing Sainsbury's / George in the Tree developments.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Hardwick [3636]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements needed by the Council.</p> <p>Brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common would be more suited to cope with additional traffic that would be using the A452.</p>
mr barry morby [3839]			Q15	<p>Object to level of growth in Dickens Heath and South Shirley as will take significant area of green belt which should be retained, wildlife will be affected, traffic already a problem around the A34, Tanworth Lane, Bills Lane, all coming from Dickens Heath, football clubs for the youngest will be hit hard, doctors and, schools already under pressure in Shirley and concerned that improvements will not be delivered.</p>
Mr Bob Holtham [3530]			Q15	<p>The need to expand Knowle by 1050 additional homes is not made.</p> <p>It is wrong to allocate 750 of these houses to one site (ref.9) on the principal approach to the village and where the typography of the southern half in particular would mean a landscape of roofs.</p> <p>This allocation is predicated on the supposed need for a land swap to fund the redevelopment of Arden Academy.</p> <p>The Policy should concentrate on allocating a variety of other smaller dispersed sites such as Smiths Lane, Bentley Heath between KDBH and Solihull where travel would have less impact on the Village.</p>
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q15	<p>No, although you have identified a number of suitable sites, a number of equally suitable sites should be added beyond what has been planned. Hockley Heath could easily accommodate more than planned as could Chadwick End and there is no mention of Illshaw Heath which has plenty of room to expand without affecting the surrounding area too drastically. Illshaw Heath has the benefit of being very close to Blythe Valley Business Park, and within walking distance.</p> <p>There seems to be no appreciation of the areas around Earlswood. Earlswood could accommodate limited additional expansion without affecting the nature of the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Cliff Dobson [3740]			Q15	<p>Site 16 is within the Meriden Gap and contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and helping prevent coalescence between settlements. The proposal would result in the permanent loss of this significant green belt site.</p> <p>In addition, the development of housing on the scale proposed will aggravate existing congestion on Hampton Lane, Lugtrout Lane and Damson Parkway, and would create immense pressure at the junction of these roads and Solihull By-pass.</p>
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q15	<p>There are other locations within Borough more suited to housing growth than Balsall Common, with some villages where little or no development is planned, whilst Balsall Common has been identified for far more than it can accommodate.</p>
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q15	<p>Frog Lane site should be removed from the Plan. Grange Farm should be included. Once the bypass is completed, some development along Kenilworth Road to both north and south may be more achievable.</p>
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q15	<p>2 of the choices for Balsall Common do not meet your requirements. One open up a new area for development in future - Frog Lane. secondly, expanding the settlement to the south when sites closer to the centre have been offered make more sense. see longer submission at the end.</p>
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q15	<p>very definitely not in the case of Balsall Common. Frog Lane is a ludicrous choice. it not only does not create a defensible boundary, it opens up one. it is the furthest point of the compass from the centre as well as medical and transport services. it also fails the landscape policies. the logic is highly questionable. Kenilworth road / Windmill lane merely extends the village southwards, when better sites in the centre are available - subject to some negotiation. primary education is critical, the current school is over crowded, one east, one west would be a solution.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Perks [3399]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q15	The design & type of housing could be adjusted to make the number larger!
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q15	I do not agree with the distribution of housing locations. Building 41% of the total number of houses in Shirley South is disproportionate, illogical and irrational. These proposals conflict with and are contrary to the policy statements in the draft plan. The plan is reliant upon growth at JLR, the NEC, the airport expansion and HS2. Building 41% of homes in Shirley South miles away from the employment growth areas is illogical and irrational. Homes should be built where the jobs are being created to minimise travelling, commuting, and the impact on the already overburdened road and transport infrastructure.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q15	The selection process by which the three sites in Balsall Common were selected is based on incorrect data in terms of Green Belt assessment, accessibility, and alternatives considered.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q15	<p>Impact on the village of Balsall Common and Meriden Gap. Scoring methodology of Green Belt assessment is subjective.</p> <p>Alternative sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The site enclosed by Wootton Green Lane and Kenilworth Road. This is largely Brownfield. -Lavender Hall Farm. Largely brownfield, easily accessed and likely to be attractive for affordable housing. -Site enclosed by Windmill Lane and Kenilworth Road which we fear is already lost as Green Belt. -New Mercote Farm. <p>Any shortfall could be shared between that part of the Barretts Lane site which fronts onto Station Road; and that part of the Grange Farm site fronting onto Wootton Green Lane.</p>
Mr Harry Siggs [2970]			Q15	<p>Object to Green Belt development in Balsall Common. No exceptional circumstances to justify development. Brownfield sites in the Borough should be used.</p>
Mr Henning Kleine [3633]			Q15	<p>No proposals for Knowle and Dorridge. The burden of new housing should be evenly distributed within the Borough. The Council is requested to demonstrate that all towns and villages in the Borough are evenly burdened.</p>
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15	<p>The sites proposed for allocations would accord with the development strategy set out. It is shaped by the evidence base and on this basis, generally speaking, the Council is planning to build new homes in the right locations.</p> <p>However, the Council has failed to grasp the opportunity to consider the Green Belt boundaries more comprehensively as part of the plan making process.</p> <p>Even if a site is incapable of performing a strategic housing or employment role it does not mean that it should remain within the Green Belt if it performs poorly against the stated purposes.</p>
Mr J Davies [2104]			Q15	<p>Sites in Catherine De Barnes / Knowle & Dorridge should be considered.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr John Addy [3308]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr John Outhwaite [3785]			Q15	I would much rather see further housing development around the periphery of the town
Mr John Southall [2995]			Q15	In relation to site 18 Sharmans cross road, comments indicate that the pitches are no longer in use. This is due to the lease on the pitches having been acquired by a commercial developer (oakmoor) when the rugby club moved off the site. Since then a number of local teams have approached Oakmoor to bring the pitches back into use and this has been refused. I find this position terrible as is a piece of amenity land that should be brought back into use for the good of community. I feel this should be recognised in the submission.
Mr John Thornhill [3372]			Q15	<p>There should be no building houses on green belt farm land. Where are we going to get our food from during the next war?</p> <p>There is no extra provision for parking in the village centre.</p> <p>How will the roads cope with the increase in pupil numbers at the local schools. Drop off and pick up time is terrible now.</p> <p>Frog Lane development. We keep cattle in a field in the winter in Frog Lane and with all the extra traffic, lights and noise etc. we won't be able to use it. So that will be the end of our business!</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr John Wilson [3890]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q15	<p>There is an inherent danger that large scale development of the kind proposed for Balsall Common and Berkswell in the rural east of the Borough risks making it a less attractive area in which to live, and this must be of major consideration in the Local Plan.</p> <p>It seems that draft plan fails to fully recognise this, but instead simply sees areas of open countryside that it is happy to urbanise without fully considering the consequences.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q15	<p>1215 new houses in Balsall Common (1350 with current permissions) is wholly inappropriate due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use of greenbelt in priority to available PDL sites 2. disproportionate level of build when compared to other borough locations with better transport links 3. combined with HS2 and developments planned for Coventry places unacceptable pressure on existing green belt 4 delivers housing in south east when employment opportunities are in North and West with an absence of reliable sustainable transport options. 5. More housing could be created by Berkswell PC proposals for use of reclaimed land at Cornets End Lane for new settlement.
Mr L Hatfield [4761]			Q15	<p>Concern about scale of development at Barratts Farm and infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Understand that Dorridge/Knowle did not need to designate any development land.</p> <p>Housing should be evenly distributed across the Borough.</p> <p>Brownfield areas should be first choice of development, before green belt is considered.</p> <p>Understand some brownfield areas have been de-selected for unclear reasons.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr M Hatfield [4759]			Q15	<p>Concern about scale of development at Barratts Farm and infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Understand that Dorridge/Knowle did not need to designate any development land.</p> <p>Housing should be evenly distributed across the Borough.</p> <p>Brownfield areas should be first choice of development, before green belt is considered.</p> <p>Understand some brownfield areas have been de-selected for unclear reasons.</p>
Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]			Q15	<p>Object as believe that the building so many properties in such a small area will be devastating to the area and cause more problems than it solves. From my 30 years experience in housing, ASB, crime, will rise and health and wellbeing will plummet. The roads will not cope, regardless of what improvements are made. Businesses will suffer and move out of the area. FORWARD THINKING PLEASE!</p>
Mr Mark Sutton [3007]			Q15	<p>It is difficult to see how placing greater burdens on the local roads and schools in Knowle while also providing spaces for travellers really helps to maintain quality. Also, it is difficult to see how the constant erosion of green-belt land is improving quality.</p>
Mr Marshall Moses [3348]			Q15	<p>Object to the concentration of 2550 homes in such close proximity to the South Shirley area and seek a fairer distribution across the Borough.</p> <p>Development is in the Green Belt</p> <p>There should be retention of a wider Greenbelt between South Shirley and the built area of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Retain and enhance the existing amenity fields and the green corridor to the bridle way, with access to Bills Lane, the canal and the countryside beyond.</p> <p>The environmental impact on wildlife by the removal of such large amounts of Greenbelt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Martin Mynott [3811]			Q15	Disproportionately high concentration of development proposed (sites 4,11, 12, 13) in south Shirley. Existing residential roads (Blackford Road and Tanworth Lane) not suitable for extra traffic - strategic road redesign for whole area and subsequent construction required to divert extra traffic in ADVANCE of any development. Additionally, Blackford Road is already regularly closed due to sewer collapse - the already heavy traffic must be a factor.
Mr Matthew Workman [2947]			Q15	The plan has no consideration for the small villages on the outskirts of Solihull like Dickens Heath, already extended beyond their means and sustainability but still being targeted for more expansion. It's just destruction of fields, woodlands and canal areas for greed, with no thought to the already busy roads that cannot sustain the current infrastructure. If development takes place, there needs to be improvements to all the roads, bypasses for the smaller villages, better train services, more shops and medical services.
Mr Max Archer [3858]			Q15	Object to the intensity of housing in the Shirley area as locating 41% of Solihull's housing allocation in one area is disproportionate, will have a dramatic effect on the area and the area is green belt and should stay that way.
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q15	<p>I do not think that an allocation of approximately 85% to greenfield sites is justified. More effort needs to be made to identify suitable brownfield areas.</p> <p>The allocation of almost 20% of the new build to Balsall Common is a disgrace and does not take into account :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the substantial increase in housing which has already taken place - the impact on an already overstretched infrastructure - proximity of the proposed Barratts Lane development to HS2 - additional incursion into Meriden gap

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q15	<p>The allocation to Balsall Common is totally disproportionate to the size of the village. The village is already overly-developed due to increases in housing and population which have outpaced the level of infrastructure.</p> <p>The centre of the village is small with relatively narrow roadways and becomes hazardous to all users at peak times. There are considerable parking problems.</p> <p>Need to consider more brownfield sites and allocations need to be spread sensible and sensitively. If this does not generate the capacity required suggest a new town/village.</p> <p>Suggest a cap on any allocation based on population to ensure fairness and sustainable integration.</p>
Mr Michael Scott [3291]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate amount of development proposed for Balsall Common</p> <p>The ratio of greenbelt to non-greenbelt development is unacceptable. The greenbelt is what makes Solihull such a nice place to live and your proposals threaten to simply make some of the commuter villages merely an extended sprawl of Birmingham. Investment, people and desirability will be impacted in the long run.</p> <p>In addition, affordable homes appears to be the priority. It therefore can't be justified to build so many homes in areas like Balsall Common / Knowle, which have a notoriously higher than average housing market price. This will not solve your objective.</p>
Mr Mike Ross [2971]			Q15	<p>I have information on the points allocated to each individual site and Frog Lane is very low compared with other sites. Why have these sites not been included, ie Grange Farm, 3 sites in Wootton Green Lane and over 100 sites across the borough which have not been included for development ?</p>
Mr Morris Arnold [3722]			Q15	<p>Solihull must not become a Birmingham overspill area.</p>
Mr N Walters [2802]			Q15	<p>The Plan should be revised to reduce the number and scale of large allocations, and to replace some of these with a wider range of small/medium housing sites which would be delivered faster and can be absorbed more easily into their communities</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q15	it is evident that further land will need to be identified for housing to meet the full need, once fully identified through the Local Plan Review process and joint working, particularly with Birmingham City Council. The site promoted in these representations would assist in meeting the Solihull housing need and also the Government's direction in the White Paper stating that local planning authorities will need to provide 10% of housing targets as smaller size allocations.
Mr Nick Houghton [3528]			Q15	The amount of housing in Knowle does not seem to fit with the areas where new economic activity is planned (which are in the A34 corridor, the A45 corridor and around Solihull town centre.
Mr Oliver Jacobs [3029]			Q15	objection to SLP allocated site 19 Riddings Hill Balsall Common
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q15	Land at the rear of 114 - 118 Widney Manor Road should be allocated for housing. There is no evidence to indicate that this site (no. 134) has been properly considered in an analysis of SHELAA sites. There is no systematic analysis of all potential sites in the Sustainability Appraisal, indicating that a re-run is necessary to meet legal requirements. The Green Belt analysis tabled as evidence is too coarse in this location to be considered a reasonable basis for plan making, and in this context it is considered the process fails to meet statutory and policy requirements.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q15	There is under representation of development in other areas of the borough, most notable towns like Dorridge, and the lack of consideration for new settlements
Mr Paul Law [3008]			Q15	Why are all of your proposed sites within the green belt? Surely there are brownfield sites within the Borough. It is bad enough that Solihull is even considering expanding Balsall Common to such a degree (more than 25% of the proposed new houses for Solihull), without ruining the remaining facilities. Have we not had enough expansion over the past 20 years?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Paul Southall [3776]			Q15	Object to excessive level of 2000 new homes planned for Dickens Heath, which already has an excessive number of houses for the road accesses, width of roads, shopping area and general infrastructure, Dog Kennel Lane and Village Green areas which, on top of development already permitted in Tidbury Green, Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley Park, will no longer fulfil the description as a 'rural area', result in loss of green belt, too little consideration of the possibilities of flooding, biodiversity not considered sufficiently, accessibility will be very poor, air quality and levels of pollution will be high.
Mr Peter Derrington [3126]			Q15	<p>At the recent Council exhibition, there was no indication/information at all about infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council also admitted that they had NOT identified any brown field sites in Balsall Common despite it being on top of its list of objectives, before slapping red diagonal lines on greenfield sites.</p> <p>IF building on Barretts Farm then there must be a field break before the houses in Meeting House Lane.</p> <p>Government policy supports the creation of new villages so put all these houses on the disused gravel pits in Cornets End Lane</p>
Mr Peter Seddon [2409]			Q15	The Local Plan Review should seek other ways to meet its housing needs other than extending urban areas by pushing their boundaries into the green belt, and should not build on existing sports and leisure facilities that are close to urban areas unless there is a clear replacement and extension plan.
Mr R Hatfield [4758]			Q15	<p>Concern about scale of development at Barratts Farm and infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Understand that Dorridge/Knowle did not need to designate any development land.</p> <p>Housing should be evenly distributed across the Borough.</p> <p>Brownfield areas should be first choice of development, before green belt is considered.</p> <p>Understand some brownfield areas have been de-selected for unclear reasons.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q15	All sites for Balsall Common our on Greenbelt land including in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap. PDL sites and the proposal for a new village north of Balsall Common have been ignored
mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q15	Object to housing growth in Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath, as already at traffic gridlock at certain times of the day, and a major increase of up to 2000 vehicles, converging on to Hampton Road, Warwick Road, and Station Road will require multiple sets of traffic lights, and the demolition of one side of the High Street though Knowle.
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q15	Not agreed. Alternatives available along M42 corridor and Catherine de Barnes
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q15	Too many of the planned developments for Balsall Common are specifically aimed at Green Belt land and little or no thought has gone into brown field sites. The attitude seems to be one of taking over the Green Belt.
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	There are too many large sites, concentrated in too few areas. This will disproportionately affect existing services and facilities and contradicts the Councils' guiding principle of 'designing and integrating new developments into existing communities'. A mix of different sized sites dispersed more evenly would be more in line with national economic, social and environmental sustainable development objectives. Proposed allocations in the urban area will lead to loss of employment, retail, community and sports uses. Housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and viability is questionable, particularly for Solihull Town Centre. Notable that there are no sites in Dorridge.
Mr Stanley Silverman [3021]			Q15	i am all in favour of the need to build new homes and understand that there will be a need to build in the green belt but it is essential that all potential for building on brownfield sites is exhausted first.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Stephen Carter [2941]			Q15	I object to the large swathe of South Shirley that is being looked at. It is being overly targeted for development. Any resident of Blackford Rd, Tamworth Lane or Dog Kennel Lane will find their lives dramatically and negatively affected by the increase in traffic, noise, loss of rural feel and loss of value of current property prices. A development only of the TRW site would be the best possible outcome with regards to affect on the current residents lives
Mr Stephen Hill [3208]			Q15	No, the locations for Allocated Housing Sites identify the loss of too many existing Football Clubs/Pitches, contrary to Policy P18/P20, without identifying any compensatory arrangements for their replacement (i.e. Sites 4, 8, 13, 16, 20). In Appendix C Schedule of Allocated Housing Sites Site Constraints, there is a an inconsistency in terms of the text for existing Football Clubs/Pitches, whilst some are not even referenced. Where the allocation of Housing Sites is identified, a clearer statement is required on how existing Football Clubs/Pitches will be protected/any loss compensated.
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q15	We should not be using green belt. We should not be planning where an increase in traffic will cause current homeowners issues. The plan to use land between Lugtrout Lane, Parkway, Field Lane should be resisted at all costs. This is green belt, the road network at that location is already stretched. JLR are being granted green belt down the road and factory already cause traffic problems when workers commute. On top of this the extended runway causes a lot of noise to existing homes. Also homes built here will be in full view of existing homes.
Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]			Q15	The council should be thinking about innovative ways to look at finding space, such as multi storey car parks at the NEC and using the saved space for housing.
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q15	The plan to take only 39ha of non-green belt and 299ha of green belt shows a total disregard for the value that green belt land is held in by the community nor the strategic benefit of the Meriden Gap to restrict urban sprawl between Coventry and Birmingham/Solihull. It was recently stated by a government minister that green belt should only be taken in extreme circumstances when no other options are available.SMBC should be limiting the take of green belt whereas it seems to be actively promoting its destruction instead of using brownfield and PDL sites borough wide first.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr. ronald handfield [3028]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Policy P5: Contend that windfall supply will not continue at past rates. Insufficient grounds for continuing with such a high windfall allowance. Furthermore, such sites are unlikely to contribute to affordable housing due to lower site size.</p> <p>Absence of evidence to support record of delivery on Rural Exceptions Sites, therefore more should be allocated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth in south-west of Borough with sites 4, 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>800 more dwellings than Dickens Heath (1,642 units).</p> <p>Land to south of Sites 12 and 13 has no clear defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Significant extension to Shirley area.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence of settlements in Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Majors Green and Whitlocks End.</p> <p>Adverse impact on existing communities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Landscape character in this area sensitive to change (LCA, 2016), cannot accommodate development of this scale.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>22% increase in dwellings in Knowle. Overconcentration of growth in rural village.</p> <p>Will have significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure.</p> <p>Difficult to assimilate new and existing communities at that scale.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions in recent years, which undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p> <p>Smaller-scaled development in Knowle/Dorridge could allow improvements at the school via CIL/S106s, and wouldn't require a rebuild.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Illogical and unsound that no suitable land has been proposed for housing in Dorridge:</p> <p>Excellent transport links (bus and rail),</p> <p>New shopping centre,</p> <p>Excellent community facilities (park, wildlife areas, cricket club).</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong location adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Scale of development equals a 39% increase in village population.</p> <p>Development south of settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>Proposed allocations do not accord with sustainable development principles of the NPPF and therefore unsound.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Policy P5: Policy justification should include SHELAA Site Ref: 19 in the summary of allocated sites and within Appendix C, for Rural Exception Site housing development in first 5 years of plan period.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Insufficient housing land provided, more Green Belt release required, or at least provide safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Too many large sites in too few areas have been proposed, contrary to Government's commitment to delivery across range of site sizes.</p> <p>Will result in disproportionate pressure on services and facilities, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Better to distribute housing across Borough, particularly close to public transport.</p> <p>Many proposed sites will result in displacement of community facilities, e.g. sport pitches. VSC for outdoor sport and recreation in Green Belt would be difficult to prove if alternative GB sites available that do not require loss of such facilities.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Rural Exception Sites:</p> <p>None in the DLP, in spite of a continuing and increasing need for affordable housing.</p> <p>A larger site than currently proposed as a Rural Exception Site has been assessed for open market housing, whilst promoting the site as Rural Exception Site in DLP under the supporting text of Policy P4.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Limited available land resource in Solihull Town Centre. Brownfield development dependent on masterplanning.</p> <p>Concern the scale of housing will jeopardise the ability of the centre to adapt to changing and expanding needs of new and existing businesses, retail and community facilities.</p> <p>Calls into question the viability, achievability and deliverability.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Many of the proposed Housing Allocations on non-Green Belt sites in the urban area will result in the loss of existing employment, retail and community use land, sports and recreation facilities and open space. The housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and issues of viability remain to be proven.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q15	<p>Add Dunstan Farm to Allocated Sites in Table at Para. 230.</p> <p>Amend Item 8 on Table at Para. 217 to read 6,300 or 6,850 depending on size of allocation. Amend 'Total Estimated Capacity' to read 15,684 or 16,234 depending on size of allocation.</p> <p>JLR will provide 2,500 new jobs. Location is ideal to provide new homes for new employees.</p> <p>Allocation would accord with proposed policies and spatial strategy in Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Still sufficient land remaining in Site 20 for JLR's needs.</p>
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q15	The proposed house building in Knowle is too high as the schooling and infrastructure i.e. parking, road congestion, medical centres and primary schooling, transport, cycling paths all need improving first
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q15	More houses should be sited near the JLR and HS2 site
Mrs Alison McWilliam [3726]			Q15	supports KDBH forum response and does not think that release of green belt land for housing or any other development is appropriate for the borough and its image.
Mrs Alison Osborne [3265]			Q15	Site not specified - but references to more housing in Shirley and the impact that this will have on infrastructure and the loss of green space.
Mrs Angela Stuart-Smith [3749]			Q15	Small numbers of housing developments in rural villages would revitalise them and prevent grid lock on over used roads.
Mrs Angela Stuart-Smith [3749]			Q15	Other brownfield sites in village ignored, Wootton Green Lane etc. Traffic kept out of centre of village and numbers sustainable plus easy access to A45. Already sustained 2 large housing sites plus some presently being built. 1300 houses proposed would increase village by a quarter ! Ludicrous.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Beverley Willacy [4442]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q15	<p>More needs to be done to identify appropriate sites for housing. The council should look at building on brown field sites - not green field.</p>
Mrs C A Preece [4744]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate number of new homes in Shirley.</p>
Mrs C M Arnold [4820]			Q15	<p>Disregard for Government's stated intention that brownfield sites should be developed first.</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q15	<p>Building in Balsall Common will increase road traffic. The existing public transport is inadequate for working other than at the Airport or Birmingham and Coventry City Centres. The trains are only 2 an hour and overcrowded already at peak times</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q15	<p>Greenfield sites almost exclusively selected while many PDL sites ignored. No mention of suggested new settlement to north of Balsall Common.</p> <p>Balsall Common sites will put large traffic increases on to local roads</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Denise Delahunty [3156]			Q15	Shirley has already took the brunt of increase in traffic since the development & further expansion of Dickens Heath. The Badgers estate is very difficult to exit every morning on Tanworth Lane due to Dickens Heath traffic. I have complained to the council & asked for traffic layout changes. Any further development should ensure traffic is taken directly to the A34 near to the M42 junction. Sol Councillors have been quoted as stating they wish a "separation" of Solihull and Knowle. Please sure other suburbs of Solihull are similarly considered
Mrs Denise Horton [3158]			Q15	Whilst I appreciate that there is a need to provide more housing across the country, I object to the number that are proposed within the Solihull area. My main objections are based on concerns for the infrastructure to support this amount of development: the roads around the area are currently at saturation point, along with school, hospital and health facilities. This development would also be destroying significant pockets of green belt which support varied wildlife and provide green spaces for the current residents. More traffic fumes will also have a negative impact on the health of current residents.
Mrs Eleanor Lee [3369]			Q15	alternative site - Oakes farm
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q15	concerned that homes are being built in a small number of large sites in Balsall Common, would rather that these are built in more smaller sites. would allow the town to expand in a managed way.
Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [3326]			Q15	Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria. Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities. Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated. Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q15	As long as sufficient numbers can be built.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q15	<p>The number of houses allocated to Balsall Common is too large. They are all in Green Belt in the Meriden Gap at its narrowest. If houses are to be built in this area they should be to the north or north west of the village.</p> <p>Errors have been made in identifying sites - others are available that would not have such a detrimental impact. Major infrastructure will be required to accommodate any increase in population. There are other more suitable areas in Dorridge and Barston</p>
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q15	Object to the locations of the new housing in South Shirley, in particular site 13 (behind Langcomb Road and the Baxters Estate) and site 4 (Tithe Barn Lane, Dickens Heath).
Mrs Helen Dean [2920]			Q15	The site proposed for development is greenfield. There are several brownfield sites within the village which have not been chosen for development. There are other sites which score more highly within Solihull e.g. Dorridge which are not subject to any proposed sites.
Mrs J Litchfield [4762]			Q15	<p>Concern about scale of development at Barratts Farm and infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Understand that Dorridge/Knowle did not need to designate any development land.</p> <p>Housing should be evenly distributed across the Borough.</p> <p>Brownfield areas should be first choice of development, before green belt is considered.</p> <p>Understand some brownfield areas have been de-selected for unclear reasons.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Watson [4765]			Q15	<p>Concern about scale of development at Barratts Farm and infrastructure implications.</p> <p>Understand that Dorridge/Knowle did not need to designate any development land.</p> <p>Housing should be evenly distributed across the Borough.</p> <p>Brownfield areas should be first choice of development, before green belt is considered.</p> <p>Understand some brownfield areas have been de-selected for unclear reasons.</p>
Mrs Jane Starling [3207]			Q15	<p>- object to the proposal in the Solihull Local Plan to build 1000 + houses on two sites in Knowle - site number 8 Hampton Road and 9 land to the South of Knowle known as the Arden Triangle</p> <p>- Do we really want to entrust new green belt to a club which app</p>
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q15	<p>Support approach that Hockey Heath not suitable for growth, which will be reviewed through neighbourhood plan process. Parish Council is seeking to identify appropriate development opportunities however as the village currently stands the facilities do not support growth as stated in the topic papers 417-422.</p>
Mrs Jennifer Whitehill [3850]			Q15	<p>Agree with KDBH Forum views and oppose proposals for 1150 new homes in Knowle as disproportionate, other locations have not received equal attention and should be revisited. The issue of rebuilding Arden is complex - I support this in principle (great legacy) but it appears the cost of such is 750 homes, all or nothing, and the loss of much of the MIND land. The village cannot sustain this on top of recent/current build. Some build is appropriate and I urge consideration of more modest levels that residents feel more appropriate and consistent with proposed build profile across Solihull.</p>
Mrs Joanne Phillips [3464]			Q15	<p>trees fields birds fresh air healthy living family walks what housing estate would give us this benefit apart from extra pollution damage to the ecological balance of the environment.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q15	1215 new houses in Balsall Common (1350 with current permissions) is wholly inappropriate due to use of greenbelt rather than available PDL sites, disproportionate level of build when compared to other borough locations with better transport links, combined with HS2 and developments planned for Coventry places unacceptable pressure on existing green belt, delivers housing in south east when employment opportunities are in North and West with an absence of reliable sustainable transport options. Smaller scale developments would blend into existing communities unlike large estates which tend to dominate or become isolated from existing provision.
Mrs Julie Cooper [3800]			Q15	The majority of the housing sites are proposed in the green belt, contrary to recent government announcements that green belt should only be used in exceptional circumstances. Housing growth in certain areas of Borough, such as Balsall Common, will exacerbate disruption from the delivery of HS2 and related UKC developments and is going to impact on residents quality of life over the coming 5 to 15 years.
mrs julie white [3844]			Q15	The Plan should be revised to reduce the number and scale of large allocations, and to replace some of these with a wider range of small/medium housing sites which would be delivered faster and can be absorbed more easily into their communities
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q15	Far too many to be built on the green belt in the Shirley and Dickens Heath area. Also taking into account Blythe Valley and the houses already being built in Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green, the house numbers account for at least half are those to be built in Solihull.They should be spread out across the borough.
Mrs Kirsty King [3592]			Q15	Object to proposals for over 1000 homes to be built on green belt land in Balsall Common, as more than 15% per cent of total is unfair and unjust, in comparison to other areas of the borough.
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q15	Object to distribution of housing locations as building 41% of the total number of houses in Shirley South is disproportionate, illogical and irrational, proposals conflict with and are contrary to the policy statements in the draft plan, plan is reliant upon growth at JLR, the NEC, the airport expansion and HS2 so building 41% of homes in Shirley South miles away from the employment growth areas is illogical and irrational. Homes should be built where the jobs are being created to minimise travelling, commuting, and the impact on the already overburdened road and transport infrastructure.
Mrs M A Highfield [3162]			Q15	Proportion allocated to Shirley sites too high. Suggest moving higher allocations to North Solihull, Catherine de Barnes, Dorridge, Hockley Heath.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Mary Hitchcock [4671]			Q15	<p>No. Alternatives:</p> <p>Cornets End - Former gravel pits</p> <p>Dorridge - Grove Road area</p> <p>Castle Bromwich Hall Gardens and surrounding area</p> <p>East of the NEC between M42 and Chester Road</p>
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q15	<p>Concerned about expansion of Balsall Common village into a town. Infrastructure would not cope with the number of planned houses, with additional construction traffic on top of HS2 construction.</p> <p>Riddings Hill not suitable for additional housing. The area is already affected by excess parking from the railway station, additional houses would mean more commuters on trains leaving cars at station that cannot cope. Worst a possible bypass on top of HS2, with more green belt lost.</p> <p>More housing should be built around the Chelmsley Wood area with better shopping facilities, school and commuting network, and on brownfield land.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]		Q15	<p>Disproportionate number of homes in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Detrimental impact on size, shape, character and environment of Balsall Common as a rural village.</p> <p>Green Belt more sensitive here than in Dorridge, Knowle, Chadwick End, Fen End etc.</p> <p>Demolition of Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Ill-planned village centre.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Noise from HS2.</p> <p>Erosion of Green Belt from HS2.</p> <p>Balsall Common is already a congested community with poor infrastructure and very poor public sector connectivity with the local economic centres which are primarily to the East and South i.e. NOT Solihull and this is the way traffic flows at peak times.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]			Q15	<p>In relation to new housing in the Shirley area:</p> <p>Increased housing would not sustain the attractiveness of the area or existing properties;</p> <p>Increased traffic would not assist tackling climate change;</p> <p>Increased traffic would reduce accessibility;</p> <p>Increased population would add pressure on local services;</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt;</p> <p>Increased flooding;</p> <p>New housing in Shirley area will not benefit HS2;</p>
Mrs Ruth Knowles [3413]			Q15	Disproportionate building in Knowle village. It would increase traffic, pollution, increase demand on GP surgeries, schools etc.
Mrs Sarah Houghton [3424]			Q15	There are plenty of other areas with Greenland, why keep building in shirley. Traffic is bad enough. What about the wildlife?
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q15	Densities proposed for housing sites 12 and 13 very low at around 20dph, so should build higher density developments in line with Government advice in fewer areas focussing on needs of single person households to accord with policy of 36dph. Consider parking under houses, terraced developments or low rise flats, environmentally efficient developments and greater provision of green belt/green space.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Victoria Moses [3121]			Q15	<p>Object to the concentration of 2550 homes in such close proximity to the South Shirley area and seek a fairer distribution across the Borough.</p> <p>Development is in the Green Belt</p> <p>There should be retention of a wider Greenbelt between South Shirley and the built area of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Retain and enhance the existing amenity fields and the green corridor to the bridle way, with access to Bills Lane, the canal and the countryside beyond.</p> <p>The environmental impact on wildlife by the removal of such large amounts of Greenbelt.</p>
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q15	<p>Balsall Common is not an accessible location. It has limited employment opportunities. Justification for significantly expanding Balsall Common is fundamentally flawed. Development of Balsall Common sites will occur at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill, putting additional strain and disruption on the settlement.</p>
Ms Ellen Darlison [3307]			Q15	<p>Largely think the plan is good, but Council has not followed its own principles in allocating land in south-west Balsall Common.</p>
Ms K Standley [1724]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Ms Lisa Inkpen [3557]			Q15	<p>The developments in Balsall Common will all lead to a flow of traffic towards the Kenilworth Road and then northwards through the village. The Kenilworth road is already very congested. Kelsey Lane is getting via busy and the speed of the traffic is very worrying. I am also concerned about the building on greenbelt when alternative brow fields sites have been considered.</p>
Ms Mary Gilligan [3547]			Q15	<p>I realise we will have to have some new builds in the area but why can't we have these spread more evenly across the whole borough? Eg. rural areas nearer to HS2?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Susan Agnama [3078]			Q15	<p>with increase housing, there is likely to be an influx of new families with teenagers etc. In my experience many teenagers enjoy socialising and meeting up in shopping malls. How will the Council cater for the needs of increased teenagers in Balsall Common?</p> <p>How will the Council provide sufficient school places and after school activity for young people in Balsall Common?</p> <p>How will the Council control traffic - i.e. parents dropping off and picking up children from school?</p>
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q15	<p>The plan allocations should set out criteria for selecting sites with the least environmental value e.g. avoid designated sites/landscapes, BMV land, areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>The policy does not identify land where development would be inappropriate, this should be addressed and clear criteria should be set out for development allocations.</p> <p>Your authority should utilise the SSSI Impact Risk Zones which has been designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the data.gov.uk website</p>
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q15	<p>Not made a detailed examination of all the site allocations.</p> <p>However, sites should not be allocated for residential development if they are found to be in near proximity to an existing livestock unit.</p> <p>Farms can be sources of noise and odour and therefore neighbouring land could be unsuited to residential development. We are keen to ensure that development in the countryside does not result in conflict between new residents and existing farm businesses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nigel Barney [4583]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will change character of area.</p> <p>Alternative sites not been explored before release of Green Belt.</p> <p>Solihull should not accommodate 2000 homes from Birmingham.</p> <p>Sites 11, 12 and 13 in tight area will be disastrous.</p>
Norman Hodgetts [4711]			Q15	<p>Why not give Knowle and Dorridge a share of the development instead of concentrating on the area south of Shirley.</p>
Norman McKeown [4113]			Q15	<p>Number of reasons given in objecting to Site 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities. - Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated. - Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on
Nurton Developments [390]	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Q15	<p>The Draft Local Plan is unjustified in concluding that Hockley Heath is not suitable for growth. Land south of School Lane at Hockley Heath should be included as a location for housing growth in order to maintain the vitality of the settlement and provide for local housing needs.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P & C Benniman [4751]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth in south-west of Borough with sites 4, 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>800 more dwellings than Dickens Heath (1,642 units).</p> <p>Land to south of Sites 12 and 13 has no clear defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Significant extension to Shirley area.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence of settlements in Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Majors Green and Whitlocks End.</p> <p>Adverse impact on existing communities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Landscape character in this area sensitive to change (LCA, 2016), cannot accommodate development of this scale.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Policy P5: Policy justification should include SHELAA Site Ref: 1013 in the summary of allocated sites and within Appendix C, for housing development in first 5 years of plan period.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Insufficient housing land provided, more Green Belt release required, or at least provide safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Too many large sites in too few areas have been proposed, contrary to Government's commitment to delivery across range of site sizes.</p> <p>Will result in disproportionate pressure on services and facilities, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Better to distribute housing across Borough, particularly close to public transport.</p> <p>Many proposed sites will result in displacement of community facilities, e.g sport pitches. VSC for outdoor sport and recreation in Green Belt would be difficult to prove if alternative GB sites available that do not require loss of such facilities.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Many of the proposed Housing Allocations on non-Green Belt sites in the urban area will result in the loss of existing employment, retail and community use land, sports and recreation facilities and open space. The housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and issues of viability remain to be proven.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>22% increase in dwellings in Knowle. Overconcentration of growth in rural village.</p> <p>Will have significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure.</p> <p>Difficult to assimilate new and existing communities at that scale.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions in recent years, which undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p> <p>Smaller-scaled development in Knowle/Dorridge could allow improvements at the school via CIL/S106s, and wouldn't require a rebuild.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong location adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Scale of development equals a 39% increase in village population.</p> <p>Development south of settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>Proposed allocations do not accord with sustainable development principles of the NPPF and therefore unsound.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Limited available land resource in Solihull Town Centre. Brownfield development dependent on masterplanning.</p> <p>Concern the scale of housing will jeopardise the ability of the centre to adapt to changing and expanding needs of new and existing businesses, retail and community facilities.</p> <p>Calls into question the viability, achievability and deliverability.</p>
P May [4988]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.</p>
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q15	<p>Largely support Council's approach to identifying land for the provision for housing.</p> <p>Separate representation made in respect to SHELAA Site 128.</p>
Pat Milnes [3430]			Q15	<p>In support of Oakes Farm alternative proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsey [4654]			Q15	<p>Object to the disproportionate amount of houses proposed for Knowle. It is inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy. The scale of development proposed for Knowle is not justified by the Council's methodology and study findings.</p> <p>The site selection methodology is unclear and its application seriously flawed.</p> <p>There has been inadequate consideration of reasonable alternative patterns of distribution either Borough wide or at the local level.</p>
Paul Haver [3395]			Q15	<p>The proposal to build over 2500 houses on sites in the Shirley area will place unprecedented pressure on the already congested roads.</p> <p>Other local services, schools, doctors, hospitals etc will be unable to cope with such a large increase in population.</p>
Paul Moore [3990]			Q15	<p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities. Serious consideration should be given to other PDL sites existing within Balsall Common and other areas in the borough, such as Dorridge.</p> <p>It is noticeable that Dorridge, which has a far superior railway station facility along with a more "open plan and spacious shopping centre, with plentiful car parking", appears to have no planned housing development in SMBC's proposed local plan.</p>
Paul Morgan [3053]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 2 - Frog Lane. Surely there are alternative sites available with less impact on the surrounding countryside - Dengate Drive appears to have been overlooked, for example.</p>
Paul Rylah [4994]			Q15	<p>If housing development is to come to Knowle it should be spread out - site of the Knowle Football Club plus north of Dorridge near J4 of the M42.</p> <p>We must spread the burden of housing across the area with significant development north of the Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath area (gap between Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath and Solihull). Most traffic will be heading to the motorway.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Paula Pountney [4579]		Q15	<p>Agree with case for meeting a proportion of housing needs across the Borough.</p> <p>Not right for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Development in Green Belt is contrary to Policy P17.</p> <p>SoS for DCLG has said that Green Belt is absolutely sacrosanct.</p> <p>Housing and Planning Minister has said most development in the Green Belt is inappropriate.</p> <p>Large swathes of Green Belt land lost in past 6 years.</p> <p>Disagree with Professor Cheshire at LSE that vast areas of Green Belt have no environment value, no amenity value and good transport links.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q15	<p>Unsuitability of Sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 in respect of Challenges:</p> <p>B - Solihull should not have to accommodate Birmingham shortfall. Development should be fairly distributed around Borough.</p> <p>C - attractiveness of Borough will not be sustained by building on Green Belt</p> <p>E - will erode gaps between settlements</p> <p>H - will increase existing congestion</p> <p>J - will be detrimental to health and wellbeing as loss of open space and countryside</p> <p>K - will result in loss of wildlife</p> <p>L - will add to flood risk</p> <p>M & N - better to build near UK Central</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q15	<p>Persimmon Homes Central agrees that the land identified so far is in the right locations.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15	<p>Generally agree, although some comments on individual allocations. Agree with SA methodology which explains how the distribution strategy has been formulated. Gravely concerned that the additional provision for the HMA shortfall is only 2000. No acceptable explanation has been offered as to why option C - provision of local need plus 4000 wider HMA option was discounted. Unconvinced that 4000 is high enough to adequately address the high unmet need from the wider HMA.</p> <p>Whilst the methodology for the SA appears to be reasonable, the scoring system is complicated and it is considered that some non-allocated sites score better.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter & Mary Higgins [4105]			Q15	objection to building on green belt land
Peter Renwick [3507]			Q15	<p>I am particularly concerned with the proposed overuse of green belt land, development in areas where it will not be adequately served by local infrastructure, and where it will engender yet more reliance on car transportation instead of public transport.</p> <p>As a Dorridge resident, I am specifically in support of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum's response.</p> <p>When we applied to Solihull 15 years ago for a 1 metre extension to the rear of our property, it was refused on the basis that 'it is the space between the houses which gives Knowle and Dorridge its character'. Has that planning tenet been abandoned?</p>
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q15	<p>Barretts Farm - in Favour - major opportunity to develop recreational infrastructure (All Weather Pitches / Pool) with existing Lant Community at Sports Centre</p> <p>Frog Lane BC- OBJECT - too small a site, too far from amenities, close to school but the school is full, so shouldnt count for anything! Long way from proposed bypass line, so lots of intra-village traffic created</p> <p>Kenilworth Road - OBJECT - access puts more traffic on A452, if approved needs access direct to bypass.</p> <p>Prefer to look at Grange Farm and NW of village - Northern bypass link provides natural boundary to a much larger BC.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Philip Colclough [3572]			Q15	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p>
phillippa holroyd [3193]			Q15	<p>too much green belt being used particularly around the m42/airport/nec where so many other infrastructure/building projects planned such as HS2/M42 relief road/service station</p>
Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Mr Charles Robinson	DLP Consultants (Mr Charles Robinson) [3608]	Q15	<p>Object- it is considered that a number of the proposed housing sites are unsuitable and will be difficult to deliver due to, for example, the need to properly replace existing sports facilities. This applies to Sites PHA 4 and PHA 18; other sites are also constrained in terms of delivery. It is proposed site PHA 13 should be extended to include land to the west (this is the subject of a detailed submission accompanied by a full suite of supporting studies) to provide the necessary certainty of delivery of housing over the initial phases of the plan period.</p>
Red Elk Holdings [4470]	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Q15	<p>The evidence base for the Draft Local Plan has given inadequate and inaccurate consideration to site 234 and it is considered that the site should be allocated for C2 residential care home development to address issues of soundness identified in our response to Question 14</p>
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate amount of housing proposed in Blythe Ward.</p> <p>Significant development in Balsall Common with no additional employment provision, a dysfunctional village centre with no space to accommodate more parking.</p> <p>Failure to explore other potential communities which should share the burden of development. Most notable are Dorridge and Hockley Heath which seem capable of taking their share.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Evans [2640]			Q15	<p>No.</p> <p>The main reason for the size of the "Barratts Farm" development appears to be to get funding from the developers to fund the proposed bypass to relieve congestion on the A452. As mentioned before this will inevitably lead to further infill development.. The infrastructure of the village barely copes as it is, parking in the "thriving village centre" is already positively dangerous. Cars reverse out from both sides of the roads and there are frequents bumps and pedestrians being knocked over, I suspect a future fatality is inevitable.</p> <p>Against purpose of Green Belt and preventing coalescence.</p>
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q15	<p>The objectives of re-using previously-developed land and creating new settlements have been ignored. Areas such as Balsall Common are being encouraged to sprawl in contravention of accessibility, sustainability, and Green Belt policies. The Green Belt analysis does not use defensible boundaries as outlined in the NPPF. The scores for the Meriden Gap Green Belt in Balsall Common are too low. Balsall Common has been singled out for concentrated and disproportionate expansion, in contrast to areas such as Dorridge, which has better public transport. Sites 1 and 3 appear to have been chosen for administrative convenience not policy compliance.</p>
Robert Blackadder [4825]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate number of homes allocated in Knowle.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Brownfield sites and increasing density of existing sites should be first option, if we are to be sustainable - environmentally, economically and socially.</p>
Robin Hill [4621]			Q15	<p>I can't see how the scheme is supposed to work sustainably without understanding the plan for additional services and roads.</p>
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q15	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Development won't benefit HS2.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	Mr Miles Drew	GVA (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	Q15	<p>Housing target should be increased, therefore conclude that insufficient land has been identified in DLP.</p> <p>Propose additional land is released from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.</p> <p>This should include land at Widney Manor Road.</p> <p>Para. 223, the Summary Table of Allocated Sites, should be amended to include land at Widney Manor Road.</p> <p>Appendix C should be updated to include aforementioned land.</p>
Sean Godfrey [4493]			Q15	Object to building on green belt land as there are better alternatives.
Shirley & Peter Hansen [4690]			Q15	The amount of housing proposed around south Shirley is disproportionate compared to other areas.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q15	<p>Proposals account for 2,600 homes at sites 4, 11, 12 and 13. Disproportionate allocation of homes within Shirley/Dickens Heath area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Already 200 homes built in Dickens Heath and consent for 200 in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Gross imbalance of housing in this area compared to Dorridge, East of Solihull/Monkspath and west of Dorridge/Knowle.</p> <p>No new infrastructure has been proposed.</p> <p>No published details of sites that have been rejected.</p> <p>Aims to satisfy housing need and retain Borough's character are contradictory.</p> <p>Densities are inconsistent.</p> <p>Propose only one of sites 4,12,13 are taken forward.</p> <p>Propose new homes west of M42.</p>
Simon Rogers [4011]			Q15	Does Shirley have to accommodate everything?
Simon Standley [4985]			Q15	There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15	<p>The concentration of sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 are in such close proximity separated by only roadways or a narrow section of open space/Green Belt resulting in an undue degree of pressure on an already stretched local infrastructure, services and local environmental amenities in the area and on the A34 Corridor.</p> <p>Risk of damaging community cohesion and the ability of the area to assimilate large additional settlement.</p> <p>Site allocations should be reviewed and the overall numbers reduced. Allocation of smaller Green Belt sites across the Borough could reduce concentration of housing in this area.</p> <p>Also opportunity for smaller builders.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15	<p>The concentration of sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 are in such close proximity separated by only roadways or a narrow section of open space/Green Belt resulting in an undue degree of pressure on an already stretched local infrastructure, services and local environmental amenities in the area and on the A34 Corridor.</p> <p>Risk of damaging community cohesion and the ability of the area to assimilate large additional settlement.</p> <p>Site allocations should be reviewed and the overall numbers reduced. Allocation of smaller Green Belt sites across the Borough could reduce concentration of housing in this area.</p> <p>Also opportunity for smaller builders.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15	<p>Green Belt release for housing is justified.</p> <p>No evidence put forward to justify the dwelling numbers on larger proposed allocations.</p> <p>On average it takes 6.5 years once an outline application has been submitted for dwellings to be delivered on larger strategic sites.</p> <p>Therefore need more smaller sites to ensure continued delivery throughout Plan period, in particular around Balsall Common and Knowle.</p> <p>1,150 dwellings proposed for Balsall Common is supported as a minimum.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15	<p>Generally agree with housing supply assumptions.</p> <p>SLP sites should be re-evaluated, as some sites not likely to come forward.</p> <p>Windfall supply is over generous.</p> <p>Land for 20% over OAN should be allocated in line with LPEG recommendations.</p> <p>Considered correct OAN is 20,000-24,000.</p> <p>Should not apply phasing to sites, market is very tight with low vacancy rate.</p> <p>Concern about inconsistencies in SHELAA scoring.</p>
Stephen Beck [2637]			Q15	<p>Agree that some development in Dorridge/Knowle will be required to meet future housing requirements and that some will be on Green Belt land. New development should have regard to the distinctive character of the local area and be in keeping with the surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There is limited open space in Dorridge and such areas are enjoyed for recreation and includes local wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stratford on Avon District Council (John Careford) [4666]			Q15	No comment as to the appropriateness of the allocations but stress the importance of ensuring that the wider transport and infrastructure implications of these proposals, both individually and cumulatively, has been properly understood and assessed, particularly the impact of this scale of development on local rural roads. In particular, it is critical that any comments raised by Warwickshire County Council as the highway authority for Stratford-on-Avon are fully taken on board. Solihull Metropolitan Borough council should also ensure that, as a neighbouring council, they fully engage with Tanworth-in-Arden Parish Council in the preparation of their Local Plan.
Sue Dilworth [3373]			Q15	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q15	<p>Agree with need to release Green Belt land for housing.</p> <p>Misconception that Solihull has sufficient brownfield land to recycle.</p> <p>Housing land assessment is flawed.</p> <p>Housing should be located close to main conurbation, not increase journey times and congestion through Green Belt.</p> <p>Areas around Dickens Heath, Tidbury Green, Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley Park are optimal locations.</p> <p>Large proportion of capacity is located where the housing market is weakest and viability is most challenged; not deliverable.</p> <p>Failure to adequately consider the capacity of the housing market in Solihull to absorb higher levels of new housebuilding over the plan period.</p>
Terra Strategic [3918]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q15	<p>More housing sites are required to contribute to HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Site at Fillongley Road would contribute ca. 100 more homes.</p>
Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]			Q15	proposal that sites should be smaller and spread across borough re: size, density and location of sites
Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]			Q15	proposal that smaller build sites should be spread across borough
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	Policy P5: Policy justification should include SHELAA Site Ref:16 and 17 in the summary of allocated sites and within Appendix C, for housing development in first 5 years of plan period.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Insufficient housing land provided, more Green Belt release required, or at least provide safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Too many large sites in too few areas have been proposed, contrary to Government's commitment to delivery across range of site sizes.</p> <p>Will result in disproportionate pressure on services and facilities, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Better to distribute housing across Borough, particularly close to public transport.</p> <p>Many proposed sites will result in displacement of community facilities, e.g. sport pitches. VSC for outdoor sport and recreation in Green Belt would be difficult to prove if alternative GB sites available that do not require loss of such facilities.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth in south-west of Borough with sites 4, 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>800 more dwellings than Dickens Heath (1,642 units).</p> <p>Land to south of Sites 12 and 13 has no clear defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Significant extension to Shirley area.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence of settlements in Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Majors Green and Whitlocks End.</p> <p>Adverse impact on existing communities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Landscape character in this area sensitive to change (LCA, 2016), cannot accommodate development of this scale.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>22% increase in dwellings in Knowle. Overconcentration of growth in rural village.</p> <p>Will have significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure.</p> <p>Difficult to assimilate new and existing communities at that scale.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions in recent years, which undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p> <p>Smaller-scaled development in Knowle/Dorridge could allow improvements at the school via CIL/S106s, and wouldn't require a rebuild.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong location adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Scale of development equals a 39% increase in village population.</p> <p>Development south of settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>Proposed allocations do not accord with sustainable development principles of the NPPF and therefore unsound.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Many of the proposed Housing Allocations on non-Green Belt sites in the urban area will result in the loss of existing employment, retail and community use land, sports and recreation facilities and open space. The housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and issues of viability remain to be proven.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Limited available land resource in Solihull Town Centre. Brownfield development dependent on masterplanning.</p> <p>Concern the scale of housing will jeopardise the ability of the centre to adapt to changing and expanding needs of new and existing businesses, retail and community facilities.</p> <p>Calls into question the viability, achievability and deliverability.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		Q15	<p>Council should provide further evidence that the proposed 8% contingency provides sufficient flexibility for the District.</p> <p>Should consider mechanisms for bringing forward, if necessary, reserve sites and/or safeguarded land during as well beyond the plan period.</p> <p>A higher housing requirement will necessitate a commensurate increase in the overall HLS.</p> <p>Any phasing set out in Policy P5 should not be a brake on bring forward sustainable development.</p> <p>To maximise housing supply, widest possible range of sites, by size and market location should be allocated.</p> <p>Key to increased housing supply is number of sales outlets and wide range of products and locations.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q15	<p>Objection to development in Knowle:</p> <p>Proportion of anticipated windfall sites will also occur in Knowle, exacerbating the impact of planned sites.</p> <p>20% of proposed housing numbers in the Green Belt are in Knowle. Unfair and unjustified.</p> <p>High existing traffic flows through the village - see TA for Waitrose application (Sept 2011). Hazardous to pedestrians; causes rat runs.</p> <p>Fourway lights near M42 Jn5 for high-voltage electricity main did not work.</p> <p>Lack of parking.</p> <p>Poor response times from emergency vehicles, needs to be improved.</p> <p>Considerable pressure on existing local services.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Policy P5: Policy justification should include SHELAA Site Ref: 209 in the summary of allocated sites and within Appendix C, for housing development in first 5 years of plan period.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong location adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Scale of development equals a 39% increase in village population.</p> <p>Development south of settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>Proposed allocations do not accord with sustainable development principles of the NPPF and therefore unsound.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Limited available land resource in Solihull Town Centre. Brownfield development dependent on masterplanning.</p> <p>Concern the scale of housing will jeopardise the ability of the centre to adapt to changing and expanding needs of new and existing businesses, retail and community facilities.</p> <p>Calls into question the viability, achievability and deliverability.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Over-concentration of growth in south-west of Borough with sites 4, 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>800 more dwellings than Dickens Heath (1,642 units).</p> <p>Land to south of Sites 12 and 13 has no clear defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Significant extension to Shirley area.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence of settlements in Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Majors Green and Whitlocks End.</p> <p>Adverse impact on existing communities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Landscape character in this area sensitive to change (LCA, 2016), cannot accommodate development of this scale.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>22% increase in dwellings in Knowle. Overconcentration of growth in rural village.</p> <p>Will have significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure.</p> <p>Difficult to assimilate new and existing communities at that scale.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions in recent years, which undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p> <p>Smaller-scaled development in Knowle/Dorridge could allow improvements at the school via CIL/S106s, and wouldn't require a rebuild.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Many of the proposed Housing Allocations on non-Green Belt sites in the urban area will result in the loss of existing employment, retail and community use land, sports and recreation facilities and open space. The housing estimates appear over optimistic in some cases and issues of viability remain to be proven.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15	<p>Insufficient housing land provided, more Green Belt release required, or at least provide safeguarded sites.</p> <p>Too many large sites in too few areas have been proposed, contrary to Government's commitment to delivery across range of site sizes.</p> <p>Will result in disproportionate pressure on services and facilities, and community cohesion.</p> <p>Better to distribute housing across Borough, particularly close to public transport.</p> <p>Many proposed sites will result in displacement of community facilities, e.g. sport pitches. VSC for outdoor sport and recreation in Green Belt would be difficult to prove if alternative GB sites available that do not require loss of such facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q15	<p>A number of new allocated housing sites have been proposed including 5,250 new dwellings in the Green Belt. Locations such as Balsall Common, Dickens Heath, Hampton in Arden and Knowle currently have limited public transport and there is a concern that housing development, at these locations, will only add to the current high levels of congestion.</p> <p>Also, with the wider impacts of HS2 and the regions natural growth, this could further exasperate congestion.</p>
Trustees of the Berkswell Estate [629]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15	<p>Most housing sites are large scale. Consider Council is relying too much on volume housebuilders performing and delivering such sites to meet annual targets.</p> <p>Recent research indicates more small and medium sites should be allocated to deliver housing by smaller building companies.</p> <p>Housing White Paper suggest 10% of allocation are 0.5ha or less.</p> <p>Should be preference for small/medium sized allocations.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of proposed housing in Blythe ward and parishes of Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15	<p>Consider that capacity of Sites 5,9,11,18 and 19 have been overestimated, resulting in a shortfall of 1,107-1.607.</p> <p>Consider that the Smiths Lane site would be sustainable and could assist by accommodating up to 300 - 350 dwellings.</p>
Vivian Drury [4984]			Q15	<p>There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil the housing requirements need by Solihull. There is no reason to take Green Belt land to build the houses proposed for site 1 in Balsall Common. There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Vivienne & Maurice Hadley [4745]			Q15	Overdevelopment in Shirley. Loss of Green Belt. Government have reconfirmed their commitment to Green Belt. Remember 'Urbs in Rure' motto.
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15	Inadequate evidence regarding natural environment/biodiversity. Site Assessment excluded potential LWS. Should take precautionary approach. Recommend that all pLWS within proposals are surveyed by Local Wildlife Sites team to ensure their status. Should also be reflected in the SHELAA
Wendy Cairns [4226]			Q15	object to housing in Balsall Common as it would lead to an erosion of the Meriden Gap; markedly change the nature of the settlement in a deleterious way and rural characteristics would be lost for little gain.
William Gamble [3346]	Mr Joel Hancock	Hancock Town Planning (Mr Joel Hancock) [1937]	Q15	object to the three sites in BC as their site (Waster Lane) is seen to be better placed to deliver housing as it does not have any site-specific requirements, in addition to scoring higher in the PBA assessment than the BFarm site
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q15	The proposed developments in Balsall Common are not in the right locations. Brownfield land should be sourced for housing rather than using green belt land. There are substantial amounts of brownfield land between Balsall Common and the motorway which would be far better sites than the 3 proposed allocations.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Zoe Murtagh [3083]			Q15	<p>Don't agree with the development concentrated in one area (Shirley/Dickens Heath). It seems a very unfair distribution.</p> <p>I don't see why these new homes cannot be built creating a completely new settlement on a sustainable site nearer to where the creation of jobs is going to be nearer the airport/HS2 line. This way workers will be closer to the proposed new jobs and won't have to travel so far causing gridlock along the way.</p>
Mr N Walters [2802]			Q15	SITES IN DORRIDGE AND KNOWLE NEED TO BE CONSIDERED
Question 15/01 Barratt's Farm				
A G Douglas [4827]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt. Reduce gap between Balsall Common and Coventry.</p> <p>Lack of parking in village.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctors.</p> <p>Will increase traffic and congestion. Local roads unsuitable for expansion.</p> <p>Only 6% of commuters from Balsall Common use public transport.</p> <p>Bypass is really an access road to 900 proposed houses.</p> <p>Will ruin community feel in the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
A G Randall [3052]			Q15/01	<p>Other large developments have changed the character of Balsall Common from quiet village to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Residents of Barretts Lane will be faced with a loss of privacy and depreciation in the value of their properties.</p> <p>Development will add to existing traffic congestion in the village.</p> <p>The centre with its shops and amenities has reached breaking point with regards to congestion and parking. This will only deteriorate further if further housing developments are approved.</p> <p>Concern that the site will have an access that runs to the side of my property and impact on the quiet nature of Barretts Lane.</p>
A Hardwick [4836]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>
A Kershaw [4832]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alan & Anita Heath [4628]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a lack of facilities in the centre of the village and not provision for increasing the services in the centre in the DLP - affordable housing in not appropriate for a place like BC, as it struggles to get sold. better located elsewhere in the borough. - traffic will increase with the new developments.
Alan Dick [3322]			Q15/01	not the right location, given proximity to HS2 route, increased traffic at same time as HS2 construction leading to congestion on roads on this side of the village
Alan Douglas [4166]			Q15/01	Object to housing Site 1 as 1,350 houses in Balsall Common is unacceptable, contrary to Government support for green belt, there is no infrastructure to support intense development, will exacerbate parking problems in village, site is affected by HS2 proposals which is politically motivated madness, no faith in planning system to ensure properly managed, existence of rail station is no justification for intensive development, there are other sites that could provide starter homes which will not be delivered in village and housing problem should be addressed by utilising empty floor space above shops.
Alastair McCulloch [3624]			Q15/01	Concerned that the focus of developments proposed in Balsall Common will have the effect of increasing car use in contradiction to the overall intentions of Accessibility policies. The only explicit improvement mentioned is a bypass route for the A452. Extensive new housing is proposed despite existing public transport being insufficient to comply with the criteria specified, and the mix of housing may not lead to adequate usage for any improvements such as an evening bus service or more frequent train services.
Andrew King [2922]			Q15/01	Far too many houses proposed east of Balsall Common which is highly unfair to our already busy and stretched village, the schools can't cope, we don't have the roads capable of such an increase in houses and we don't have adequate facilities as it is. Please reconsider and spread the building of so many houses to other parts of the borough and share the burden. I understand houses need to be built, but I highly contest the number of them on our beautiful green belt farm land.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew King [3581]			Q15/01	Development will result in loss of park at Meeting House Lane which together with other development in Balsall Common will mean the loss of green space with 4 pitches. Alternative green space will need to be found or existing facilities in the village improved to accommodate multi sports, training and 3 to 4 games per weekend.
Angela Perrett [4548]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection and Bypass.</p> <p>Does not require a bypass.</p> <p>Real reason for bypass it to fulfil future road links for HS2 expansion.</p> <p>Current proposal is not a bypass but an access road for Site 1.</p> <p>Lack of parking spaces in the village.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Added pressure to congestion.</p> <p>Lack of jobs in village.</p> <p>Poor public transport access.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation.</p> <p>Already have disruption of flight path and HS2.</p> <p>Will close gap between Solihull and Coventry.</p> <p>Brownfield sites elsewhere.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Ward [4831]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Ann Ward [4831]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>
Archdiocese of Birmingham (Rev Paul O'Connor) [3184]			Q15/01	The attached statements demonstrate a support for the allocation of Barratt's Farm, Balsall Common for housing development and demonstrates the ability of the Archdiocese of Birmingham and the Restful Home Group to deliver a viable and sustainable development site to assist SMBC in its housing and wider objectives.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Balsall and Berkswell Football Club (Mr James Aspinall) [3643]		Q15/01	<p>Understand need for housing in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Want to ensure appropriate sports facilities available to families and children.</p> <p>Balsall and Berkswell Football Club lease land from the Council on Lavender Hall Lane and rent pitches in Lavender Park.</p> <p>Sites 1 & 2 would result in 2-4 football pitches being lost to village.</p> <p>Proposed sports facility will not provide external pitch or outdoor facilities.</p> <p>Football Club and Council could develop facilities at grounds and Lavender Hall Park:</p> <p>E.g. Improve playing surface, drainage, car parking, install floodlights, provide integrated sports facility at Lavender Hall, all weather surface for hockey, netball.</p>
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]		Q15/01	<p>Support. Has potential for good accessibility with the potential to limit the increased use of journeys by car. But its accessibility will be limited because of HS2 construction.</p> <p>All housing to achieve the target number in Balsall Common could be built on Site 1. It can provide a range of facilities and will link better with the village centre and the railway station.</p> <p>It would create mixed living opportunities of inter-generational relationships for the elderly and young residents of the village.</p> <p>It would preserve more of the Green Belt around Balsall Common.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>The proposed allocations in Balsall Common represents an increase in the size of the population for the village of approximately 39%. This is an over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong place adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Development south of the settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, the Green Belt, highway network, surrounding communities and infrastructure.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q15/01	<p>It is in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap.</p> <p>HS2 will interfere with delivery of the site but would have little or no impact on the alternatives.</p> <p>Alternative sites have no listed buildings.</p> <p>Allocation is not supported by the evidence base.</p> <p>Impact on landscape character and value. The historic field pattern is irreplaceable and part of the character of the area.</p> <p>LCA does not support large areas of development in this area.</p> <p>The Green Belt assessment is flawed. Site 1 extends into Broad Area 4 which performs highly in Green Belt terms.</p>
Bethan Jackson Baker [4495]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing Site 1 as Balsall Common not an accessible location and has limited employment opportunities resulting in most residents commuting by car, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A452 at peak times and risk of accidents, and will add to parking problems in village centre.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]			Q15/01	concerned with the development at Barratts Farm. We note that this development covers more hectares, 57, than any other development in Solihull and stretches from Waste Lane to Station Avenue. As well as impacting severely on the landscape, it affects the Greenway which is a treasured amenity, not only for residents in Burton Green, Berkswell and Kenilworth, but for those further afield. Walkers and cyclists will now have to contend with HS2 on one side and a housing estate of 800 houses on the other. The sense of well-being which the Greenway brings will be further tarnished by this development.
C Berry [4838]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Carol Colclough [4588]			Q15/01	Object to proposal for 1,000+ houses in Balsall Common on top of growth over last 10 years, attempt to justify as split between 2 parishes, unfairness in targeting village when other villages such as Berkswell, Hampton and Meriden have few or none and has not been justified, disregard to green belt, and failure to focus on infrastructure capacity and demand to determine distribution of new housing.
Carol Walker [3989]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Protest about Sites in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Green Belt.</p> <p>Live close to Barratt's Farm, felt this would be an ideal site to live, but not with this proposal on offer.</p>
Cathy Morrey [4646]			Q15/01	<p>General concerns about the level of development in balsall common and the impact this will have on the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>concerns about local roads (sunnyside lane) being used as rat runs.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
Christine M Philip [4830]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Christopher Kershaw [4986]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q15/01	We are fully in agreement with the principles of sustainable urban extensions to address local housing needs and also the provision of community services and facilities. With specific respect to Proposed Housing Allocation 1, Barratt's farm, Balsall Common the proposed allocation is supported in principle for all the reasons set out in this Vision Document. However, it is considered, as summarised within paragraphs 6.16-6.17 of Section 5: The Concept Masterplan, that the Proposed Allocation should justifiably be extended further to the north to connect with the Kenilworth Greenway and existing development along the southern edge of Station Road.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 1002 is Category 2, partially within HS2 safeguarded zone, 10-25% in flood zone, less than 10% within LWS. Ref. 1016 is Category 1.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5-6.</p> <p>No clear defensible boundary on eastern edge if HS2 not come forward.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - Score is not true reflection of the whole site.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, impact on heritage assets and over 20ha of good quality agricultural land.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/01	<p>Contrary to Green Belt policy and Council policy to protect 'urbs in rure' character, unsustainable location dependent on car travel, would harm attractive open countryside, remove opportunities for quiet recreation, loss of playing fields/sports grounds and drainage issues and impact on flood risk.</p>
Cromwell & Duggins Lane Residents Association (Mr P McDonald) [2265]			Q15/01	<p>We do not feel therefore that the housing numbers and locations at Barrat's Farm, Windmill Lane and Frog Lane are appropriate in size or location relative to the Meriden Gap and certainly don't comply with the NPPF concerning the protection of green belt land.</p>
D A Waltham [4740]			Q15/01	<p>The site is precious Green Belt and to let it disappear would be sacrilege.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Holtom [3685]			Q15/01	Object to proposed housing site 1 as the location just fills a small green corridor wedged between existing housing with extremely close proximity to the proposed HS2 main line. The noise from HS2 would bring nothing but misery for anyone living in this housing. A better choice would be to build any new development on the west side of the conurbation along with a new bypass to relieve the existing overcrowded main route through Balsall Common.
David White [4173]			Q15/01	Whilst no objection to more houses in Balsall Common, should not cram in too many houses between village and HS2 line, access to Site 1 should not be from Meeting House Lane as this would lead to accidents/congestion, but better from Old Waste Lane, larger and safer parking area in Station Road is required and should make provision for elderly persons accommodation.
Debbie Wylde [4546]			Q15/01	Object to level of housing in Balsall Common as will turn it into a town without facilities or infrastructure to cope with additional population, and road network and public transport will need improvement, and to Site 1 as beautiful piece of green belt enjoyed by residents for recreational purposes which enhances village and prevents urban sprawl, results in loss of green space for recreation, is surrounded by houses and small roads unsuitable for significant additional vehicles, village centre and surgery will be unable to cope but lack room to expand.
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q15/01	Object to housing Site 1 as green belt land should not be used where alternative previously developed land available as exceptional circumstances not demonstrated, fails to meet accessibility criteria as bus services infrequent and too far from school/amenities to discourage car use, rail services/parking over capacity, will increase traffic on roads already gridlocked especially at peak times, rat running and danger to children, parking in and around village limited, schools oversubscribed, limited employment results in commuting by car and not compliant with national or local planning policies or sustainable.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q15/01	<p>I don't consider that the criteria for selection have been correctly applied:</p> <p>*This is GREEN BELT LAND and this should have over-riding priority over all other criteria.</p> <p>*It will MASSIVELY increase the size of the village causing unresolvable problems in traffic congestion, parking, overcrowding of the secondary school (and hence further lowering academic standards), and service provision.</p> <p>*It will inevitably and permanently ALTER THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE, which would be completely at odds with the Borough's policies.</p> <p>There should therefore be NO BUILDING on Barratt's farm, AND IT SHOULD BE LOCATED ADJACENT TO A LARGE CONURBATION - SOLIHULL</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 would destroy a huge area of Green Belt accessible to the community and reaching the Kenilworth Greenway, criss-crossed with regularly used footpaths, and fields where wheat is grown and cows pastured, with no other footpaths nearby for people on this side of the village, whilst a park would never replace this amenity, whilst traffic will be unmanageable as 800 houses will probably produce 1600 cars, and some access points are minor lanes and will not cope with this volume of traffic. The Council needs to give details of brownfield sites which have been rejected, and reasons for this.</p>
Elaine Nicholls [4589]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing Site 1 as access point to Meeting House Lane is narrow and would present hazard during house building and should include 113 Meeting House Lane as well.</p>
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gillian & Carl Archer [4189]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unnecessary destruction of the Green belt - have had development in recent years - windmill lane: issues with traffic management. cars for commuting are essential - Parking at the railway station in BC is an issue - congestion in the centre of BC, development will add to this. - concerned about presue and impact on social infrastructure
Greenlight Developments (Philip Rawle) [3908]	Philip Rawle	Greenlight Developments (Philip Rawle) [3908]	Q15/01	<p>Support inclusion of Site 1 in Local Plan.</p> <p>Promoter of part of site, potential for 50-60 dwellings.</p> <p>Can be brought forward quickly.</p>
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/01	<p>Comment - Notes the site includes or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
I Black [4824]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt. Reduce gap between Balsall Common and Coventry.</p> <p>Lack of parking in village.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctors.</p> <p>Will increase traffic and congestion. Local roads unsuitable for expansion.</p> <p>Only 6% of commuters from Balsall Common use public transport.</p> <p>Bypass is really an access road to 900 proposed houses.</p> <p>Will ruin community feel in the village.</p>
Ian Morrey [4541]			Q15/01	<p>Object to level of housing proposed for Balsall Common as roads, parking and services would be unable to cope, and should be replaced by smaller developments on periphery of village with existing or new road links, and to Site 1 as too many houses proposed and would result in traffic congestion at access points, access should be away from village centre and residential roads, existing roads are unsuitable and subject to rat-running and speeding making them dangerous for pedestrians.</p>
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q15/01	<p>Barratt's farm land is Green field land not Brownfield land and has significant drain off issues. The village has poor public transport. Development will impact on the local ecology of the Green fields, ancient hedgerows and trees. It will directly affect the existing local residents and families who extensively use the area for recreation. The additional traffic will add to existing air pollution from flights from Birmingham Airport, especially the north turn over the settlement.</p> <p>If this land is built on the existing drainage problems will represent a risk to local adjoining properties to the north and south.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Hardwick [4837]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
J M King [4842]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Janice Whittlesey [4640]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not convinced that consideration has been given to developing brownfield sites elsewhere or that building on the green belt constitutes 'exceptional circumstances' -the lack of consideration for infrastructure improvements -public transport links are insufficient -centre of Balsall Common will certainly require improvement - parking, banks, etc - concerned about the a proposed access to the Barratt's Farm site being on Meeting House Lane.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q15/01	Would result in the loss of sporting amenities or recreational areas. This seems to go against the policy objective of "Supporting the retention and protection of facilities which promote healthy lifestyles such as open space, including public rights of way to open space, playing pitches and allotments;"

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jeremy Andrews [4575]			Q15/01	Object to housing Site 1 as sufficient brownfield land to fulfil housing requirement so no need for green belt development, bypass will serve as access road only, will not ease pressure on village and should be moved further away, needs access to south as roads to north alone will not cope with increased traffic, will exacerbate lack of parking in centre, at station and surgery, medical services already at capacity, lack of local employment means contrary to policy and car based commuting mainly to north where brownfield land available, contrary to national green belt policy as reduces gap to Coventry.
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
John & Janet Taylor [4595]			Q15/01	<p>Objection to development in BC per se:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate infrastructure (schools, medical) - congestion/gridlock on roads - Parking is insufficient
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
Jonathan Moore [4680]			Q15/01	Object to level of new housing proposed in Balsall Common which has been unfairly targeted, infrastructure and facilities such as schools, shops, medical services, leisure facilities and parking have hardly changed despite previous developments and are already overstretched, will exacerbate traffic congestion and risk of accidents especially at peak times made worse by JLR site in Honiley, limited job opportunities in village and significant car commuting, will add to construction impacts of HS2, and there are other areas with better facilities that can share the burden with previously developed land used first.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Judith Harris [4277]			Q15/01	Object to loss of green belt and 'green lung' when all areas of brownfield/derelict land have not been investigated/considered, no consideration of impacts of HS2 on village which will be exacerbated by further building, will result in loss of village identity turning it into a commuter village for Birmingham, extra traffic will gridlock area, parking already inadequate and people will not walk or use public transport, extra demands on schools and medical facilities, failure to provide by-pass will cause traffic/pollution problems, area around station subject to flooding, Greenway amenities will be destroyed and will not provide truly affordable housing.
Karen Bell [4586]			Q15/01	Object to total of 1150 new houses in village as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed, the medical/welfare facilities, schools, shops, parking, public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate, would sacrifice valuable green belt in the Meriden Gap with important environmental and social benefits, encourage reinstatement of bypass line, and to Site 1 in particular as this side of village lacks necessary infrastructure, will set precedent for further growth, and village already blighted by HS2 construction meaning 15 years of disruption and development.
Keith Batty [3639]			Q15/01	Object to Balsall Common housing proposals as disproportionate and should be spread more evenly across Borough to reduce environmental impact, there are pockets of brownfield land that should be used to reduce loss of green belt, not balanced by additional employment opportunities creating even more of a dormitory settlement than at present leading to additional congestion and parking around the station, when added to HS2 construction will make life almost intolerable, and Site 1 is inappropriate as will create significant additional traffic on Station Road, at junction with A452 and in village centre, which are already congested at peak times.
L J Crumpton [4987]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
L Longstaffe [4840]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
landowners land Balsall Common [3754]	Mr Roy Hammond	Howkins & Harrison (Mr Roy Hammond) [3714]	Q15/01	site 1 - support
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 1002 is Category 2, partially within HS2 safeguarded zone, 10-25% in flood zone, less than 10% within LWS. Ref. 1016 is Category 1.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5-6.</p> <p>No clear defensible boundary on eastern edge if HS2 not come forward.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - Score is not true reflection of the whole site.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, impact on heritage assets and over 20ha of good quality agricultural land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
M Black [4823]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Reduce gap between Balsall Common and Coventry.</p> <p>Lack of parking in village.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctors.</p> <p>Will increase traffic and congestion. Local roads unsuitable for expansion.</p> <p>Only 6% of commuters from Balsall Common use public transport.</p> <p>Bypass is really an access road to 900 proposed houses.</p> <p>Will ruin community feel in the village.</p>
M Hardwick [4833]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Malcolm J Harris [4245]			Q15/01	Object to housing Site 1 as not satisfied that all available brownfield sites have been given priority as required by Government, unclear what the exceptional circumstances are for ignoring green belt designation, involves loss of agricultural land, development likely to cause flooding, adverse impact on wildlife, recreational footpaths, ancient trees and hedgerows, impact of increased traffic and light pollution on semi-rural character, deteriorating impact on water supply, drainage, services and road conditions/safety, and schools, medical services, shops and parking inadequate to cope with population increase.
Margaret Walls [4681]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Marjie Douglas [4828]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Matthew Quinn [4344]</p>		<p>Q15/01</p>	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>20% of new housing development in Balsall Common, but settlement does not meet Council's own criteria on accessibility.</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities, which encourages car travel. This adds pressure to road network and increases carbon. No proposals for SPRINT in this area.</p> <p>3 Greenfield sites have been chosen over 14 PDL sites; therefore very special circumstances have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>No safe access via Meeting House Lane. Highway safety risk to children walking to school or cricket/tennis club.</p> <p>Cul-de-sacs should not become through-routes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q15/01	<p>Barratt's Farm land is Greenfield land not Brownfield land.</p> <p>Significant drain off issues.</p> <p>Poor public transport connectivity.</p> <p>Demolition of Meriden Gap Green Belt.</p> <p>Impact on local ecology of the green fields, ancient hedge rows and trees.</p> <p>Loss of green space for local residents.</p> <p>Additional traffic will add to air pollution from Airport.</p> <p>Area already under severe threat of noise from HS2.</p> <p>HS2 will also erode Green Belt.</p> <p>New development and facilities will have poor access to existing roads.</p>
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q15/01	<p>Green field land and not Brown field land and has significant drain-off issues.</p> <p>This Green Belt site is in the Meriden Gap and its impact on the local ecology of the green fields, ancient hedge rows and trees will directly affect the existing local residents and families who extensively use the area and its many cross-crossing footpaths for open air exercise and leisure activities.</p> <p>The resulting additional traffic will add to air pollution.</p> <p>Building an additional 800 homes is a planning nightmare.</p>
Michael Watkinson [3576]			Q15/01	<p>Encroachment onto Green Belt, when there is brownfield land available.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Wylde [4544]			Q15/01	Object to level of new housing in Balsall Common as will turn it into town, there are no plans to manage increased traffic, road network public transport and parking insufficient for expansion, centre cannot be expanded yet houses proposed close to centre, there are better sites for development which would minimise impact such as Oakes Farm and north of the village, and to Site 1 as will develop remaining green belt east of village which is used for recreational purposes.
Mr & Mrs Bird [5004]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>
Mr & Mrs . Taylor [4990]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Jagger [4299]			Q15/01	<p>Objection to Site 1.</p> <p>Land at Barratt's Farm is in Green Belt; should not be built on until other brownfield sites have been developed.</p> <p>Green Belt is Green Belt which means no houses or development.</p> <p>The Meriden Gap must stay without development.</p> <p>Lack of consideration of infrastructure needs to accommodate 1350 extra homes.</p>
Mr . King [4989]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Hardwick [3636]			Q15/01	<p>Without clear access from the south, neither Hallmeadow Road or Station Road could cope with the increased traffic.</p> <p>While traffic levels are higher during peak commuter periods it has been accepted that the village does not require a bypass. It will be an access road for 900 houses which will add further traffic through the village.</p> <p>Will increase pressure on parking capacity in the village and medical facilities are at capacity.</p> <p>The development would close the gap between Solihull and Coventry.</p> <p>The area is already blighted by HS2.</p> <p>Impact on existing property and business. Impact on light to the property.</p>
Mr C Edwards [4622]			Q15/01	<p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q15/01	<p>The size and location of the Barratt's Farm (Balsall Common) housing area will cripple the village. The centre of the village is already a traffic jam in the peak hours and you are proposing to build 800+ houses in a location where all these homeowners will be driving through the village to go North (to where all the major transport links are).</p> <p>A relief road to the east of the village will help a little but the existing part of this road is already full of cars parking for the train station and is a dangerous road.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
mr chris leigh [2943]			Q15/01	Object to building on land previously known as Catchem's Nursery off Waste Lane, which appears to be included in Site 1, as there are many trees on this plot that have TPOs on them, there are several public footpaths that cross the land, drainage will be a problem, as there is a storm drain that runs directly on to it, and planning permission was refused 6 years ago to build houses there.
Mr christopher McDermott [3693]			Q15/01	Proposal should incorporate significantly improved leisure facilities to reduce need for existing and new residents to travel, including swimming pool, gym, all weather pitches, squash courts and space for community/club activities, additional facilities for existing clubs, improved rights of access to maintain leisure walking routes, and use of HS2 buffer for enhanced facilities, additional school places for Catholic children as St George and St Teresa school oversubscribed and bus service threatened, and improved accessibility by increasing train and station parking capacity, southern access to Kelsey Lane but no access to Meeting House Lane as dangerous, improved parking in Station Road.
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q15/01	Object to total of 1150 new houses in village as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed, the medical/welfare facilities, schools, shops, parking, public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate, would sacrifice valuable green belt in the Meriden Gap with important environmental and social benefits, encourage reinstatement of bypass line, and to Site 1 in particular as this side of village lacks necessary infrastructure, will set precedent for further growth, and village already blighted by HS2 construction meaning 15 years of disruption and development.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q15/01	Barratts Farm should not be included. Whilst i don't have access to accurate figures, I estimate that Barratt's Farm represents 13% of Solihull's planned 6150 dwelling increase, but Balsall Common in TOTAL encompasses just 9% of land mass. Furthermore, I believe there are approx 2,400 dwellings in Balsall Common, so Barratts Farm on its own is a 33% increase to the total settlement. I don't think that can be called managed or sustainable development, and it is at the expense of Green Belt. The negative impact on residents, wildlife and ancient woodland is huge and seemingly ignored.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q15/01	<p>-site is one of the narrowest parts of the Meriden Gap</p> <p>-erosion of limited greenbelt between Coventry and Balsall Common.</p> <p>-loss of open feel and countryside views for recreational walking and pursuits.</p> <p>-access onto MHL would be an extremely unsafe si</p>
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q15/01	<p>site 1 objection:</p> <p>- location is under severe threat (HS2 project) and further encroachment needs to be halted immediately.</p> <p>- not taking into serious consideration brownfield sites (14 identified by berskswell parish)</p> <p>- Solihull is a target for b'ham overspill</p>
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q15/01	<p>I believe that the propsed large development in Balsall Common, does not meet the criteria from question 3. Over 800 homes are planned on green belt at the narrowest point of the Meriden gap, closing the distance with Coventry. Developed land, for example, to the north of Balsall Common has been ignored. The west of Balsall Common has more room to accommodate development sensitively. The largest site chosen has poor public transport and worse car access than other sites. Increased car numbers would add significantly to the congestion in Balsall Common itself.</p>
Mr Greg Kirby [3051]			Q15/01	<p>Major concern regarding groundwater and potential flooding.</p> <p>Traffic congestion in the village and along Meeting House Lane.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure (schools, doctors, transport).</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Henning Kleine [3633]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt which should be protected. A number of brownfield sites have not been chosen.</p> <p>This large site will benefit big developers. The 2017 Housing White Paper encourages smaller sites to benefit smaller developers.</p> <p>The site will not integrate with the village, especially if the bypass is developed. Access is from Meeting House Lane will be unsuitable.</p> <p>Development would have to be postponed until the construction of HS2 is complete.</p> <p>Additional primary school and shops will be needed. Likely to require secondary school places.</p>
Mr James Lupton [3554]			Q15/01	<p>I believe the fields around Barratt's farm justify a conservation order in the same manner as that accorded to the fields to the south of Berkswell. That said, I would favour acceptance of the application of Berkswell Estate for development on one of the Berkswell fields behind Village Farm. My reasons are: a) development will be tucked away behind a short frontage b) I believe the village would benefit from the injection of a few new residents c) it could be adopted as the better of the two developments proposed by Berkswell Estate for the centre of the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr Jason Williams [3731]		Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Moved to Balsall Common in 2014. Thought land would remain Green Belt.</p> <p>Property will reduce in value as a result of proposed allocation.</p> <p>Construction will cause lots of stress.</p> <p>Acknowledge the Borough needs to expand, especially with airport and HS2 development.</p> <p>All previous applications have been dismissed on this site.</p> <p>Site not flagged up on search.</p> <p>Consult with people who are going to be inconvenienced financially, logistically and mentally by this development.</p> <p>Dispute with lawyers.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q15/01	<p>Inherent danger that large scale development of the kind proposed for Balsall Common and Berkswell will make it a less attractive area in which to live, and this must be of major consideration in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Urbanisation of countryside.</p> <p>Major investment needed in local services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Need for clear defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of landscape character.</p> <p>Loss of green infrastructure assets.</p>
Mr L Hatfield [4761]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of rural character in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Leslie Noble [3503]			Q15/01	<p>I object to the Local Plan proposal for Balsall Common under references 1at Barratts Farm, 2 at Frog Lane & 3 at Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>All these plans for Balsall do not give sufficient consideration for the infrastructure of Balsall Common; the impact on the local primary school, GP surgery and village centre etc. I would support a plan where one housing site catering for all the housing needs and incorporating a school and shops is built. I understand that land is available to the north of the village for such a proposal.</p>
Mr Liam Eccleston [4834]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>
Mr M Hatfield [4759]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of rural character in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q15/01	<p>This allocation to Balsall Common (and especially to Barratts Farm) is totally disproportionate to the size of the village. The village is already overly-developed due to recent increases in housing which have outpaced both existing and recent increases in infrastructure.</p> <p>Unacceptable incursion into the Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Increased traffic.</p> <p>Inadequate infrastructure.</p> <p>Construction of HS2 at the same time.</p> <p>Size of the allocation is too large to be absorbed by the village.</p> <p>Will impact on the quality of life currently enjoyed by residents.</p>
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q15/01	<p>The Barratt's farm development is inappropriate - it is being proposed on greenbelt land, that has no boundary and so could open up development from Balsall Common to Tile Hill. The latest Government white paper states that all other avenues should be investigated before Green Belt land.</p> <p>The impact on traffic levels in and around the site would be significant, with delayed transport times, congestion, additional pollution and noise.</p> <p>The delivery of Barratts lane, HS2, by pass, would create an environmental and social divide and impinge on the quality of life of the inhabitants of the east of Balsall Common</p>
Mr Peter Derrington [3126]			Q15/01	<p>objection to site 1</p> <p>follow on email responding to system generated acknowledgment asking to change the initial online response ID167</p> <p>I must have pressed the wrong button - I OBJECT to the proposals.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr R & Mrs B Collins [4729]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals for Balsall Common as green belt land which will impact significantly on community and rural setting, centre cannot take more parking and station parking inadequate, primary school cannot sustain further children, 2 large developments in last 10 years without improved facilities, Sites 1 and 3 will be blots on landscape, affect highway safety and road users, increase noise and disturbance, pollution and loss of privacy, recent development crammed on sites and not affordable, and there is land outside area that is more suitable, whilst Knowle/Dorridge benefit from better infrastructure.
Mr R Hatfield [4758]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of rural character in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q15/01	Building on Barratts Farm could cause significant drainage issues when coupled with HS2 and increase flooding risk which is already an issue at Berkswell Station
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>The proposed allocations in Balsall Common represents an increase in the size of the population for the village of approximately 39%. This is an over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong place adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Development south of the settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, the Green Belt, highway network, surrounding communities and infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Tim Ledger [3827]	Mr Michael Jones	Mr Michael Jones [3787]	Q15/01	Qualified support is given to the principle of the proposed allocation of land at Barratts Farm, Balsall Common, subject to ensuring that the master plan protects the existing amenities and future interests of Pool Orchard and allows for the sensitive and independent development of parts of the adjoining paddock.
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 1002 is Category 2, partially within HS2 safeguarded zone, 10-25% in flood zone, less than 10% within LWS. Ref. 1016 is Category 1.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5-6.</p> <p>No clear defensible boundary on eastern edge if HS2 not come forward.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - Score is not true reflection of the whole site.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, impact on heritage assets and over 20ha of good quality agricultural land.</p>
Mrs Alison Eccleston [4689]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Mrs Angela Stuart-Smith [3749]			Q15/01	Object to housing site 1 as green belt, in Meriden gap and Coventry gap, HS2 is planned through it plus extra road from Kenilworth, traffic through middle of village causing even more gridlock!

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q15/01	We moved to Balsall Common in 2011 and the main reason was the Barratt's Farm land where we take our children for walks many weekends. The Berkswell side of Balsall Common is due to be impacted significantly by HS2. Barratt's Farm should not be included for housing as it is green belt, does not comply with the policy set out for health and supporting communities and would reduce our quality of life to such an extent that we would want to move away from the area.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q15/01	It would appear for Balsall Common site selection has preferred Greenbelt over PDL sites. Barratts Farm appears to have been selected to facilitate a bypass rather than choosing sites to the north of Balsall Common with direct access onto the A452.
Mrs Christine Plant [4686]			Q15/01	Do not agree that a whole farm within the Berkswell Parish should be allocated for 800 houses. The site is in the Green Belt and takes away an existing park and disregards the valued and well-used footpaths and rights of way within this area.
Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Need to look at brownfield sites, not Green Belt.</p> <p>Recent Government White Paper stated that Green Belt should be protected.</p> <p>Need to protect Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Appreciate we have a housing shortfall. Council should seek to develop sites that current residents are happy with.</p> <p>Will add to construction traffic from HS2.</p> <p>Lack of sufficient school places and public transport.</p>
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q15/01	<p>Concerned about large number of homes being planned for Barrett's Farm for a number of reasons, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * This will create a large volume of additional traffic for a small number of routes * town centre will not be able to cope with the additional demand and has little room to expand * The location is a beautiful natural habitat for a range of wildlife and the public footpaths are a well-used and well-enjoyed feature of the area * a large estate of new build houses is not in keeping with the unique and semi-rural character of the area
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green spaces.</p> <p>Impact on Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Too many houses proposed in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and local facilities needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Accessibility to the Barratts Lane site is virtually non-existent.</p>
Mrs Gillian Westlake [4706]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing Site 1 as access to Meeting House Lane would result in extra traffic eradicating the rural character of Lane frequently used by joggers, horse riders, parents and children, turning it into an urbanised road with noise, lighting and air pollution, proposed access is too close to bend in Lane and would cause traffic chaos at busy Kelsey Lane junction, and needs more considered approach.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Litchfield [4762]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of rural character in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>
Mrs J Watson [4765]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of rural character in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q15/01	Housing site 1 will severely impact on vital role of the green belt in preserving a distinct boundary with Coventry, supporting a vibrant range of wildlife and in providing many paths for recreation/walking etc for the community, and plans must reflect this by retaining trees and hedgerows, preserving green corridors for wildlife, potentially through the creation of substantial green buffers or tree belts which could also mitigate impacts of development, linking such spaces with existing green leisure provision such as the Lant Trust, and maintaining rural character of Meeting House Lane without significant loss of local amenity.
Mrs Julie Cooper [3800]			Q15/01	Object to housing site 1 as the volume of houses proposed (800) is disproportionate to the area, which lacks the infrastructure to support that number of houses, the existing road network will not cope with the changes proposed, will exacerbate problems associated with the construction of HS2, and loss of green belt is not justified by exceptional circumstances.
Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Balsall Common not a suitable 'town centre'. Improving the centre has to be a priority before any new housing.</p> <p>Settlement does not meet Council's own accessibility criteria.</p> <p>Allocation of 20% of new housing here is contrary to policy.</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>More cars will increase carbon footprint.</p> <p>Note that plan does not mention bungalows or facilities for older residents.</p> <p>Road system near to Barratts farm is insufficient, cannot support extra traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kirsty King [3592]			Q15/01	Object to proposal for 1150 houses in Balsall Common, as on Green Belt land, in ancient Forest of Arden and the Meriden Gap, is in breach of the Government's White Paper, which specifies that building on greenbelt should be avoided when other sites are available, and to Site 1 which is a farm containing footpaths, playing fields and sites of interest, the village will not cope, Station Road/Kenilworth Road already too busy, there is a lack of transport, services, amenities, schools are already full, and building is coinciding with HS2 which will turn village into a building site for years.
Mrs Manjit Kaur-badial [3748]			Q15/01	<p>Do not support bypass as plans are not detailed or clear enough.</p> <p>Balsall Common Primary school is oversubscribed. Should reduce catchment to just Balsall Common.</p> <p>Sports pitches in the village would be sufficient if Council did not dispose of recreation ground at Site 2.</p> <p>Should not review housing to the detriment of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Site 1 is preferred to Site 2 as it is close to the train station. Would reduce traffic coming through the village.</p> <p>Local amenities and services would not be able to cope.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Already encroached towards Holly Lane from JLR.</p>
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q15/01	Concerns that flood plains will be used to build on. Where will the additional water drain to. Will the local rivers flood and damage the local environment?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q15/01	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of village character.</p> <p>Impact on local amenities and services. No mention is made of shopping, banking etc, as banks are withdrawing from Balsall Common.</p> <p>Car parking facilities are limited in the village. Dangerous in some areas.</p> <p>Disproportionate number of homes.</p> <p>Demolition of Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Noise from HS2.</p> <p>Erosion of Green Belt from HS2.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion.</p> <p>Poor existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Poor public sector connectivity with the local economic centres which are primarily to the East and South i.e. NOT Solihull and this is the way traffic flows at peak times.</p>
Mrs P Nurse [1700]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Shimi Kaur [4644]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection</p> <p>It is our understanding that there are adequate brown field sites which could be used without using greenbelt land in order to fulfil the housing requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development will not benefit the village - will lead to increase in traffic and associated congestion - put additional pressure on services (medical, retail)
Mrs V Higgins [4497]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing in Balsall Common as green belt in Meriden Gap when growth should be on brownfield sites near good transport links and other infrastructure saving green belt for future generations, and village has inadequate centre with poor and insufficient parking.</p>
Ms Emma Harris [3634]			Q15/01	<p>There is insufficient existing infrastructure to support the proposed increase in housing in Balsall Common, which will exacerbate traffic congestion at peak times, result in increased difficulty parking and overstretched local amenities, reduce desirability and character of village, impact on environment and loss of open space, and possibility of a bypass using Hall Meadow Road will increase traffic, noise and pollution levels.</p>
Ms K Standley [1724]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Ms Susan Agnama [3078]		Q15/01	<p>Developers should be expected to provide solutions, not create more problems.</p> <p>Need for appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>Need to provide sufficient school places.</p> <p>Need to consider impact of traffic increases.</p> <p>Need to increase and improve sustainable transport options.</p> <p>Need to provide activities for teenagers and children.</p> <p>Need to balance green policy with housing development.</p> <p>Need to give same degree of consideration to transport infrastructure/environment and aesthetics in Balsall Common as in Dorridge with new Sainsbury's development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
N Birtley [4453]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Disagree with 1500 houses in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be a priority as per government recommendations.</p> <p>Generate high volume additional traffic. Already busy area. Inadequate parking in village. Would create congestion at/near station roundabout.</p> <p>Traffic flow towards Coventry already restricted by the light controlled light underpass.</p> <p>Pressure on station car park.</p> <p>Pressure on oversubscribed schools and local health services.</p> <p>Close to HS2 - impact of HS2 construction work and noise once operational. Impact on saleability of properties.</p>
Neil Jackson Baker [4668]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing Site 1 as Balsall Common not an accessible location and has limited employment opportunities resulting in most residents commuting by car, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A452 at peak times and risk of accidents, and will add to parking problems in village centre.</p>
Nick Brimble [4982]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>
Nick Sloane [3662]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing sites in Balsall Common on Green Belt grounds as proposals contravene the latest Government White Paper directive that green belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances and where there is no alternative, in that there are 14 brownfield sites in and around Balsall Common that have been ignored.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nicola Cleaver [4188]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as it means releasing land from the green belt. - insufficient consideration given to brownfield land/site elsewhere in the borough in preparing the DLP - negative impact on BC and the settlement - pressure on existing infrastructure
P A Henwood [4684]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 1002 is Category 2, partially within HS2 safeguarded zone, 10-25% in flood zone, less than 10% within LWS. Ref. 1016 is Category 1.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5-6.</p> <p>No clear defensible boundary on eastern edge if HS2 not come forward.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - Score is not true reflection of the whole site.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, impact on heritage assets and over 20ha of good quality agricultural land.</p>
P May [4988]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>
Parminder S Badial [4584]			Q15/01	<p>Housing Site 1 is a more considered and sensible option than others in Balsall Common due to proximity to station, distribution of traffic through the village and accessibility to Coventry/Tile Hill, but do not support bypass as details unclear, primary school should be adequate providing just serve needs of village, and there are sufficient sports and recreation grounds, and new housing needs to be supported by plans for medical services, shops and bus services.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q15/01	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green field not Brownfield land and has significant drain off issues. The village has poor public transport. Development will impact on the local ecology of the Green fields, ancient hedgerows and trees. It will directly affect the existing local residents and families who use the area for recreation.</p> <p>The additional traffic will add to existing air pollution.</p> <p>Existing drainage problems will be exacerbated and impact on local properties.</p> <p>Reduction in the Meriden Gap and a connection with Coventry is on the cards.</p> <p>The houses will be undesirable because of HS2, railway line and aircraft noise.</p>
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q15/01	The site has potential to shape the future of the village / settlement for years to come. The context of the proposed bypass line for BC is needed to fully exploit this opportunity. Access to this development should be exclusively off the bypass route, connections to the existing village infrastructure should be by way of foot and cyclepath only. The appropriate development of this site gives a number of recreational amenity opportunities: the proposed provision of a new Junior School could enable shared an All Weather Sports pitch and Swimming Pool to be provided

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Philip Colclough [3572]			Q15/01	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p>
Philip Wood [4552]			Q15/01	<p>Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.</p>
Professor David Walton [3795]			Q15/01	<p>Concerned about lack of significance given to green belt designation if it can be so easily cast aside and precedence for further growth, developments proposed will change the nature of Balsall Common from semi-rural to more town-like, it is hard to tell if the necessary improvements to local services and facilities including schools, medical services, water, sewage, power, public transport, car parking and roads are in hand and will be synchronised with development, roads are narrow and awkward which will become worse unless pre-empted, and little mention of HS2 despite proximity and impacts.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection</p> <p>1) The issue of the disproportionate allocation of new housing to Balsall Common, compared with both Knowle and Dorridge, both of which have well established town centres, unlike Balsall Common.</p> <p>2) The need to develop a comprehensive Plan for Balsall Common which considers improvements to the infrastructure necessary to support any proposed increase in population.</p> <p>3) The clear logic and evidence for accommodating all proposed housing on the Barrett's Lane site and not developing any of the other suggested sites.</p>
Robert Harrison [3968]			Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>1350 houses in Balsall Common is unbelievable. 4000 extra residents and 2700 extra cars.</p> <p>Roads and lanes around the village are noticeably busier since new developments on Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>Not supported by all Councillors. Would not happen in Knowle.</p> <p>Other areas on outskirts of the village. e.g. Oak Farm on bus routes.</p> <p>Meeting House Lane will become a thoroughfare, lane will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Balsall Common grown enormously over last ten years; reaching maximum capacity.</p> <p>Feel no-one is listening to negative impact proposals will have on this community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ruth Brimble [4981]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Sarah Moore [4698]			Q15/01	Object to level of new housing proposed in Balsall Common which has been unfairly targeted, infrastructure and facilities such as schools, shops, medical services, leisure facilities and parking have hardly changed despite previous developments and are already overstretched, will exacerbate traffic congestion and risk of accidents especially at peak times made worse by JLR site in Honiley, limited job opportunities in village and significant car commuting, will add to construction impacts of HS2, and there are other areas with better facilities that can share the burden with previously developed land used first.
Simon Standley [4985]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/01	Site allocation too large.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Steve & Samantha Townsend & Cook [4336]			Q15/01	<p>Objection to Site 1.</p> <p>Already lack significant park or green play areas.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Not all landowners have been contacted.</p> <p>Loss of landscape character.</p> <p>Proposals shown in the Church Hall had more detail than the DLP.</p> <p>Unfeasible to walk to village centre with shopping.</p> <p>Village will be overrun with traffic.</p> <p>Proposals will completely change look and feel of Balsall Common.</p>
Stuart Drury [4983]			Q15/01	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.</p>
Terry Lee [4027]			Q15/01	<p>Object to the proposal to build more homes in the Green Belt. In particular, I would like my objection to the housing proposed for Barrett's Farm registered. We are not looking forward to HS2 so the idea to build houses nearer to its path than us seems bizarre to say the least.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 1002 is Category 2, partially within HS2 safeguarded zone, 10-25% in flood zone, less than 10% within LWS. Ref. 1016 is Category 1.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5-6.</p> <p>No clear defensible boundary on eastern edge if HS2 not come forward.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - Score is not true reflection of the whole site.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, impact on heritage assets and over 20ha of good quality agricultural land.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/01	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 1002 is Category 2, partially within HS2 safeguarded zone, 10-25% in flood zone, less than 10% within LWS. Ref. 1016 is Category 1.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5-6.</p> <p>No clear defensible boundary on eastern edge if HS2 not come forward.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - Score is not true reflection of the whole site.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, impact on heritage assets and over 20ha of good quality agricultural land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tom Walls [4687]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Tracy Andrews [4573]			Q15/01	Object to housing Site 1 as sufficient brownfield land to fulfil housing requirement so no need for green belt development, bypass will serve as access road only, will not ease pressure on village and should be moved further away, needs access to south as roads to north alone will not cope with increased traffic, will exacerbate lack of parking in centre, at station and surgery, medical services already at capacity, lack of local employment means contrary to policy and car based commuting mainly to north where brownfield land available, contrary to national green belt policy as reduces gap to Coventry.
V Hardwick [4835]			Q15/01	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to fulfil housing requirement and no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, Hallmeadow Road/Station Road unable to cope with additional traffic without access to south, bypass is access road that will add to congestion in village, inadequate parking for village centre, station and medical centre, will encourage more unsustainable car commuting especially on A452, medical services already oversubscribed, and will contribute nothing to benefit village but ruin community feel and add pressure on infrastructure.
Vivian Drury [4984]			Q15/01	<p>The site is Green Belt and will close the gap between Solihull and Coventry. There are enough brownfield sites to meet the housing need in Balsall Common. The bypass will simply provide an access road for the houses and the surrounding roads will not cope. Development will add to commuter traffic through the village. The development will add to existing car parking problems and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Building more houses will encourage more car commuters in an area where there is little employment.</p> <p>It will do nothing to benefit the village and will ruin its community feel.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/01	Whilst there are no designated sites within this site allocation, our mapping data shows numerous ponds, hedgerows and areas of meadow grassland which are likely to have a value to wildlife and biodiversity. Ecological survey results should be used to inform site layout with high value habitats protected as part of any plans.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q15/01	Object to site 1 as green belt so contrary to Government policy, land prevents neighbouring villages from merging and safeguards countryside from encroachment, area is waterlogged in places, vital to land drainage and protects against surface water flooding, flora helps to absorb CO2 and combat climate change, essential buffer to HS2 line, land is diverse and accessible nature reserve providing social/environmental, and health and well being benefits, no evidence demonstrating that brownfield opportunities have been assessed/found unsuitable, will encourage commuting and exacerbate congestion and gridlock especially at Junction 6, and public transport will not be used or inadequate.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Yvonne Naylor [4456]		Q15/01	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic pressure on congested roads.</p> <p>Inadequate parking provision in village for station or local services.</p> <p>Doctors oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Ruin community feel of village.</p> <p>Put further strain on capacity.</p> <p>Impact of construction traffic, added to HS2 construction.</p> <p>Noise, congestion etc from new homes and proposed bypass.</p> <p>Bypass only acting as access road to new houses and not easing congestion pressure in the village.</p> <p>Existing residents impacted by new housing and HS2.</p> <p>Seek no high density housing near boundary with existing housing.</p> <p>Loss of view.</p> <p>Loss of light.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/02 Frog Lane, Balsall Common			
Aidan Blanco [3056]		Q15/02	<p>This green belt site has been selected over more suitable brown field sites in the village and extending existing developments.</p> <p>Will set a precedent and promote additional erosion of the surrounding green belt. Other residents have had to adhere to Green Belt restrictions.</p> <p>Already severe congestion in the area.</p> <p>The site is in a prominent position and development would have a harmful visual impact.</p> <p>The site is a considerable distance from village amenities, including the train station.</p> <p>The extent of development in Balsall Common will have a fundamental and irreversible impact on the village.</p> <p>The site is small.</p>
Alan Douglas [4166]		Q15/02	<p>Object to 1,350 houses in Balsall Common as unacceptable, contrary to Government support for green belt, there is no infrastructure to support intense development, will exacerbate parking problems in village, no faith in planning system to ensure properly managed, existence of rail station is no justification for intensive development, there are other sites that could provide starter homes which will not be delivered in village and housing problem should be addressed by utilising empty floor space above shops.</p>
Alastair McCulloch [3624]		Q15/02	<p>Concerned that the focus of developments proposed in Balsall Common will have the effect of increasing car use in contradiction to the overall intentions of Accessibility policies. The only explicit improvement mentioned is a bypass route for the A452. Extensive new housing is proposed despite existing public transport being insufficient to comply with the criteria specified, and the mix of housing may not lead to adequate usage for any improvements such as an evening bus service or more frequent train services. Site 2 is not within walking distance of most local facilities and has very limited access to public transport.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew King [3581]			Q15/02	Development will result in loss of playing fields at Holly Lane which together with other development in Balsall Common will mean the loss of green space with 4 pitches. Alternative green space will need to be found or existing facilities in the village improved to accommodate multi sports, training and 3 to 4 games per weekend.
Antony Truman [3057]			Q15/02	<p>Frog Lane is a green field site. Why it has been preferred to other available brown field sites?</p> <p>The site is 1.5 miles from local amenities. How does it comply with government planning guidelines?</p> <p>The playing fields are a valuable community amenity and should be preserved. Why is SMBC ignoring these guidelines and why were they added?</p> <p>There is significant congestion in this part of the village. What is the justification for further development in this area, which will only worsen the levels of congestion</p> <p>On what grounds were alternative available brown field sites rejected?</p>
Arabethan Lecuyer [3060]			Q15/02	Object to the proposed housing development on this beloved site in the village. This site has long been used by the entirety of my family, from sporting activity to dog walking. To use it as a housing development would take away an integral part of our village character.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall and Berkswell Football Club (Mr James Aspinall) [3643]			Q15/02	<p>Understand need for housing in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Want to ensure appropriate sports facilities available to families and children.</p> <p>Balsall and Berkswell Football Club lease land from the Council on Lavender Hall Lane and rent pitches in Lavender Park.</p> <p>Sites 1 & 2 would result in 2-4 football pitches being lost to village.</p> <p>Proposed sports facility will not provide external pitch or outdoor facilities.</p> <p>Football Club and Council could develop facilities at grounds and Lavender Hall Park:</p> <p>E.g. Improve playing surface, drainage, car parking, install floodlights, provide integrated sports facility at Lavender Hall, all weather surface for hockey, netball.</p>
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q15/02	<p>Not the right location. Balsall Street East should remain the southern boundary of the village. Breaching this would make the Green Belt boundary less defensible and generate pressure for further development. Site unlikely to deliver affordable housing, similar to Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>Need to protect the playing fields.</p> <p>This number of houses could be accommodated in Knowle and Dorridge.</p>
BC BARRAGE (BC Barrage) [3479]			Q15/02	<p>Concerns about site access and appropriate visibility splays being achieved. There would only be a single point of access and this will have roads safety implications. The area around the school is already gridlocked at peak times and on street parking is an issue. Holly Lane is already becoming a ratrun.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>The proposed allocations in Balsall Common represents an increase in the size of the population for the village of approximately 39%. This is an over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong place adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Development south of the settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, the Green Belt, highway network, surrounding communities and infrastructure.</p>
Bethan Jackson Baker [4495]			Q15/02	Object to housing Site 2 as Balsall Common not an accessible location and has limited employment opportunities resulting in most residents commuting by car, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A452 at peak times and risk of accidents, and will add to parking problems in village centre.
Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]			Q15/02	As per comments re site 1 (Barratts farm)
Carol Colclough [4588]			Q15/02	Object to proposal for 1,000+ houses in Balsall Common on top of growth over last 10 years, attempt to justify as split between 2 parishes, unfairness in targeting village when other villages such as Berkswell, Hampton and Meriden have few or none and has not been justified, disregard to green belt, failure to focus on infrastructure capacity and demand to determine distribution of new housing, and to loss of allotments and playing fields that are used by local residents and children at a time when people being encouraged to exercise.
Carol Walker [3989]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection.</p> <p>Protest about Sites in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Green Belt.</p>
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q15/02	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 75 is only part of Site 2. No assessment been made of eastern section, should be removed from allocation. If no willing landowners not a Category 1 site.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Makes maximum contribution towards GB purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - other than close proximity to primary school site scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/02	Contrary to policies to protect the Green Belt, would harm attractive open countryside and remove playing fields.
Cromwell & Duggins Lane Residents Association (Mr P McDonald) [2265]			Q15/02	We do not feel therefore that the housing numbers and locations at Barrat's Farm, Windmill Lane and Frog Lane are appropriate in size or location relative to the Meriden Gap and certainly don't comply with the NPPF concerning the protection of green belt land.
David Collier [3284]			Q15/02	site 2 objection
Debbie Wylde [4546]			Q15/02	Object to level of housing in Balsall Common as will turn it into a town without facilities or infrastructure to cope with additional population, and road network and public transport will need improvement.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Diane & Andrew Cunningham [2975]			Q15/02	We are totally opposed to Frog Lane being development because of the loss of playing fields.
Diane & Andrew Cunningham [2975]			Q15/02	<p>Frog Lane is a greenfield site. Why has it been earmarked in preference to available brown field sites in the area?</p> <p>The south of Balsall Common is the most congested part of the village so why are you proposing yet another development here?</p> <p>The playing fields are a valuable public amenity. Local football teams use it regularly. Dog walkers also use it regularly.</p> <p>Schools are full. Doctors surgeries are full. Lack of decent shopping amenities and parking is a nightmare.</p>
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q15/02	Object to housing Site 2 as green belt land should not be used where alternative previously developed land available as exceptional circumstances not demonstrated, fails to meet accessibility criteria as bus services infrequent and too far from school/amenities to discourage car use, rail services/parking over capacity, will increase traffic on roads already gridlocked especially at peak times and danger to children, parking in and around village limited, schools oversubscribed, limited employment results in commuting by car and not compliant with national or local planning policies or sustainable.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q15/02	<p>I don't consider that the selection criteria have been correctly applied:</p> <p>*This is GREEN BELT LAND and this should have over-riding priority over all other criteria.</p> <p>*It will further increase the size of the village causing additional problems in traffic congestion, parking, overcrowding of the secondary school (and hence further lowering academic standards), and service provision.</p> <p>*It will permanently contribute to further ALTERING THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE, which would be completely at odds with the Borough's policies.</p> <p>There should therefore be NO BUILDING on Frog Lane, AND IT SHOULD BE LOCATED ADJACENT TO A LARGE CONURBATION - SOLIHULL</p>
Elta Estates (Helen Lavery) [3169]			Q15/02	<p>Object, as will result in a change to the Green Belt boundary, loss of local playing fields and allotments, increased traffic using the road network which is already overloaded and congested, compounded by impact of new Jaguar Land Rover facility, and future highway safety issues. Should consider more suitable brownfield sites in north of village close to local amenities, rail and road main networks which would not impact on current residents of the village.</p>
Emily Evans [3371]			Q15/02	<p>site 2 objection</p>
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q15/02	<p>Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Father Peter Thomas [2991]		Q15/02	<p>The fields and allotments are included which are well used by the community.</p> <p>A widened/upgraded Frog Lane is no more a defensible boundary than the existing greenbelt boundary.</p> <p>Traffic issues, especially with new Jaguar Landrover site.</p> <p>There are brownfield sites closer to amenities to the north of Balsall Common that could be used but are not included in the proposals. Therefore find it difficult to justify using greenbelt land in preference to the brownfield sites.</p> <p>Impact of HS2 construction traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Gemma Blanco [4349]		Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection.</p> <p>Understand need for additional housing in Solihull, but Frog Lane unsuitable.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are available or extend existing developments.</p> <p>Proposal does not include provision of infrastructure. Would put pressure on school places. Balsall Common Primary is already at full capacity.</p> <p>Congestion.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and doctors.</p> <p>Loss of local recreational land.</p> <p>On wrong site of village. Too far from railway station, shops.</p> <p>Will increase congestion around primary and secondary school. Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Will set an unwelcome precedent.</p> <p>Development not large enough to solve housing shortage.</p> <p>Recommend one large site instead.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Geoff Seabridge [2972]			Q15/02	Frog Lane is narrow. It will definitely need to be widened. Objects to use of the playing fields. The development is more than 1.5 miles from local facilities which is outside government guidelines. Motorists speed past the junction of Frog Lane / Balsall Street which makes for potential road accidents. The southern side of Balsall Common is already congested. Why push the village footprint further south and east when there are more suitable brownfield sites within the existing footprint of Balsall Common.
Gillian & Carl Archer [4189]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unnecessary destruction of the Green belt - have had development in recent years - windmill lane: issues with traffic management. cars for commuting are essential - Parking at the railway station in BC is an issue - congestion in the centre of BC, development will add to this. - concerned about presue and impact on social infrastructure
Gilly Dale [2985]			Q15/02	<p>Loss of playing fields.</p> <p>Increased traffic congestion and highway safety issues.</p> <p>Why is Frog Lane being proposed given that it scored below other local sites and other brown field sites in Solihull and to the north of Balsall Common that are served by much better access and local amenities.</p> <p>The primary school is at capacity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heart of England School (Mrs Anne Lycett) [3805]			Q15/02	<p>This allocation would potentially result in the Heart of England's school playing fields being considered for residential development in next 5 years.</p> <p>School has 125 year lease with Council.</p> <p>If playing fields are built on in part or in full, School would require compensatory playing fields in close proximity to main buildings.</p> <p>If Balsall Common Primary School were re-built on a new site, then Heart of England could use the Primary school land for educational use and add to their playing fields.</p>
Helen Goodwin [4636]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection</p> <p>not a viable or appropriate development.</p> <p>green belt areas of land. several brownfield sites more suited.</p> <p>situated on the south side of the village - increase in traffic on already overwhelmed road system, a hazard to the pedestrian traffic, made up of a very high percentage of children)</p> <p>an abundance of wild life living and visiting, at the moment the fieldfares are on the Frog Lane fields along with buzzards, muntjac deer, French partridge and bullfinches.</p>
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/02	<p>Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.</p>
Hollie Lecuyer [3059]			Q15/02	<p>Object to the proposed housing development on HOLLY Lane playing fields. I regularly use this site along with my family to walk our dog, jog and participate in other fitness activities. I have never seen these fields empty, and hope that this is not taken away from the many residents that use it in the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Howard Farrand [3273]			Q15/02	<p>do not think that site 2 (frog lane) is the right location, as it performs less well than site 240 in terms of accessibility to PT (rail transport) which has not been included in the DLP. Also the GB assessment of this site is somewhat subjective and in fact would make GB boundary less defensible.</p> <p>the sites around dorridge should also be considered for delivering housing.</p> <p>congestion on roads from existing road users at peak times</p>
Ian Morrey [4541]			Q15/02	<p>Object to level of housing proposed for Balsall Common as roads, parking and services would be unable to cope, and should be replaced by smaller developments on periphery of village with existing or new road links.</p>
Jeremy Dale [3254]			Q15/02	<p>Recreation ground is an important amenity for residents, providing space for individuals and families to play and participate in physical activity and sports. Loss of this Green Belt space will significantly reduce local residents' opportunities to maintain physical fitness. . Convenient access to outdoor space is vital if we want to give everyone the chance to exercise to improve their health, and this will become ever more important as the population of Balsall Common grows.</p> <p>Proposal is not justified in light of SMBC's Public Health strategy, strategy for playing fields, and Sport England's guidance on maintaining recreation grounds.</p>
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q15/02	<p>Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John & Janet Taylor [4595]			Q15/02	<p>Objection to development in BC per se:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate infrastructure (schools, medical) - congestion/gridlock on roads - Parking is insufficient
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q15/02	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
Jonathan Moore [4680]			Q15/02	Object to Site 2 as green belt and should not be considered before the 14 identified brownfield sites, Balsall Street East is already congestion hotspot that will worsen with JLR traffic with increased incidence of accidents at Holly Lane junction and close to schools, is on outskirts of village meaning journeys by car adding to congestion and parking problems, access would be more appropriate from Frog Lane than Balsall Street East, will increase risk of flooding at low points on north side of Balsall Street East, impacts of car headlights on property, trees and wildlife and on aircraft flight paths.
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q15/02	Object to site 2 as development will destroy green belt land rather than using brownfield alternatives, add to congestion hotspots on A452, site scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School, journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties, schools and medical services cannot cope with further increase and loss of Holly Lane Playing fields public open space.
Karen Bell [4586]			Q15/02	Object to total of 1150 new houses in Balsall Common as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed, the medical/welfare facilities, schools, shops, parking, public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate, would sacrifice valuable green belt in the Meriden Gap with important environmental and social benefits, and encourage reinstatement of bypass line.
Katie Roe [3282]			Q15/02	site 2 objection on the basis that it is a popular site used by dog walkers, walkers, and local football teams.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Keith Batty [3639]			Q15/02	Object to Balsall Common housing proposals as disproportionate and should be spread more evenly across Borough to reduce environmental impact, there are pockets of brownfield land that should be used to reduce loss of green belt, not balanced by additional employment opportunities creating even more of a dormitory settlement than at present leading to additional congestion and parking around the station, and when added to HS2 construction will make life almost intolerable.
landowners land Balsall Common [3754]	Mr Roy Hammond	Howkins & Harrison (Mr Roy Hammond) [3714]	Q15/02	site 2 - support
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 75 is only part of Site 2. No assessment been made of eastern section, should be removed from allocation. If no willing landowners not a Category 1 site.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Makes maximum contribution towards GB purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - other than close proximity to primary school site scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent.</p>
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q15/02	Object to site 2 as development will destroy green belt land rather than using brownfield alternatives, add to congestion hotspots on A452, site scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School, journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties, schools and medical services cannot cope with further increase and loss of Holly Lane Playing fields public open space.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q15/02	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q15/02	Object to site 2 as development will add to congestion hotspots on A452, site scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School, journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties, and loss of Holly Lane Playing fields public open space.
Marie Lecuyer [3061]			Q15/02	I would like to formally object to this proposed housing development on Holly Lane playing field. This site is regularly used by my family and a large number of the Balsall Common residents.
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q15/02	<p>Will add to the congestion hotspots on the A452 caused by northbound traffic heading to the main employment centres.</p> <p>Scores poorly in relation to all accessibility criteria, as defined by SMBC, apart from the Primary School. As such most journeys to the shops, medical centre and railway station will have to be by car, adding to the existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p>
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q15/02	<p>Objection to Site 2, Frog Lane.</p> <p>Not suitable as requires significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Worst traffic hotspot in Balsall Common, queues, parking outside Primary School, dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>Preferable sites (some part brownfield) to north of Balsall Common.</p> <p>Playing fields should not be built on, lack of public green space in south of village.</p> <p>Sport England should be consulted.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Martin Green [3108]			Q15/02	<p>Lack of supporting infrastructure - parking, increased traffic, lack of police presence, schools above capacity.</p> <p>Loss of view and devaluation of properties.</p> <p>Loss of playing fields.</p> <p>Housing development will exacerbate impact of HS2 and flight path change from airport.</p>
Mary Dawson [2981]			Q15/02	<p>Not only is Frog Lane in the green belt, it offers a valuable well used public amenity by junior football teams, walkers and families. It is in the south of the borough which is already a very congested area without the appropriate infrastructure to support further housing. There are brown field sites which offer increased opportunity for development. Why have government guide lines been ignored and no consultation has taken place?</p>
Michael Watkinson [3576]			Q15/02	<p>Encroachment onto Green Belt, when there is brownfield land available.</p>
Michael Wylde [4544]			Q15/02	<p>Object to level of new housing in Balsall Common as will turn it into town, there are no plans to manage increased traffic, road network public transport and parking insufficient for expansion, centre cannot be expanded yet houses proposed close to centre, there are better sites for development which would minimise impact such as Oakes Farm and north of the village.</p>
Miss Emma Sewell [3704]			Q15/02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BC not a high Frequency transport location and therefore not most accessible - has limited employment opportunities - 14 brownfield sites in the settlement - should be considered ahead of greenfield sites - will add to the congestion hotspots on the

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Brad & Eleanor Lee [2974]			Q15/02	<p>Frog Lane and the playing fields is used to walk dogs. It is used by local sports clubs.</p> <p>Balsall Street East is already congested at school pick-up time. There will be increased parking problems. The facilities in Balsall Common will not be able to cope with this increase in population.</p> <p>Why is a green field site being considered over other brownfield sites that were initially identified.</p>
Mr & Mrs Chris & Jean Brooks [3106]			Q15/02	<p>Would require significant improvement to infrastructure which is not provided by this proposal.</p> <p>Increased volume of traffic would be via Gypsy Lane. Bearing in mind the presence of the High School, the size of Lane and the congestion currently experienced at peak times, this would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Jaguar Land Rover site will increase the traffic volume in Balsall Common and this should be also be considered by the council.</p> <p>The loss of green spaces and playing fields.</p>
Mr & Mrs Philip & Sharon Lapworth [2949]			Q15/02	<p>Why have more suitable brownfield sites not been chosen?</p> <p>The site includes playing fields and ore houses than was shown the local exhibition.</p> <p>This part of Balsall Common in the most congested part of the village.</p> <p>Highway safety issues.</p> <p>Site is 1.5 miles from centre of the village.</p> <p>Sites to the north of the village are more suitable.</p> <p>Frog Lane has a poor accessibility score.</p> <p>Failure to justify the allocation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs D A & S F Timmis [2969]			Q15/02	Why has the site been preferred to other available brownfield sites? Brownfield sites to the north of the village have been ignored. Object to the loss of playing fields which are well used and allotments. The site includes wildlife. It is distant from local facilities. The south of Balsall Common is the most congested part of the village. The schools are crowded.
Mr & Mrs George & Alice Tipton [2980]			Q15/02	<p>Why develop this green field sites when there are brownfield sites far more suitable?</p> <p>The playing fields are an important local amenity.</p> <p>The area is already congested.</p> <p>Infrastructure.</p> <p>Accept that there is a need for new houses, but should be affordable with public transport to support it.</p>
Mr & Mrs Jagger [4299]			Q15/02	<p>Objection to Site 2.</p> <p>Green Belt land should not be built on until other brownfield sites have been developed.</p> <p>Green Belt is Green Belt which means no houses or development.</p> <p>The Meriden Gap must stay without development.</p> <p>Lack of consideration of infrastructure needs to accommodate 1350 extra homes.</p>
Mr & Mrs Jonathan & Helen Brown [3058]			Q15/02	<p>Objection to loss of public open space at Holly Lane which is well used.</p> <p>Increased traffic would pose an increased accident concern to an already busy junction and along roads that are the main walking and vehicular routes to both main schools.</p> <p>We understand that new housing developments are key to the sustainable growth of Balsall Common, but it is clear that other areas are more convenient and less disruptive.</p> <p>A bypass for traffic is needed and future housing would be better zones around this area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Mark & Susan Fitton [3062]			Q15/02	<p>It is green field site and established community facility. It is unclear why it has been selected over brownfield sites in the Borough.</p> <p>The site scores highly in terms of Green Belt assessment and should be preserved at all costs.</p> <p>The south side of the village is already the most congested area. This development will increase congestion issues and heighten pollution.</p> <p>Site is 1.5 miles from local amenities.</p> <p>Pressure on existing medical and schooling facilities.</p> <p>Parking and traffic is already chaotic and HS2 development will further impact.</p> <p>Increased traffic will heighten potential for accidents along Balsall Street East.</p>
Mr & Mrs Martin & Charlotte Scarrott [3050]			Q15/02	<p>Object to use of the playing field which is a valuable public amenity. The playing fields should be preserved.</p>
Mr Andrew Dean [3073]			Q15/02	<p>A single access to the site will be problematic. Further busy junction will be created and access risk for emergency services. Will blight surrounding properties.</p> <p>Flood risk issues.</p> <p>Increased traffic in an area with pedestrian activity. Will result in highway safety issues.</p> <p>Will increase traffic along Frog Lane, which will change its character and increase accidents.</p> <p>Impact on character and vista of existing properties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr C Edwards [4622]			Q15/02	There is previously developed land available in the village which has not been allocated. The local infrastructure cannot cope. The site is a considerable distance from local facilities resulting in increased car use.
Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]			Q15/02	Proposal should incorporate significantly improved leisure facilities to reduce need for existing and new residents to travel, including swimming pool, gym, all weather pitches, squash courts and space for community/club activities, additional facilities for existing clubs, improved rights of access to maintain leisure walking routes, and use of HS2 buffer for enhanced facilities, additional school places for Catholic children as St George and St Teresa school oversubscribed and bus service threatened, and improved accessibility by increasing train and station parking capacity, and improving parking in Station Road.
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q15/02	Object to total of 1150 new houses in Balsall Common as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed, the medical/welfare facilities, schools, shops, parking, public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate, would sacrifice valuable green belt in the Meriden Gap with important environmental and social benefits, and encourage reinstatement of bypass line.
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q15/02	Extending the western fringe by developing Frog Lane is nonsense; Balsall Street is already a defensible boundary. The policies in respect of landscape will be compromised by this proposal.
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q15/02	The Frog Lane site is not huge and the Windmill Lane site is infilling the triangle already being developed. Whilst I don't like to see development on the greenbelt I don't have a view on these small sites.
Mr Gerard O'Regan [3012]			Q15/02	I strongly object to the proposed loss of the playing fields located in the Frog Lane site, Balsall Common. Playing fields are a rare and precious facility that should be preserved for the community. There are plenty of alternative locations to build new houses without the need to build on this facility. The playing fields were not part of the original consultation when this location was originally proposed, they appear to have been added as an after thought.
Mr Harry Siggs [2970]			Q15/02	No exceptional circumstances to justify development in the Green Belt when there are many brownfield sites within the Borough that could be developed. The site provides valuable public amenity and access to the surrounding countryside. Objects to the use of the playing fields which is contrary to planning guidance.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr J L Halton [2977]			Q15/02	<p>Site is far from the village and residents will use their cars.</p> <p>Will add to congestion in the area at peak times and lead to highway safety issues.</p> <p>Object to loss of playing fields and there are several brownfield sites in more suitable parts of the village.</p> <p>Plans pushed through without proper consultation.</p>
Mr John Thornhill [3372]			Q15/02	<p>There should be no building houses on green belt farm land. Where are we going to get our food from during the next war?</p> <p>There is no extra provision for parking in the village centre.</p> <p>How will the roads cope with the increase in pupil numbers at the local schools. Drop off and pick up time is terrible now.</p> <p>Frog Lane development. We keep cattle in a field in the winter in Frog Lane and with all the extra traffic, lights and noise etc. we won't be able to use it. So that will be the end of our business!</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q15/02	<p>Inherent danger that large scale development of the kind proposed for Balsall Common and Berkswell will make it a less attractive area in which to live, and this must be of major consideration in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Urbanisation of countryside.</p> <p>Major investment needed in local services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Need for clear defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of landscape character.</p> <p>Loss of green infrastructure assets.</p>
Mr King [3281]			Q15/02	Objecting to site 2 and instead its replacement with Oakes farm
Mr Leslie Noble [3503]			Q15/02	<p>I object to the Local Plan proposal for Balsall Common under references 1at Barratts Farm, 2 at Frog Lane & 3 at Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>All these plans for Balsall do not give sufficient consideration for the infrastructure of Balsall Common; the impact on the local primary school, GP surgery and village centre etc. I would support a plan where one housing site catering for all the housing needs and incorporating a school and shops is built. I understand that land is available to the north of the village for such a proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr Marcus Jones [2979]		Q15/02	<p>Impact on property both in terms of its surrounds and market value.</p> <p>Development on Green Belt. Own property development had to adhere to very strict guidelines.</p> <p>Why has the playing fields been added? It is used by local football teams and for other activities.</p> <p>Proposal not viable in terms of traffic generation and local infrastructure.</p> <p>Parking issues.</p> <p>Potential for accidents along Holly Lane due to additional traffic.</p> <p>Lack of correspondence.</p> <p>Must be more suitable brownfield land.</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of the allotments.</p> <p>Property will be overlooked.</p> <p>Local disruption during construction.</p> <p>The area is the most congested in the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Nelson [3009]			Q15/02	<p>The playing fields are a very valuable asset to this side of Balsall Common, which is used regularly.</p> <p>Why move the green belt line to Frog Lane?</p> <p>Why build so far away from local amenities?</p> <p>Why use green belt? there are already brown field sites identified by Solihull Council?</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure - local schools and health care facilities.</p> <p>This part of Balsall Common has been identified as being the most congested.</p>
Mr Mike Ross [2971]			Q15/02	<p>There is already traffic congestion in this part of Balsall Common, leading to dangerous driving conditions, parking and highway safety issues. Why has this green field site been considered when brownfield sites to the north of the village have not been identified. The playing fields are a valuable and well-used public amenity which should be preserved at all costs. The site is 1.5 miles from local facilities and therefore unsustainable. What about impact on schools, doctors and parking in the village.</p>
Mr Paul Law [3008]			Q15/02	<p>Object to use of playing fields.</p> <p>Frog Lane is one of the few remaining, untouched rural lanes in existence anywhere in the country.</p> <p>Why are the proposed sites within the green belt? Surely there are brownfield sites within the Borough.</p> <p>Reconsider using Balsall Common as a dumping ground without even due consideration for maintaining the existing facilities.</p>
Mr R & Mrs B Collins [4729]			Q15/02	<p>Object to housing proposals for Balsall Common as green belt land which will impact significantly on community and rural setting, centre cannot take more parking and station parking inadequate, primary school cannot sustain further children, 2 large developments in last 10 years without improved facilities, recent development crammed on sites and not affordable, and there is land outside area that is more suitable, whilst Knowle/Dorridge benefit from better infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>The proposed allocations in Balsall Common represents an increase in the size of the population for the village of approximately 39%. This is an over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong place adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Development south of the settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, the Green Belt, highway network, surrounding communities and infrastructure.</p>
Mrs Irene Thompson [4127]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/02	<p>site is less well connected to the village centre and performs poorly against a number of assessments [studies].</p> <p>it will also not deliver the school infrastructure until sites 1 and 3 have been delivered.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 75 is only part of Site 2. No assessment been made of eastern section, should be removed from allocation. If no willing landowners not a Category 1 site.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Makes maximum contribution towards GB purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - other than close proximity to primary school site scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent.</p>
Mrs Angela Stuart-Smith [3749]			Q15/02	<p>I agree Frog Lane - Oakes farm site suitable. Traffic kept out of centre of village and numbers sustainable plus easy access to Warwick, M40.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Brenda Price [2992]			Q15/02	<p>There are many brownfield sites that could be redeveloped before green field land is encroached on.</p> <p>Why have brownfield sites to the north of the village been ignored.</p> <p>Development will be under the flight path.</p> <p>The playing field should be preserved. It was included without local community knowledge or discussion.</p> <p>Increase in traffic in an area that is the most congested part of the village.</p> <p>Schools exceed capacity.</p> <p>Needs investment in infrastructure including schools, health.</p> <p>Disproportionate development in Balsall Common and will exacerbate other developments like HS2.</p>
Mrs Breytenbach [3280]			Q15/02	site 2 objection received via Oakes Farm survey
Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]			Q15/02	does not see this as being the right location

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection.</p> <p>Need to look at brownfield sites, not Green Belt.</p> <p>Recent Government White Paper stated that Green Belt should be protected.</p> <p>Need to protect Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Appreciate we have a housing shortfall. Council should seek to develop sites that current residents are happy with.</p> <p>Will add to construction traffic from HS2.</p> <p>Lack of sufficient school places and public transport.</p>
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q15/02	<p>Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.</p>
Mrs Eleanor Lee [3369]			Q15/02	<p>site 2 objection</p>
Mrs Elsie Crook [3006]			Q15/02	<p>Objects to loss of the green space and the playing fields which are well used.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and highway safety issues.</p> <p>Poor bus services.</p>
Mrs Farren [3283]			Q15/02	<p>site 2 objections</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q15/02	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green spaces.</p> <p>Impact on Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Too many houses proposed in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and local facilities needs to be addressed.</p>
Mrs Gillian Dale [3490]			Q15/02	<p>Confused as to why SMBC have chosen Frog Lane given its lower scoring in relation to other sites around the borough.</p> <p>Is there any awareness in SMBC as to the traffic congestion twice daily around the Balsall Street East, Holly Lane, Alder Lane and Gypsy Lane junction? This junction is an accident hotspot and has been for the last 19 years. I have witnessed and helped casualties from these accidents on many occasions. I have voiced my concerns to SMBC in the past regarding this issue.</p> <p>Does the proposed development of Frog Lane still include the playing fields?</p>
Mrs Gillian Stansfield [3076]			Q15/02	<p>Object to use of allotments and playing fields. It is important for those who do not have a garden.</p> <p>Also, the road is extremely busy during certain times of the day outside the school and I would sincerely hope thought is given to any new houses on this road as it could not take any additional traffic. There is also the problem with increasing the school numbers. Although I do not have any connection with the school I am aware it is fully subscribed.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Helen Dean [2920]		Q15/02	<p>Flooding.</p> <p>Additional traffic will impact on lives of residents and wildlife.</p> <p>Speed of traffic on Balsall Street East. The development would lead to more cars and create a further dangerous junction.</p> <p>The pavements are inequitable.</p> <p>Noise pollution for existing and future residents.</p> <p>There is already an existing definable Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Poor public transport links.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be closer to employment opportunities.</p> <p>Security to existing properties would be compromised.</p> <p>Lack of policing and emergency support in the area.</p> <p>Object to loss of playing fields.</p> <p>The site is greenfield. Several brownfield sites in the village that have not been chosen.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Janet Purnell [2976]		Q15/02	<p>Frog Lane is a Green Field site. Why has it been preferred to other available Brown Field sites?</p> <p>Why was the playing field added at such a late stage without any public consultation or knowledge?</p> <p>Solihull Connected acknowledges that the south of Balsall Common is the most congested part of the village. Why propose another development here?</p> <p>Brown Field sites to the north were identified and appeared in the original shortlist of potential sites.</p> <p>The playing fields are a valuable, well used public amenity.</p>
Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]		Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection.</p> <p>Balsall Common not a suitable 'town centre'. Improving the centre has to be a priority before any new housing.</p> <p>Settlement does not meet Council's own accessibility criteria.</p> <p>Allocation of 20% of new housing here is contrary to policy.</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>More cars will increase carbon footprint.</p> <p>Note that plan does not mention bungalows or facilities for older residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kirsty King [3592]			Q15/02	Object to proposal for 1150 houses in Balsall Common, as on Green Belt land, in ancient Forest of Arden and the Meriden Gap, is in breach of the Government's White Paper, which specifies that building on greenbelt should be avoided when other sites are available, and to Site 1 which is a farm containing footpaths, playing fields and sites of interest, the village will not cope, Station Road/Kenilworth Road already too busy, there is a lack of transport, services, amenities, schools are already full, and building is coinciding with HS2 which will turn village into a building site for years.
Mrs Lynda Moore [4233]			Q15/02	<p>- Balsall Common is being unfairly targeted, especially as the development allocated to Berkswell parish, actually impacts on Balsall Common village</p> <p>- How can this site be considered, when there are 14 identified sites of previous development, which must</p>
Mrs Manjit Kaur-badial [3748]			Q15/02	<p>Should not review housing to the detriment of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Balsall Common Primary school is oversubscribed. Should reduce catchment to just Balsall Common.</p> <p>Sports pitches in the village would be sufficient if Council did not dispose of recreation ground at Site 2.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Site 1 is preferred to Site 2 as it is close to the train station. Would reduce traffic coming through the village.</p> <p>Balsall Street and Balsall Street East should be retained as southern defensible GB boundary.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Already encroached towards Holly Lane from JLR.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Margot Brown [2982]		Q15/02	<p>Why build in the countryside and Green Belt where there is an abundance of wildlife, hedgerow and greenery. The countryside begins behind Balsall Street; it is indefensible that Holly Lane and Frog Lane are suddenly being spoken about as the boundary of the Green Belt - we already have one - Balsall Street!</p> <p>Why build on greenfield site when there are other partly developed sites closer to village amenities.</p> <p>Object to development of the playing fields.</p> <p>New houses will be under the flight path.</p> <p>Existing lack of facilities.</p> <p>The south of the village is the most congested part.</p>
Mrs Maxine White [3854]		Q15/02	<p>Concerns that flood plains will be used to build on. Where will the additional water drain to. Will the local rivers flood and damage the local environment?</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]		Q15/02	<p>Site 2 preferable to Sites 1 and 3.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of village character.</p> <p>Impact on local amenities and services. No mention is made of shopping, banking etc, as banks are withdrawing from Balsall Common.</p> <p>Car parking facilities are limited in the village. Dangerous in some areas.</p> <p>Demolition of Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion.</p> <p>Poor existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Poor public sector connectivity with the local economic centres which are primarily to the East and South i.e. NOT Solihull and this is the way traffic flows at peak times.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Sally Bell [3005]			Q15/02	<p>South of Balsall Common is the most highly congested in terms of traffic.</p> <p>Accessibility: does not meet the Council's own criteria.</p> <p>Brownfield sites were identified to the north of the village but were not considered</p> <p>Heritage: Frog Lane is one of the last surviving historic lanes in the village. Duty to protect it and its wide variety of wildlife.</p> <p>There is already a clearly defined defensible boundary.</p> <p>Impact of HS2 development coinciding with new development in the village.</p> <p>Congestion, especially with Jaguar LandRover site to the south and resulting highway safety issues.</p>
Mrs Salt [3362]			Q15/02	prefer another site
Mrs V Higgins [4497]			Q15/02	Object to housing in Balsall Common as green belt in Meriden Gap when growth should be on brownfield sites near good transport links and other infrastructure saving green belt for future generations, and village has inadequate centre with poor and insufficient parking.
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q15/02	<p>Will add to proven congestion hotspots to the south of Balsall Common and add to traffic delays. Development of the site is contrary to draft local plan policies P7 and P9.</p> <p>The site score poorly in relation to all accessibility criteria apart from the primary school. Therefore most journeys will be by car.</p> <p>The sites are Green Belt and very special circumstance to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt has not been demonstrated. There are 14 previously developed sites available that have not been properly considered.</p> <p>Inclusion of the playing fields is contrary to other policies in the DLP.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Ms Ellen Darlison [3307]		Q15/02	<p>Contradicts many of the aims of the DLP.</p> <p>Looks like a dash for cash rather than meeting the Borough's housing needs.</p> <p>Playing fields and allotments are key contributors to health and well-being. Both are important for community cohesion and physical activity. These should not be built on.</p> <p>Not an accessible location.</p> <p>Will result in 150+ extra cars.</p> <p>Existing congestion in village.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Environmental study of ancient meadow on western part of site was carried out, but is not in the public domain. Can this be made available?</p> <p>Ground water flooding on site.</p>
Ms Emma Harris [3634]		Q15/02	<p>There is insufficient existing infrastructure to support the proposed increase in housing in Balsall Common, which will exacerbate traffic congestion at peak times, result in increased difficulty parking and overstretched local amenities, reduce desirability and character of village, and impact on environment and loss of open space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Susan Agnama [3078]			Q15/02	<p>Developers should be expected to provide solutions, not create more problems.</p> <p>Need for appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>Need to provide sufficient school places.</p> <p>Need to consider impact of traffic increases.</p> <p>Need to increase and improve sustainable transport options.</p> <p>Need to provide activities for teenagers and children.</p> <p>Need to balance green policy with housing development.</p> <p>Need to give same degree of consideration to transport infrastructure/environment and aesthetics in Balsall Common as in Dorridge with new Sainsbury's development.</p>
Neil Jackson Baker [4668]			Q15/02	<p>Object to housing Site 2 as Balsall Common not an accessible location and has limited employment opportunities resulting in most residents commuting by car, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A452 at peak times and risk of accidents, and will add to parking problems in village centre.</p>
Neil Sears [3923]			Q15/02	<p>Objection to Site 2.</p> <p>Solihull Connected strategy states south of Balsall Common is most congested part of village.</p> <p>Will add to A452 and B4101 congestion hotspots.</p> <p>Will delay drivers and increase risk of accidents.</p> <p>Not accessible location - 1.5 miles from local amenities.</p> <p>Parking difficulties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Sloane [3662]			Q15/02	Object to housing sites in Balsall Common on Green Belt grounds as proposals contravene the latest Government White Paper directive that green belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances and where there is no alternative, in that there are 14 brownfield sites in and around Balsall Common that have been ignored.
Nicola Cleaver [4188]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as it means releasing land from the green belt. - insufficient consideration given to brownfield land/site elsewhere in the borough in preparing the DLP - negative impact on BC and the settlement - pressure on existing infrastructure
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 75 is only part of Site 2. No assessment been made of eastern section. Should therefore be removed from allocation. If no willing landowners not a Category 1 site.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Makes maximum contribution towards GB purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - other than close proximity to primary school site scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area could only accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent.</p>
Pam Gunn [3448]			Q15/02	Concern over the inclusion of the Holly Lane allotments and their future. They are a unique facility in the village and provide a social, emotional and healthy activity to many people.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Parminder S Badial [4584]			Q15/02	Object to housing Site 2 and do not support bypass as details unclear, primary school should be adequate providing just serve needs of village, and there are sufficient sports and recreation grounds serving village providing Holly Lane recreation ground is retained for recreational purposes, village has already had green belt reduced with JLR expansion and further growth should not be at expense of green belt land, Balsall Street should be defensible southern boundary to village and new housing needs to be supported by plans for medical services, shops and bus services.
Paul Moore [3990]			Q15/02	Increased traffic, particularly with development of JLR at Honiley will add to existing congestion hotspot at Balsall Street East. Object to inclusion of the recreation facilities when the plan emphasises the importance of such facilities. The site scores poorly in terms of accessibility criteria as defined by SMBC apart from the Primary School
Paul Morgan [3053]			Q15/02	This green belt land and has been selected over more suitable sites in the village - in particular the brown field sites and extending existing developments. The roads in this part of Balsall Common are severely congested. The development would increase the problem. The development will be a blight on the countryside and can be seen from miles away due to its prominent position. The site is a considerable distance from village amenities, in particular the train station.
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q15/02	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Cross [3082]			Q15/02	<p>Poor public transport access and will therefore exacerbate existing parking problems at the station.</p> <p>Increased housing will need more infrastructure. School traffic will increase. A junior school to the north end of Balsall Common will relieve pressure around Holly Lane/Balsall Street.</p> <p>Frog Lane is distant from centre of the village and other amenities like GP surgery.</p> <p>Would remove green space with public access. This needs to be preserved.</p> <p>Future development would be under the flight path.</p>
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q15/02	<p>This site has erroneous analysis of the proximity to the primary school, and limited bus connections.</p> <p>Accessibility is to a school that is full to bursting point, and causes significant traffic issues. Overall access to other village amenities is poor - station, shops and surgeries are all at the other end of the village, and so this location will add to short journey car traffic in the village, as well as having to cross the A452 artery to reach any of these facilities.</p> <p>Access from Balsall Street East is a concern as there is already congestion in the morning peak.</p>
Philip Colclough [3572]			Q15/02	<p>The proposed development at site 2 (Frog Lane) will completely spoil one of the finest landscape views in the village looking south west.. It covers an area of allotments which have only been open in the past few years and a sports field which is the only available sports field on the west side of the A452. This is currently used by village football teams, joggers, walkers, dog walkers and is one of the few "quiet" environments left in BC away from traffic noise and pollution.</p> <p>Remove site 2 from the DLP as a prime piece of community used land offering a totally rural & tranquil environment away from traffic & pollution enjoyed by residents of all ages.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Philip Wood [4552]			Q15/02	Object to housing proposals in Balsall Common as use of green belt not justified because due consideration not given to brownfield opportunities, fails to meet accessibility criteria and has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, phasing of all allocations at same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement as insufficient time to plan for infrastructure improvements and contravenes managed growth approach.
Professor David Walton [3795]			Q15/02	Concerned about lack of significance given to green belt designation if it can be so easily cast aside and precedence for further growth, developments proposed will change the nature of Balsall Common from semi-rural to more town-like, it is hard to tell if the necessary improvements to local services and facilities including schools, medical services, water, sewage, power, public transport, car parking and roads are in hand and will be synchronised with development, roads are narrow and awkward which will become worse unless pre-empted, and little mention of HS2 despite proximity and impacts.
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection</p> <p>1) The issue of the disproportionate allocation of new housing to Balsall Common, compared with both Knowle and Dorridge, both of which have well established town centres, unlike Balsall Common.</p> <p>2) The need to develop a comprehensive Plan for Balsall Common which considers improvements to the infrastructure necessary to support any proposed increase in population.</p> <p>3) The clear logic and evidence for accommodating all proposed housing on the Barrett's Lane site and not developing any of the other suggested sites.</p>
Professor Jeremy Dale [2986]			Q15/02	<p>Playing fields are an important local amenity, important for health and well being and should be preserved.</p> <p>It is contrary to the Council's Public Health strategy, strategy for playing fields, and Sport England's guidance on maintaining recreation grounds.</p>
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/02	No strategic reason to allocate land at Frog Lane for development. Better to replace this with a selection of smaller sites at the northern end of the village that could deliver the same additional housing numbers at a faster rate. That would help to round the village and spread the burden of new development in the village.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Harrison [3968]			Q15/02	<p>Site 2 Objection.</p> <p>1350 houses in Balsall Common is unbelievable. 4000 extra residents and 2700 extra cars.</p> <p>Roads and lanes around the village are noticeably busier since new developments on Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>Not supported by all Councillors. Would not happen in Knowle.</p> <p>Other areas on outskirts of the village. e.g. Oak Farm on bus routes.</p> <p>Meeting House Lane will become a thoroughfare, lane will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Balsall Common grown enormously over last ten years; reaching maximum capacity.</p> <p>Feel no-one is listening to negative impact proposals will have on this community.</p>
Sarah Moore [4698]			Q15/02	<p>Object to Site 2 as green belt and should not be considered before the 14 identified brownfield sites, Balsall Street East is already congestion hotspot that will worsen with JLR traffic with increased incidence of accidents at Holly Lane junction and close to schools, is on outskirts of village meaning journeys by car adding to congestion and parking problems, access would be more appropriate from Frog Lane than Balsall Street East, will increase risk of flooding at low points on north side of Balsall Street East, impacts of car headlights on property, trees and wildlife and on aircraft flight paths.</p>
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q15/02	<p>Object to site 2 as development will destroy green belt land rather than using brownfield alternatives, add to congestion hotspots on A452, site scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School, journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties, schools and medical services cannot cope with further increase and loss of Holly Lane Playing fields public open space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q15/02	Richborough Estates Limited support the proposed allocation at Frog Lane, Balsall Common (Site 2) with any proposals being determined via a master planning approach. These allocations accord, or can be made to accord with the spatial strategy and sequential approach adopted in the Local plan review, the locational and accessibility criteria of Policy P7, and the criteria in Policy P8 for managing travel demand, reducing congestion and providing parking.
Susan Law [3213]			Q15/02	Objection the use of green belt land for new housing development in the borough and in particular Frog Lane and BC in general.
Susan Woodhouse [2978]			Q15/02	<p>Site is 1.5 miles from local amenities.</p> <p>Building on playing fields.</p> <p>Preference of greenfield site over more accessible brownfield sites in the village.</p> <p>Development would create traffic chaos and is it feasible to widen Frog Lane? This would destroy its character.</p> <p>Impact on hedgerows and wildlife which would be displaced.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 75 is only part of Site 2. No assessment been made of eastern section, should be removed from allocation. If no willing landowners not a Category 1 site.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Makes maximum contribution towards GB purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - other than close proximity to primary school site scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/02	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 75 is only part of Site 2. No assessment been made of eastern section, should be removed from allocation. If no willing landowners not a Category 1 site.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Makes maximum contribution towards GB purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - other than close proximity to primary school site scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent.</p>
Wendy Stilgoe [2973]			Q15/02	<p>The fields are important to the local community and the playing fields are used by Heart of England School.</p> <p>There is heavy traffic at school times and additional development could lead to accidents.</p>
Question 15/03 Windmill Lane, Balsall Common				
A McManus [3997]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Alan Douglas [4166]			Q15/03	<p>Object to 1,350 houses in Balsall Common as unacceptable, contrary to Government support for green belt, there is no infrastructure to support intense development, will exacerbate parking problems in village, no faith in planning system to ensure properly managed, existence of rail station is no justification for intensive development, there are other sites that could provide starter homes which will not be delivered in village and housing problem should be addressed by utilising empty floor space above shops.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alastair McCulloch [3624]			Q15/03	<p>Concerned that the focus of developments proposed in Balsall Common will have the effect of increasing car use in contradiction to the overall intentions of Accessibility policies. The only explicit improvement mentioned is a bypass route for the A452. Extensive new housing is proposed despite existing public transport being insufficient to comply with the criteria specified, and the mix of housing may not lead to adequate usage for any improvements such as an evening bus service or more frequent train services. Site 3 is not within walking distance of most local facilities and has very limited access to public transport.</p>
Amrit Teja [4784]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Andrea Baker [3471]</p>			<p>Q15/03</p>	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
<p>Andy Wilson [3394]</p>			<p>Q15/03</p>	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Angela Chandler [3319]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Angela Lane [4769]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Angela Miller [3453]</p>			<p>Q15/03</p>	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
<p>Anne Hazlewood [4775]</p>			<p>Q15/03</p>	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ayaz Mahmood [4485]			Q15/03	Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.
Balsall Common Properties (Mrs Catherine Cortez) [3778]			Q15/03	Object to housing Site 3 as village fails to meet accessibility criteria, has limited employment so most residents commute by car adding to congestion in village, green field site when there are 14 previously developed sites available so exceptional circumstances not demonstrated, will add delays and risk of accidents on A452 and rat running in Windmill Lane, site performs poorly against all accessibility criteria other than primary school, will alter supposedly permanent green belt boundaries, fails to take account of impact on listed building or existence of Great Crested Newts, other sites outperform it and phasing ignores wider impacts.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q15/03	Object. Will be poorly integrated with the existing community, has poor accessibility and should not be considered. The presence of the listed Windmill makes development unacceptable.
BC BARRAGE (BC Barrage) [3479]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>The proposed allocations in Balsall Common represents an increase in the size of the population for the village of approximately 39%. This is an over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong place adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Development south of the settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, the Green Belt, highway network, surrounding communities and infrastructure.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q15/03	Agree with response from Barrage.
Beth Foster [4057]			Q15/03	<p>Object to change of green Belt status and housing development proposed.</p> <p>The land consists largely of fields and is adjacent to an historic and protected monument, Berkswell Windmill. This proposed development appears to be contrary to all national guidelines regarding the preservation of protected monuments of historical importance. To build houses on this land will have the affect of losing open spaces for future generations - which we can never replace.</p>
Bethan Jackson Baker [4495]			Q15/03	Object to housing Site 3 as Balsall Common not an accessible location and has limited employment opportunities resulting in most residents commuting by car, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A452 at peak times and risk of accidents, and will add to parking problems in village centre.
Brian Hubbleday [4421]			Q15/03	Site 3 Objection
Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]			Q15/03	as per comments for Sitea 1&2

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Carol Colclough [4588]			Q15/03	Object to proposal for 1,000+ houses in Balsall Common on top of growth over last 10 years, attempt to justify as split between 2 parishes, unfairness in targeting village when other villages such as Berkswell, Hampton and Meriden have few or none and has not been justified, disregard to green belt, and failure to focus on infrastructure capacity and demand to determine distribution of new housing.
Carol Walker [3989]			Q15/03	Site 3 Objection. Protest about Sites in Balsall Common. Green Belt.
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q15/03	The proposed allocation LPR 3 represents a natural extension to Balsall Common which reflects the limited landscape impact that would result and the site's proximity to a good range of services and facilities. - the loss of open space will be restricted to a well contained area closely related to the existing area. The rationale for its identification is considered to be sound in accordance with Para 182 of the NPPF, draft allocation LPR3 is considered sound.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Catherine Langton [3384]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>
Chris Brittain [3166]			Q15/03	<p>site 3 objection</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Brittain [3166]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 objection.</p> <p>Concerns over proposed site boundaries. The paddock is not available for development and should remain as part of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Suitable screening or planting will be required.</p> <p>Disapproves of level of affordable housing to be provided on site, but should it be permitted, it should be centrally located on the site. Concern about loss of value of property if affordable housing is visible.</p> <p>Concern for loss of wildlife.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 47 and 138. Classed as Category 1 but could be ecological considerations.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 4. Contend should be higher score.</p> <p>Adverse impact on Grade II* heritage asset, Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent, proximity to noise sources.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/03	<p>Partly under development already.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cromwell & Duggins Lane Residents Association (Mr P McDonald) [2265]			Q15/03	We do not feel therefore that the housing numbers and locations at Barrat's Farm, Windmill Lane and Frog Lane are appropriate in size or location relative to the Meriden Gap and certainly don't comply with the NPPF concerning the protection of green belt land.
Darren Abreu [4794]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
David Langton [3382]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Munton [3378]			Q15/03	<p>Will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p> <p>Some land unavailable for development.</p>
David Harvey [3379]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Miller [3454]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
David Shaw [4772]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Debbie Wylde [4546]			Q15/03	<p>Object to level of housing in Balsall Common as will turn it into a town without facilities or infrastructure to cope with additional population, and road network and public transport will need improvement.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Diane Langton [3380]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Diane Mahmood [4490]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as green belt land should not be used where alternative previously developed land available as exceptional circumstances not demonstrated, fails to meet accessibility criteria as bus services infrequent and too far from school/amenities to discourage car use, rail services/parking over capacity, will increase traffic on roads already gridlocked especially at peak times, rat running and danger to children, parking in and around village limited, schools oversubscribed, limited employment results in commuting by car, will encroach on and ruin adjoining listed building and not compliant with national or local planning policies or sustainable.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Dominic Griffin [2558]		Q15/03	<p>The site is Green Belt. It will have negative impacts on the quality of life of the residents of NE Balsall Common. This area is physically constrained by the location of the current railway, a low bridge and the proposed plans for HS2. The layout does not take into account the existence of HS2, which will mean any construction will have to take place further away from the railway line, and closer to the current village.</p> <p>Also impact on flora and fauna and health and well being of local residents who use the land for recreation.</p>
Dominique McGarry [4414]		Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Donald Lowe [4783]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Dr Anna Griffin [4206]			Q15/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection on the basis of the BARRAGE investigations, and detailed below: - BC not a high Frequency transport location and therefore not most accessible - has limited employment opportunities - 14 brownfield sites in the settlement - should be consid

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Dr I G Beasley [4055]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Dr Richard Anderson [3552]</p>			<p>Q15/03</p>	<p>I don't consider that the criteria for selection have been correctly applied:</p> <p>*This is GREEN BELT LAND and this should have over-riding priority over all other criteria.</p> <p>*It will MASSIVELY increase the size of the village causing unresolvable problems in traffic congestion, parking, overcrowding of the secondary school (and hence further lowering academic standards), and service provision.</p> <p>*It will inevitably and permanently ALTER THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE, which would be completely at odds with the Borough's policies.</p> <p>There should therefore be NO BUILDING on Windmill Lane, AND IT SHOULD BE LOCATED ADJACENT TO A LARGE CONURBATION - SOLIHULL</p>
<p>Elaine Kell [4771]</p>			<p>Q15/03</p>	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ella McGarry [4246]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as will exacerbate impacts of increased development and loss of green fields in recent years when already experiencing increase in traffic and gridlock in Kelsey Lane particularly at peak times, settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
G S Oliver [4773]		Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Gemma Blanco [4349]		Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection.</p> <p>Understand need for additional housing in Solihull, but need more suitable locations.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are available or extend existing developments.</p> <p>Proposal does not include provision of infrastructure. Would put pressure on school places. Balsall Common Primary is already at full capacity.</p> <p>Congestion.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and doctors.</p> <p>Loss of local recreational land.</p> <p>On wrong site of village. Too far from railway station, shops.</p> <p>Will increase congestion around primary and secondary school. Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Will set an unwelcome precedent.</p> <p>Development not large enough to solve housing shortage.</p> <p>Recommend one large site instead.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Georgina Joyce [4627]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Gillian & Carl Archer [4189]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unnecessary destruction of the Green belt - have had development in recent years - windmill lane: issues with traffic management. cars for commuting are essential - Parking at the railway station in BC is an issue - congestion in the centre of BC, development will add to this. - concerned about presue and impact on social infrastructure
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q15/03	<p>site 3 objection</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p>
Helen Goodwin [4636]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection</p> <p>not a viable or appropriate development.</p> <p>green belt areas of land. several brownfield sites more suited.</p> <p>situated on the south side of the village - increase in traffic on already overwhelmed road system, a hazard to the pedestrian traffic, made up of a very high percentage of children)</p> <p>an abundance of wild life living and visiting, at the moment the fieldfares are on the Frog Lane fields along with buzzards, muntjac deer, French partridge and bullfinches.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Helen Young [3390]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/03	<p>Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.</p>
Iain Foster [3579]			Q15/03	<p>Object to change of green Belt status and housing development proposed.</p> <p>The land consists largely of fields and is adjacent to an historic and protected monument, Berkswell Windmill. This proposed development appears to be contrary to all national guidelines regarding the preservation of protected monuments of historical importance. To build houses on this land will have the affect of losing open spaces for future generations - which we can never replace.</p>
Ian Morrey [4541]			Q15/03	<p>Object to level of housing proposed for Balsall Common as roads, parking and services would be unable to cope, and should be replaced by smaller developments on periphery of village with existing or new road links.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
James Langton [3383]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Jason Edwards [4655]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jean Fleming [3444]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Jeanette McGarry [4247]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jill Hubbleday [4462]			Q15/03	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>
John & Janet Taylor [4595]			Q15/03	<p>Objection to development in BC per se:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate infrastructure (schools, medical) - congestion/gridlock on roads - Parking is insufficient

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Bedington [3511]			Q15/03	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Windmill is listed Grade 2*, only given to a small proportion of listed building.</p> <p>Rare surviving example of once common Warwickshire style of tower mill.</p> <p>By far most complete example in surrounding counties.</p> <p>Proposed development would compromise the historic setting and airflow to the mill:</p> <p>Block distant view</p> <p>Compromise nearby rural view</p> <p>Make it impossible to run the sails</p>
John Boucher [4012]			Q15/03	<p>The proposal fails to take into account the effect on the adjacent grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill. The proposed housing development could seriously interrupt the airflow and create difficulties with operation of the windmill in the future. A major related problem is the amount of traffic already in the area making entry and exit to the mill hazardous. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation.</p>
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jonathan Moore [4680]			Q15/03	Object to level of new housing proposed in Balsall Common which has been unfairly targeted, infrastructure and facilities such as schools, shops, medical services, leisure facilities and parking have hardly changed despite previous developments and are already overstretched, will exacerbate traffic congestion and risk of accidents especially at peak times made worse by JLR site in Honiley, limited job opportunities in village and significant car commuting, will add to construction impacts of HS2, and there are other areas with better facilities that can share the burden with previously developed land used first.
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Judith Dean [4222]			Q15/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection on the basis of the BARRAGE investigations, and detailed below: - BC not a high Frequency transport location and therefore not most accessible - has limited employment opportunities - 14 brownfield sites in the settlement - should be consid
Julie Birchall [2945]			Q15/03	site 3 objection by landowner. Part of the site is not available for building.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Karen Munton [3377]			Q15/03	<p>Will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p> <p>Some land unavailable for development.</p>
Karen Bell [4586]			Q15/03	<p>Object to total of 1150 new houses in village as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed, the medical/welfare facilities, schools, shops, parking, public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate, would sacrifice valuable green belt in the Meriden Gap with important environmental and social benefits, encourage reinstatement of bypass line, and to Site 3 as will sacrifice rural aspect at southern end of village, Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane dangerous for additional traffic, and will impact on historically/culturally important Windmill and visitor parking.</p>
Karin Chessell [4284]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Kathy Jones [3513]		Q15/03	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Support BARRAGE response to Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Why have 3 Green Belt sites been chose over 14 brownfield sites?</p> <p>Balsall Common cannot accommodate 1150 additional homes.</p> <p>Services overstretched as well as schools.</p> <p>Traffic a problem near the 2 schools.</p> <p>Houses on Frog Lane would add to peak hour congestion on Balsall Street East and Alder Lane.</p> <p>Jaguar Land Rover site to south of village will also increase traffic.</p> <p>Disruption of HS2 and associated construction traffic.</p>
Keith Batty [3639]		Q15/03	<p>Object to Balsall Common housing proposals as disproportionate and should be spread more evenly across Borough to reduce environmental impact, there are pockets of brownfield land that should be used to reduce loss of green belt, not balanced by additional employment opportunities creating even more of a dormitory settlement than at present leading to additional congestion and parking around the station, and when added to HS2 construction will make life almost intolerable.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ken Hazlewood [4774]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
landowners land Balsall Common [3754]	Mr Roy Hammond	Howkins & Harrison (Mr Roy Hammond) [3714]	Q15/03	site 3 - objection and alternative site promoted

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 47 and 138. Classed as Category 1 but could be ecological considerations.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 4. Contend should be higher score.</p> <p>Adverse impact on Grade II* heritage asset, Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent, proximity to noise sources.</p>
Liam Sawyer [4768]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Louis Burns [4069]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p>
Lynsey Addy [3317]			Q15/03	site 3 objection
Lynsey Addy [3317]			Q15/03	<p>land which is in ownership of respondent has been included in the DLP, and respondent would like it removed from DLP site allocation.</p> <p>Do not consider that the level of proposed housing is appropriate for BC.</p> <p>concerned about Impact of housing development on wildlife, which will also be detrimental as a consequence of the loss of open space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
M J Beasley [4051]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Matthew Becker [3402]			Q15/03	site 3 objection

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Matthew Becker [3402]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Matthew Quinn [4344]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Melanie Hughes [4657]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q15/03	<p>The site between Windmill Lane and the A452 Kenilworth Road to the South of the settlement is broadly a Brownfield site, BUT it is also proposed for a density of housing which is too high.</p> <p>This will generate traffic onto the narrow Windmill Lane that has poor visibility junctions at each end, or onto the A452 Trunk road with difficult North and South junctions.</p>
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q15/03	see comment on site 3
Michael Watkinson [3576]			Q15/03	Encroachment onto Green Belt, when there is brownfield land available.
Michael Wylde [4544]			Q15/03	Object to level of new housing in Balsall Common as will turn it into town, there are no plans to manage increased traffic, road network public transport and parking insufficient for expansion, centre cannot be expanded yet houses proposed close to centre, there are better sites for development which would minimise impact such as Oakes Farm and north of the village.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Jagger [4299]			Q15/03	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Land at Windmill Lane is in Green Belt; should not be built on until other brownfield sites have been developed.</p> <p>Green Belt is Green Belt which means no houses or development.</p> <p>The Meriden Gap must stay without development.</p> <p>Lack of consideration of infrastructure needs to accommodate 1350 extra homes.</p>
Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]			Q15/03	site 3 objection
Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Mr Alfred Valler [3115]	Mr Ronald Perrin	Mr Ronald Perrin [2684]	Q15/03	Site 3 agent representing landowner. Adjoining land should be included in the allocation to create a defensible Green Belt boundary using Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr C Edwards [4622]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr C Gledhill [4812]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr christopher McDermott [3693]			Q15/03	Proposal should incorporate significantly improved leisure facilities to reduce need for existing and new residents to travel, including swimming pool, gym, all weather pitches, squash courts and space for community/club activities, additional facilities for existing clubs, improved rights of access to maintain leisure walking routes, and use of HS2 buffer for enhanced facilities, additional school places for Catholic children as St George and St Teresa school oversubscribed and bus service threatened, and improved accessibility by increasing train and station parking capacity, and improving parking in Station Road.
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q15/03	Object to total of 1150 new houses in village as unfair, an increase of 37.5% over the 2011 Census which would turn already overcrowded and under-resourced village into a town and cannot be absorbed, the medical/welfare facilities, schools, shops, parking, public transport and road infrastructure is inadequate, would sacrifice valuable green belt in the Meriden Gap with important environmental and social benefits, encourage reinstatement of bypass line, and to Site 3 as will sacrifice rural aspect at southern end of village, Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane dangerous for additional traffic, and will impact on historically/culturally important Windmill and visitor parking.
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q15/03	Extending the village southwards along Kenilworth Road should be deferred until the by-pass is completed and removed at this stage.
Mr D Edmonds [4808]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Eustace [4791]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr D Perks [3399]			Q15/03	site 3 objection
Mr D Perks [3399]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q15/03	The Frog Lane site is not huge and the Windmill Lane site is infilling the triangle already being developed. Whilst I don't like to see development on the greenbelt I don't have a view on these small sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Derrick Walker [4780]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q15/03	<p>site 3 objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - location is under severe threat (HS2 project) and further encroachment needs to be halted immediately. - not taking into serious consideration brownfield sites (14 identified by berskswell parish) - Solihull is a target for b'ham overspill

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr G Wilkinson [4788]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr G Frost [4809]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr H Keene [4806]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr J Stanley [4786]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr John Addy [3308]			Q15/03	site 3 objection

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr John Addy [3308]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr John Addy [3308]			Q15/03	<p>land which is in ownership of respondent has been included in the DLP, and respondent would like it removed from DLP site allocation.</p> <p>Do not consider that the level of proposed housing is appropriate for BC.</p> <p>concerned about Impact of housing development on wildlife, which will also be detrimental as a consequence of the loss of open space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr John Wilson [3890]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr K Millican [4779]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q15/03	<p>Inherent danger that large scale development of the kind proposed for Balsall Common and Berkswell will make it a less attractive area in which to live, and this must be of major consideration in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Urbanisation of countryside.</p> <p>Major investment needed in local services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Need for clear defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of landscape character.</p> <p>Loss of green infrastructure assets.</p>
Mr Leslie Noble [3503]			Q15/03	<p>I object to the Local Plan proposal for Balsall Common under references 1at Barratts Farm, 2 at Frog Lane & 3 at Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>All these plans for Balsall do not give sufficient consideration for the infrastructure of Balsall Common; the impact on the local primary school, GP surgery and village centre etc. I would support a plan where one housing site catering for all the housing needs and incorporating a school and shops is built. I understand that land is available to the north of the village for such a proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr P Phillips [4798]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr P Greasley [4813]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr R Vernon [4801]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr R & Mrs B Collins [4729]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing proposals for Balsall Common as green belt land which will impact significantly on community and rural setting, centre cannot take more parking and station parking inadequate, primary school cannot sustain further children, 2 large developments in last 10 years without improved facilities, Sites 1 and 3 will be blots on landscape, affect highway safety and road users, increase noise and disturbance, pollution and loss of privacy, recent development crammed on sites and not affordable, and there is land outside area that is more suitable, whilst Knowle/Dorridge benefit from better infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr R A Smith [4782]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr R E Green [4789]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>The proposed allocations in Balsall Common represents an increase in the size of the population for the village of approximately 39%. This is an over-concentration of growth on large sites in the wrong place adjacent to the detached rural village of Balsall Common. Development south of the settlement will have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure such as the road network and education.</p> <p>There will be adverse impacts on the character of the landscape, the Green Belt, highway network, surrounding communities and infrastructure.</p>
Mr Surinder Teja [3298]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr Surinder Teja [3298]			Q15/03	<p>In reference to - Proposed Housing Allocation 3 - Windmill Lane / Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>The paddock at Kerly Close is privately owned and maintained by the residents and therefore should be removed from the Draft Local Plan. As a resident and owner of the paddock I don't want it to be removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>I would also like to personally object to the proposed housing expansion within Balsall Common. Balsall Common is a village location and the proposed housing expansion plans are too large for the village to cope with as regards to infrastructure, schooling and local services.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr T N Walton [4817]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mr. ronald handfield [3028]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs E A Seal [4814]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs G Elson [4816]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Bliss [4803]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 47 and 138. Classed as Category 1 but could be ecological considerations.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 4. Contend should be higher score.</p> <p>Adverse impact on Grade II* heritage asset, Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent, proximity to noise sources.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Anna Walters [4777]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs B Stanley [4785]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Beverley Willacy [4442]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs C Cavigan [4810]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q15/03	Object to Site 3.
Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]			Q15/03	do not agree that this is the right location

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Catherine Kent [3473]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs Christine Plant [4686]			Q15/03	Impact on Berkswell Windmill.
Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection.</p> <p>Need to look at brownfield sites, not Green Belt.</p> <p>Recent Government White Paper stated that Green Belt should be protected.</p> <p>Need to protect Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Appreciate we have a housing shortfall. Council should seek to develop sites that current residents are happy with.</p> <p>Will add to construction traffic from HS2.</p> <p>Lack of sufficient school places and public transport.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q15/03	Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.
Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [3326]			Q15/03	site 3 objection
Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [3326]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q15/03	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green spaces.</p> <p>Impact on Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Too many houses proposed in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and local facilities needs to be addressed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Gillian Tonkys [4787]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs H Brookes [4795]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs J Carpenter [4796]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J E Smith [4781]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs J Vernon [4797]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs K Drakes [4793]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection</p> <p>Balsall Common not a suitable 'town centre'. Improving the centre has to be a priority before any new housing.</p> <p>Settlement does not meet Council's own accessibility criteria.</p> <p>Allocation of 20% of new housing here is contrary to policy.</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>More cars will increase carbon footprint.</p> <p>Note that plan does not mention bungalows or facilities for older residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kirsty King [3592]			Q15/03	Object to proposal for 1150 houses in Balsall Common, as on Green Belt land, in ancient Forest of Arden and the Meriden Gap, is in breach of the Government's White Paper, which specifies that building on greenbelt should be avoided when other sites are available, and to Site 1 which is a farm containing footpaths, playing fields and sites of interest, the village will not cope, Station Road/Kenilworth Road already too busy, there is a lack of transport, services, amenities, schools are already full, and building is coinciding with HS2 which will turn village into a building site for years.
Mrs L Keene [4800]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs Lorraine Horlor [3498]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs M Edmonds [4804]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q15/03	<p>Concerns that flood plains will be used to build on. Where will the additional water drain to. Will the local rivers flood and damage the local environment?</p>
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q15/03	<p>The site between Windmill Lane and the A452 Kenilworth Road to the South of the settlement is broadly a Brownfield site, BUT it is also proposed for a density of housing which is too high. This will generate traffic onto the narrow Windmill Lane that has poor visibility junctions at each end, or onto the A452 Trunk road with difficult North and South junctions.</p>
Mrs N Walton [4818]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs P Green [4790]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs P Phillips [4799]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pam Marsden [4802]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs Pamela Frost [4807]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Rita Perks [4805]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Mrs V Higgins [4497]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing in Balsall Common as green belt in Meriden Gap when growth should be on brownfield sites near good transport links and other infrastructure saving green belt for future generations, and village has inadequate centre with poor and insufficient parking.</p>
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as scores poorly in relation to all accessibility criteria, apart from school and is unsustainable, alteration of green belt boundaries after changes in the adopted Plan contravenes NPPF, wildlife including protected species will be damaged, will exacerbate traffic congestion and pressure on burdened infrastructure such as congestion hotspots on A452, fails to recognise historically setting of Windmill, and primary school is already oversubscribed, quality of education is diminishing and traffic around school is danger to children.</p>
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q15/03	<p>Will add to proven congestion hotspots to the south of Balsall Common and will add to traffic delays. Development of the site is contrary to local plan policies DLP Policy P7 and DLP Policy P9.</p> <p>The site score poorly in relation to all accessibility criteria apart from the primary school. Therefore most journeys will be by car.</p> <p>The sites are Green Belt and very special circumstance to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt has not been demonstrated. There are 14 previously developed sites available that have not been properly considered.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Emma Harris [3634]			Q15/03	There is insufficient existing infrastructure to support the proposed increase in housing in Balsall Common, which will exacerbate traffic congestion at peak times, result in increased difficulty parking and overstretched local amenities, reduce desirability and character of village, and impact on environment and loss of open space.
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15/03	site 3 objection
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15/03	<p>site 3 objection</p> <p>Concerns over proposed site boundaries. The paddock is not available for development and should remain as part of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Suitable screening or planting will be required.</p>
Ms Susan Agnama [3078]			Q15/03	<p>Developers should be expected to provide solutions, not create more problems.</p> <p>Need for appropriate infrastructure.</p> <p>Need to provide sufficient school places.</p> <p>Need to consider impact of traffic increases.</p> <p>Need to increase and improve sustainable transport options.</p> <p>Need to provide activities for teenagers and children.</p> <p>Need to balance green policy with housing development.</p> <p>Need to give same degree of consideration to transport infrastructure/environment and aesthetics in Balsall Common as in Dorridge with new Sainsbury's development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Myran Larkin [4296]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
N Birtley [4453]			Q15/03	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Disagree with 1500 houses in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be a priority as per government recommendations.</p> <p>Generate high volume additional traffic. Already busy area. Inadequate parking in village. Would create congestion at/near station roundabout.</p> <p>Traffic flow towards Coventry already restricted by the light controlled light underpass.</p> <p>Pressure on station car park.</p> <p>Pressure on oversubscribed schools and local health services.</p> <p>Close to HS2 - impact of HS2 construction work and noise once operational. Impact on saleability of properties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nadia McGarry [4240]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Neil Jackson Baker [4668]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as Balsall Common not an accessible location and has limited employment opportunities resulting in most residents commuting by car, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A452 at peak times and risk of accidents, and will add to parking problems in village centre.</p>
Neil Sears [3923]			Q15/03	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Solihull Connected strategy states south of Balsall Common is most congested part of village.</p> <p>Will add to A452 and B4101 congestion hotspots.</p> <p>Will delay drivers and increase risk of accidents.</p> <p>Not accessible location.</p> <p>Parking difficulties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Larkin [3514]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Nick Sloane [3662]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing sites in Balsall Common on Green Belt grounds as proposals contravene the latest Government White Paper directive that green belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances and where there is no alternative, in that there are 14 brownfield sites in and around Balsall Common that have been ignored.</p>
Nicola Cleaver [4188]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as it means releasing land from the green belt. - insufficient consideration given to brownfield land/site elsewhere in the borough in preparing the DLP - negative impact on BC and the settlement - pressure on existing infrastructure

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nikki Burns [4068]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p>
Norman McKeown [4113]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 47 and 138. Classed as Category 1 but could be ecological considerations.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 4. Contend should be higher score.</p> <p>Adverse impact on Grade II* heritage asset, Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent, proximity to noise sources.</p>
Parminder S Badial [4584]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 and do not support bypass as details unclear, primary school should be adequate providing just serve needs of village, and there are sufficient sports and recreation grounds, village has already had green belt reduced with JLR expansion and further growth should not be at expense of green belt land, Balsall Street should be defensible southern boundary to village and new housing needs to be supported by plans for medical services, shops and bus services.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Deane [3120]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Paul Lynch [3901]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q15/03	<p>Support for Site 3.</p> <p>Client's land small part of Site 3; 0.38ha.</p> <p>Can be built out independently of rest of Site 3 as different ownership and no constraints.</p> <p>Ideal opportunity for a small house builder and the Local Plan allocation should recognise this.</p> <p>Alternative is to build out site as one, which client does not rule out, but seeks flexibility.</p>
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Lowe [4776]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q15/03	<p>This site lacks the critical mass to contribute significantly to the village - either in terms of supporting a bypass, but also significant distance away from all of the key amenities. The current walking routes back to the local services and facilities are unattractive and potentially hazardous.</p> <p>If on the other hand the intention is that this development should be inhabited largely by commuters, there would be more sense to provide direct access to the proposed bypass line on the North East of the site, rather than further traffic on to the existing A452, and through the existing traffic lights.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Phil Chessell [4287]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Philip Wood [4552]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>
Philippa Lowe [4778]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Professor David Walton [3795]			Q15/03	Concerned about lack of significance given to green belt designation if it can be so easily cast aside and precedence for further growth, developments proposed will change the nature of Balsall Common from semi-rural to more town-like, it is hard to tell if the necessary improvements to local services and facilities including schools, medical services, water, sewage, power, public transport, car parking and roads are in hand and will be synchronised with development, roads are narrow and awkward which will become worse unless pre-empted, and little mention of HS2 despite proximity and impacts.
Raymond Evason [4229]			Q15/03	<p>- shocked, and very worried about the sheer scale of the proposed building of over 2,500 houses between Dickens Heath, and Majors Green</p> <p>- semi rural aspect of the area will be turned into a town</p> <p>- increase in traffic, pollution, and noise</p>
Rebecca Clare [3956]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Coles [3499]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Richard Onions [4280]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as scores poorly in relation to all accessibility criteria, apart from school and is unsustainable, alteration of green belt boundaries after changes in the adopted Plan contravenes NPPF, wildlife including protected species will be damaged, will exacerbate traffic congestion and pressure on burdened infrastructure such as congestion hotspots on A452, fails to recognise historically setting of Windmill, and primary school is already oversubscribed, quality of education is diminishing and traffic around school is danger to children.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Harrison [3968]			Q15/03	<p>Site 3 Objection.</p> <p>1350 houses in Balsall Common is unbelievable. 4000 extra residents and 2700 extra cars.</p> <p>Roads and lanes around the village are noticeably busier since new developments on Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>Not supported by all Councillors. Would not happen in Knowle.</p> <p>Other areas on outskirts of the village. e.g. Oak Farm on bus routes.</p> <p>Meeting House Lane will become a thoroughfare, lane will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Balsall Common grown enormously over last ten years; reaching maximum capacity.</p> <p>Feel no-one is listening to negative impact proposals will have on this community.</p>
Sally Anne Coles [3500]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Moore [4698]			Q15/03	Object to level of new housing proposed in Balsall Common which has been unfairly targeted, infrastructure and facilities such as schools, shops, medical services, leisure facilities and parking have hardly changed despite previous developments and are already overstretched, will exacerbate traffic congestion and risk of accidents especially at peak times made worse by JLR site in Honiley, limited job opportunities in village and significant car commuting, will add to construction impacts of HS2, and there are other areas with better facilities that can share the burden with previously developed land used first.
Sarah Ravenscroft [4478]			Q15/03	Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Clare [3953]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
SPAB Mills (Sophie Martin) [3912]			Q15/03	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Concerns about visual impact and scale of development on the historic setting and significance of Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Grade II* listed building.</p> <p>Most complete example of a West Midlands tower mill.</p> <p>Irreplaceable resource.</p> <p>Recently been restored to full working order - current capacity to turn the sails may be reduced by construction of new buildings, which could diminish the wind strength.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stephen Joyce [4242]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Steve & Samantha Townsend & Cook [4336]			Q15/03	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Already lack significant park or green play areas.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Not all landowners have been contacted.</p> <p>Loss of landscape character.</p> <p>Proposals shown in the Church Hall had more detail than the DLP.</p> <p>Unfeasible to walk to village centre with shopping.</p> <p>Village will be overrun with traffic.</p> <p>Proposals will completely change look and feel of Balsall Common.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sue Dilworth [3373]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed</p>
Susan Lo [4208]			Q15/03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection on the basis of the BARRAGE investigations, and detailed below: - BC not a high Frequency transport location and therefore not most accessible - has limited employment opportunities - 14 brownfield sites in the settlement - should be consid

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 47 and 138. Classed as Category 1 but could be ecological considerations.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 4. Contend should be higher score.</p> <p>Adverse impact on Grade II* heritage asset, Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent, proximity to noise sources.</p>
The Occupier [4873]			Q15/03	<p>object to housing site 3 as Kenilworth Road already afflicted with bad congestion and any further development will make situation intolerable.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/03	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Ref. 47 and 138. Classed as Category 1 but could be ecological considerations.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 4. Contend should be higher score.</p> <p>Adverse impact on Grade II* heritage asset, Berkswell Windmill.</p> <p>Accessibility Study - scores poorly.</p> <p>LCA - general assessment is that area would only be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>Interim SA - scores relatively well except on distance from jobs, proximity to Greenspaces, site is visually prominent, proximity to noise sources.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tracy Jolly [4770]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
William B Gibbs [4369]			Q15/03	<p>Development will add to congestion hotspots on A452 and delay drivers accessing the A452. Risk of accidents will increase. Windmill Lane will become even more of a "rat run".</p> <p>Site 3 scores poorly for all accessibility criteria, apart from the Primary School. Journeys to shops, medical centre and station will be by car, adding to existing congestion and parking difficulties.</p> <p>Altering the boundaries surrounding existing developments on Kenilworth Road would contravene National policy, as these boundaries were regarded as permanent.</p> <p>Council's assessment has overlooked Berkswell Windmill (Grade II* listed building) and Great Crested Newts.</p> <p>Site 3 should be removed.</p>
Zoe Speed [4472]			Q15/03	<p>Object to housing Site 3 as settlement fails to meet accessibility criteria with congestion and parking difficulties and alternatives perform better, has limited employment opportunities resulting in commuting, there are 14 brownfield sites which should be considered before green belt, will add to congestion/risk of accidents on A452 and rat running, green belt boundaries altered recently should be permanent, impact on listed building and protected species, and of phasing with HS2 which will place intolerable strain on settlement.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/04 Land West of Dickens Heath			
A & V Blake [4304]		Q15/04	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Should be fairer distribution of housing.</p> <p>Recent development in Cheswick Green and Dickens Heath already added to congestion.</p> <p>Proposed development of 2550 houses will increase strain on road infrastructure, including air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of green space for community benefit and health.</p> <p>Loss of green corridor to canal and countryside.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Retain Green Belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p>
A H & M A Craig [3339]		Q15/04	concerned about the increased level of traffic and its impact on the local road infrastructure.
A J Edgeworth [4106]		Q15/04	Object to proposals for 2,500 new houses in South Shirley and particularly Site 4 as area already suffers from loss of green belt and extra congestion from Dickens Heath, will result in loss of several football pitches used by local clubs and additional pollution from vehicles when we should be reducing harm to health and encouraging physical activities, road infrastructure in area will be unable to cope with extra traffic, significant development is already taking place in Earlswood area, and there must be brownfield and green field sites elsewhere that can take a share.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alex Thompson [4616]			Q15/04	<p>object to development in the area as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed sites are very well used natural environment, that provides a much welcomed break from the urban environment - Shirley area is already subject to a huge amount of congestion which affects the whole of the Stratford Road from the M42 junction and all arterial routes - extremely concerned about the impact on local roads which are already very congested - a large number of sports clubs and facilities currently in allocation 4 <p>would impact on the physical and mental well being of the residents in the local community</p>
Ana & Mark Spittle McGuire [4693]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Andrew Moreton [3185]			Q15/04	As a resident of Haslucks Green Road we have seen a large increase in traffic with the development of Dickens Heath and Whitlocks End Station. I feel that the proposed expansion of Dickens Heath will have a huge impact on our road and will affect property values
Andy & Natasha Maidment [4073]			Q15/04	Object to housing site 4 as the surrounding roads are already heavily congested and the additional development will result in gridlock, rail services and park and ride are at capacity during peak hours and will not cope with additional passengers, will result in loss of green belt land, recreational and social facility and sports club grounds, and increase anti social behaviour and crime rates. Required housing should be accommodated on other sites especially brownfield before using this green belt land.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Ann & Craig Plant [3945]		Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Infrastructure of roads, drainage etc will not be able to cope with further traffic, houses.</p> <p>Insufficient shops, doctors, schools. Hospital not big enough, A&E closing and not open to children.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Why not build at Blythe Valley where no-one is?</p> <p>What happens to village status of Dickens heath?</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>
Ann Scholes [4618]		Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very special circumstances for building on green belt has not been proved by SMBC in the DLP - proven that contact with nature promotes health and well being in all of us - inability of infrastructure to cope with new development -

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Barry & Jenny Jennings [4300]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4, 11, 12 and 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath and Shirley would merge into one huge suburb, which wasn't the vision for Dickens Heath Village.</p> <p>Considerable development already threatening gaps between Dickens Heath, Wythall and Earlswood.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development increased traffic on Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Haslucks Green Road.</p> <p>Roads could not cope with more traffic.</p> <p>Need to keep green spaces for wellbeing.</p> <p>Look for brownfield sites.</p>
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the coalescence of settlements and have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing communities and infrastructure as well as the Green Belt and landscape.</p>
Bev Ellis [4253]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as will result in loss of recreational facilities for residents and children at a time when there is recognition of the need to encourage greater activity for health and well-being and to discourage crime, loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of local area of natural beauty for walking, exacerbate traffic on roads that are barely coping now, schools and medical services are oversubscribed and cannot take extra strain.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Bradley Healey Gwilliam [4286]			Q15/04	South Shirley area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.
Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Site 4 abuts Bromsgrove District boundary. As Majors Green in Bromsgrove already abuts the boundary to the west, this allocation would result in the coalescence of settlements contrary to purpose 2 of the function of Green Belts</p> <p>as set out in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment concluded that this area has a very low landscape capacity to accommodate new development with visual sensitivity in the area being high.</p> <p>Unclear how allocation would retain 'meaningful' Green Belt gaps as expressed in Topic Paper.</p>
C A Frost [4006]			Q15/04	<p>Already a massive problem with traffic congestion in the local area. If you add a further concern about the capacity of the local NHS system and the underfunding of schools in the area, then the proposal to build over 2500 new homes seems to be totally absurd.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the national requirement for new homes, it is wrong to blindly pursue the delivery of numbers and ignore the quality of life of existing and new residents.</p> <p>Hope that a more moderate approach can be found which will avoid turning Shirley into a new town on the edge of Solihull.</p>
Canal & River Trust (Anne Denby) [3983]			Q15/04	This site has a direct boundary with the North Stratford Canal which is partially in a cutting at this point. There is also a culvert adjacent, sewer crossing and a lay-by within the waterway that extends into the site. Any application for this site would need to make an appropriate assessment of the site constraints. The offside bank along the proposed site allocation is unprotected with very limited freeboard. As protection to the development site some green edge protection and an increase in freeboard height would be required as part of the proposals.
Carol Edgeworth [4101]			Q15/04	Whilst new housing is very much needed, object to 2550 homes in 4 sites so close together as local schools, medical services and roads will be unable to cope and the green belt will be a concrete jungle when there are brownfield sites that should be used first.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Carolyn Locke [4096]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as part of overall 41% of housing allocations in South Shirley as unfair and should be spread more fairly across Borough, will add to already congested roads causing higher levels of pollution implicated in various chronic conditions, increase pressure on struggling medical services, require significant investment in new schools and impact on catchments, increased number of residents travelling long distances to Waste & Recycling Centre, impact on natural environment, wildlife and flooding, on top of developments already taking place will undermine attractiveness, health and well-being of the area.
Charlotte Street [4615]			Q15/04	<p>Harm to Dickens Heath's village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, which scores highly in assessment, resulting in urban sprawl and coalescence.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion, e.g. Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Existing services are inadequate. SMBC not have a good track record. Particular concern are schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severely lacking in DH village and Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Flood risk.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba.</p> <p>Overdevelopment in general.</p>
Children Families and Communities (Mrs A Barnes) [3527]			Q15/04	Note that Dickens Heath Primary School is a named feeder school for Woodrush High School in Worcestershire. Increased population of 700 may impact education provision at this secondary school.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Christina Lawlor [4252]			Q15/04	Allocation will result in loss of countryside and urban sprawl contrary to Council motto, leading to coalescence with Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green, loss of natural green space/green corridor and impact on recreation and well-being, and increased housing and density will have huge detrimental impact on infrastructure, schools and medical services.
Christine Street [4315]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Harm to Dickens Heath's village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, which scores highly in assessment, resulting in urban sprawl and coalescence.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion, e.g. Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Existing services are inadequate. SMBC not have a good track record. Particular concern are schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severely lacking in DH village and Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Flood risk.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba.</p> <p>Overdevelopment in general</p>
Christopher Taylor [4473]			Q15/04	Object to scale of growth proposed for South Shirley on top of recent supermarket and retail park developments which is unfair, involves loss of so much green belt land in one area when other areas unaffected, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A34 and local roads, there is inadequate public transport to carry increased population or parking provision at local stations and inadequate provision for school places and is clearly not in best interests of local residents.
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/04	Site 4 - shouldn't be allowed to sprawl across and join almost to majors green . the existing roads cant cope.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 7 and 8 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Refs 126 and 130 are Category 2; SHELAA Ref 176 is Category 3.</p> <p>Issues include: existing road needs upgrading, 10-24% is LWS, much of site not within or adjacent to settlement, includes sports pitches from which multiple football clubs operate, less than 50% is contaminated land, much is Grade 4 agricultural land.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15/04	<p>This site covers 3 nature reserves and 2 ancient woodlands. There are also at least four football grounds, two of which are senior and two of which are junior. It is important that these are retained. Parking provision at both Whitlocks End and Shirley stations is already inadequate to satisfy the current demand. Will public transport services help deal with this issue in the future? Local residents would also like to know what plans for further housing Bromsgrove have in the area.</p> <p>A significant investment in the local road network would have to be made to make this site sustainable</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/04	<p>site covers 3 nature reserves and 2 ancient woodlands. Whilst I understand the benefits of developing land near to the Whitlocks End Train Station, as it has the potential for reducing dependence on cars for transport, this is still likely to impact traffic flows down the Haslucks Green Road. For this site to be developed would require not only a great deal of consideration to the points raised, it would also be of benefit for residents to be made aware of what development Bromsgrove are doing on their side of the border next to this site.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/04	<p>Contrary to Green Belt policy and Council policy to protect 'urbs in rure' character, unsustainable location dependent on car travel, would harm attractive open countryside, remove opportunities for quiet recreation, loss of playing fields/sports grounds and drainage issues and impact on flood risk.</p>
Cpt D A Benton [4097]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as part of horrendous proposals for 2550 houses in South Shirley, which will exacerbate traffic already overloaded by Dickens Heath development, local shops, medical services, schools and parking infrastructure will be inadequate to support additional population, developments will result in loss of open space, countryside and peace and fresh air. Only benefit is extra employment and rates income, Council should make case to Government that enough development already and find more suitable areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
D Wilkinson [4001]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection - together with allocations 11, 12 & 13 there is an over-allocation of proposed houses in a small area of the borough, on mainly on precious green space.</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with this extra demand to the local area. Will exacerbate existing traffic problems, increase pollution and impact on community infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p> <p>This scheme adds little value to the HS2 access plans and will make the M42 unbearable and more like London's M25.</p> <p>Request that the plans be considerably scaled back to a sensible build programme.</p>
David Paddock [3988]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 (general South of Shirley) Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Need to exhaust alternatives before building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of sporting pitches.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Parkinson [4562]			Q15/04	Object to proposals for an additional 2550 houses in Shirley area as will have detrimental impact on area through loss of green area/countryside, highway infrastructure is already struggling to cope with current traffic levels especially during peak times, lack of school places to meet expected demand never mind growth which will lead to larger classes and poorer education, and medical and police services at capacity.
Debbie Stokes [4255]			Q15/04	Object to housing in South Shirley as concentration of 41% of new housing in one small area is unfair, 2,500 plus houses will exacerbate severe traffic congestion on A34, Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road, the impact will have a severe detrimental affect on local schools, medical services and transport, and loss of recreational facilities and club football pitches used by many local children.
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Disproportionate allocation in Blythe Ward; 45% of new allocations.</p> <p>Should be more medium and smaller Green Belt releases, spread across the Borough.</p> <p>High scoring Green Belt parcels should not be released for development.</p> <p>Need exceptional circumstances to change Green Belt boundaries, housing not sufficient.</p> <p>Significant harm to village character and rural setting.</p> <p>Greater than 800m walking distance from village centre.</p> <p>Increased traffic and parking unacceptable.</p> <p>Negative ecological impact.</p> <p>90% of survey respondents objected to both sites being removed from Green Belt.</p> <p>Site 4 conflicts with the original masterplan and vision for Dickens Heath village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Andrea Collins [4511]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Dr Colin Thompson [3305]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as the site includes flood plain and sports fields, the rural highway infrastructure is unsuitable and in urgent need of repair, will exacerbate already heavy traffic congestion and unclear whether any traffic impact analysis undertaken, lack of new schools and medical practices to serve new residents, no details of pedestrian routes, need to review new road structure/lights for station car park extension in context of growth proposals and liaise with Bromsgrove over Tilehouse Lane/Haslucks Green Road junction improvements, and should build on brownfield rather than green field land.
Earlswood & Forshaw Heath Residents Association (Jennifer Buckley) [4439]			Q15/04	<p>Object to Site 4.</p> <p>Contrary to Government manifesto 2015 on protecting Green Belt and countryside.</p> <p>No evidence of cross-boundary consultation or discussion as prescribed by the Localism Act.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and quality of life of residents in Earlswood & Forshaw Heath not been taken into account.</p> <p>Developments by SMBC in last 20 years had dramatic impact on rural parish and none for the better.</p> <p>No recompense to Stratford District Council for impacts of these developments, e.g. traffic on roads.</p> <p>SDC should be compensated.</p>
Edward Fraser [4138]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as proposed as together with other sites in South Shirley will deplete the green belt with its intrinsic benefits, cause major traffic problems and exacerbate existing unacceptable delays, overload medical services and impact on local schools. Whilst it is recognised that housing is required, Shirley has more than its fair share and is not the place for growth associated with HS2. A reduced Site 4 allocation with Site 11 only may be acceptable.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Edward Tan [4658]			Q15/04	<p>Dickens Heath has a distinct character and unique evolution. There should be limits to its continued growth in terms of numbers and direction to protect its character. The proposals do not comply with the policies of the adopted local plan or those in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Object to loss of Green Belt. It would see coalescence of settlements and the loss of sporting facilities. New sporting facilities would be more intensive to be appropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site is not in a sustainable location and would result in additional car traffic.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife and ecology.</p>
Elizabeth & Gregg Harley [4512]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Elizabeth Padgett [4610]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic is already dire - Green belt land and wildlife are more important to people than houses which they cannot afford - Traffic pollution is not good for anyone's health or safety
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q15/04	Object to amount of land proposed for development in Shirley, as too much on green belt, the area south of Stratford Road is already congested and will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic, there are insufficient transport connections such as railway links, and loss of green areas will reduce Shirley's image from the lovely 'town in the country' it always was.
Elizabeth Yates [3274]			Q15/04	Object to development on playing pitches used by young people, allotments and countryside, loss of wildlife, inadequate transport and road infrastructure .
Georgina & Fergal O'Gara [4576]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Graham Watson [3355]			Q15/04	Site 4 objection -concerns on traffic and ability of road Infrastructure to cope with level of traffic.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Graham Gilbert [4437]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Agree more houses are required in Solihull.</p> <p>Agree with Green Belt Review due to lack of brownfield sites.</p> <p>Concerned with loss of sports pitches at Site 4.</p> <p>Grounds are very well-used.</p> <p>Consider current football pitches are kept and upgraded if necessary, and Green Belt released elsewhere.</p>
Harry Street [3905]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Harm to Dickens Heath's village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, which scores highly in assessment, resulting in urban sprawl and coalescence.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion, e.g. Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Existing services are inadequate. SMBC not have a good track record. Particular concern are schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severely lacking in DH village and Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Flood risk.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba.</p> <p>Overdevelopment in general.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hazel & Ian MacKenzie [4102]			Q15/04	Object to large amount of houses on Site 4 as will exacerbate congestion as road infrastructure is limited in the area with access to A34/M42 difficult enough at busy periods and access and parking at Whitlocks End station is a problem, no provision for expansion of schools or medical services for new population, and proposals do not include essential infrastructure improvements.
Helen Blyth [3350]			Q15/04	site 4 objection as the level of housing proposed is disproportionate for this location esp as the road infrastructure is unable to cope with existing demand/use.
Helen Reed [4641]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need to retain GB between DH and other settlements Majors Green, Wythall - as it will increase congestion and lead to more accidents - insufficient transport infrastructure - need to develop on brownfield sites first - exceeds the capacity of existing public amenities and infrastructure, including schools, a medical centre and shops built specifically for the existing Dickens Heath Development-
Howard Maine [4172]			Q15/04	Object to development of green belt to provide 2,250 additional houses around South Shirley as will have detrimental impact on transport problems, schools and already stretched hospitals, and exacerbate already frightening volume of traffic on A34 and surrounding local roads.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Jack Street [3906]		Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Harm to Dickens Heath's village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, which scores highly in assessment, resulting in urban sprawl and coalescence.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion, e.g. Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Existing services are inadequate. SMBC not have a good track record. Particular concern are schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severely lacking in DH village and Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Flood risk.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba.</p> <p>Overdevelopment in general.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jacqueline Harris [4320]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>41% of development in area around Shirley is disproportionate.</p> <p>Should be spread more fairly across Borough.</p> <p>Heavy congestion on Stratford Road, M42 and surrounding roads will get worse.</p> <p>Poor public transport links.</p> <p>More pollution</p> <p>Insufficient parking at railway stations.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Local schools, nurseries, doctor surgeries and hospital already unable to cope. Will need new school and surgery.</p> <p>Feels Shirley is forgotten part of Solihull.</p> <p>Look for options with better transport links and more direct access to M42 and A34.</p>
Jane & Alan Horton [4443]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Development will join Dickens Heath, Majors Green, Tidbury Green and Shirley.</p> <p>Will be one giant housing estate.</p> <p>Traffic volume on Haslucks Green Road is major hazard.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jane Mills [4134]			Q15/04	Object to housing in South Shirley as over 2,500 houses or 41% of proposed allocations is unfair and will have negative affect on local community through loss of precious green belt, increased traffic on all local roads, Shirley station car park is currently inadequate let alone for a huge increase in users, increased noise, pollution and rat running on local roads across Shirley, construction traffic will be intrusive and unwelcome, and local schools and medical services unlikely to have capacity for increase in population.
Janet Blair [3605]			Q15/04	Object to housing site 4 due to impact of increased traffic on Blackford Road, which is already inadequate, has suffered from closures for repairs and has a weight restriction which is not enforced.
Janett Reynolds [4664]			Q15/04	Objects to building of 2,550 new houses in South Shirley area which amounts to 41% of total allocations and is grossly unfair, will have serious impact on already congested roads, will affect local schools and medical services, result in loss of 6 sports and recreational grounds and high density housing will lead to disputes over parking, noise and other social issues through lack of space.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q15/04	Would result in the loss of sporting amenities or recreational areas. This seems to go against the policy objective of "Supporting the retention and protection of facilities which promote healthy lifestyles such as open space, including public rights of way to open space, playing pitches and allotments;"
Jo McGrory [4577]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joanne Hale [4400]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Understand the need for housing.</p> <p>2550 houses in such a small congested area is excessive.</p> <p>Consider highways impact.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Impact on walking and recreation.</p> <p>Already lost part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Loss of countryside, e.g. in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Not a good location to get to HS2.</p> <p>Loss of 'Urbs in rure'.</p>
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Allocations 4, 11, 12, 13 will all have a very large impact on the area with respect to transport, schooling and healthcare facilities such as GPs in what is an already congested and high density of dwellings area.</p> <p>Would not benefit from HS2.</p> <p>Development should be more evenly spread across the Borough.</p>
John & Christine Thorp [4477]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as will result in loss of green footpaths in a semi rural area which are used daily by many local residents to help keep fit and maintain well-being when there are no other similar amenities, loss of green belt gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath, loss of wildlife, increased use of cars, traffic, air pollution and litter, increased pressure on schools and medical services already at capacity and on roads with poor surfaces, and any affordable housing element will not meet needs of local young people or encourage them to remain in area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John & Julie Russell [4238]			Q15/04	Object to proposal to locate 41% of proposed houses in South Shirley as inordinate amount compared with elsewhere in Borough, will destroy green field sites, extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion on A34 and surrounding roads especially at peak times, demand for places at oversubscribed schools, demands on already crowded local rail services and inadequate parking, construction will cause extra traffic/noise/disruption, will result in loss of sports grounds/recreation areas for 9 clubs and discourage outside activities with health benefits and will degrade the area with loss of character that makes it attractive.
John Dancer [4303]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Recognise urgent need for housing.</p> <p>41% development in Shirley/Dickens Heath is disproportionate.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of Green Belt land; contrary to central government policy.</p> <p>Lots of brownfield land available in Birmingham.</p> <p>Lots of opportunity elsewhere for infilling.</p> <p>DLP not consider impacts on local infrastructure, including roads, parking, congestion, hospitals.</p> <p>3000+ cars will increase air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of trees to absorb pollution.</p> <p>Reducing recreational and public amenity space.</p> <p>Loss of 9 sports pitches.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Junctions 4 to 6 of M42 already at capacity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Harrison [3347]			Q15/04	site 4 objection on the grounds that the existing infrastructure and road layout is not capable of supporting the scale of development envisaged.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/04	Loss of sports pitches; no reference to relocation or compensation. Development would result in coalescence of Dickens Heath with Majors Green which would be contrary to National Green Belt policy.
John Ryder [3349]			Q15/04	Site 4 objection on the grounds that development has already led to increased levels of traffic, congestions, speeding and litter.
Judith Stanley [3431]			Q15/04	The sites earmarked around dickens heath do not take into consideration the inadequate road system for the existing population. Dickens Heath road itself is in a terrible condition. The pot holes are getting worse. This road needs urgent resurfacing The station car park is already full on weekdays. Dickens Heath road, Rumbush Lane and Tythe Barn Lane are unsuitable to take the extra traffic the additional housing would require. Akamba is a gem for the area. A lot of work has gone into making this the unique attraction it is. Please do not affect this.
Julian Cook [4463]			Q15/04	The proposed development at Sites 4 and 13 will exacerbate the traffic congestion on Haslucks Green Road, already causing gridlock in peak times following the Asda development and with the Powergen redevelopment to come, as occupiers will use Asda and/or route to Solihull/Birmingham so the road infrastructure is inadequate to support this level of development, and will remove green belt further from Shirley.
K J Hewitt [4733]			Q15/04	Object to housing proposals for Shirley as infrastructure of area will not allow this intensity of development and needs more consideration, most of new residents will need to use Blackford Road, which is already seriously affected by traffic from Dickens Heath and retail park and has been closed on a number of occasions for repairs due to damage to sewers, and plans are likely to change so that improvements may not end of being delivered.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
K Neale [4085]			Q15/04	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair, as will exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed, and contrary to national policy protecting green belt as other options for growth have not been explored or investigated.
Kay Wilkes [4000]			Q15/04	<p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Need to exhaust alternatives before building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of sporting pitches.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kim Cowie [4399]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Understand the need for housing.</p> <p>2550 houses in such a small congested area is excessive.</p> <p>Consider highways impact.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Impact on walking and recreation.</p> <p>Already lost part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Loss of existing countryside, e.g. in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Not a good location to get to HS2.</p> <p>Loss of 'Urbs in rure'.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/04	<p>Concern about the impact on the function of Green Belt. There would coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlock End and Majors Green. It is also within a landscape character area of high sensitivity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 7 and 8 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Refs 126 and 130 are Category 2; SHELAA Ref 176 is Category 3.</p> <p>Issues include: existing road needs upgrading, 10-24% is LWS, much of site not within or adjacent to settlement, includes sports pitches from which multiple football clubs operate, less than 50% is contaminated land, much is Grade 4 agricultural land.</p>
Laura Davies [4547]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Laura Manton [4525]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lauren Bosworth [3998]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Detrimental to local community and way of life.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Increase in crime rate in Dickens Heath since new development been finished.</p> <p>HS2 already destroying other parts of local countryside.</p> <p>Council object to new developments in the Green Belt, why treat one house different from over 2000?</p>
Lesley Murtagh [4553]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Lesley Nightingale [4480]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as green belt has already been significantly eroded through creation of Dickens Heath, will result in loss of semi rural gaps between settlements, will put massive pressure on schools and medical services already in high demand, will add further traffic and pedestrians to already congested area that suffers frequent accidents with dangerous roads and junctions especially around Whitlocks End station, will result in loss of wildlife habitats and increased risk of flooding, loss of recreational areas essential for health and well-being, and there are brownfield sites, such as NEC that should be developed instead.
Liz Moloney [4564]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Lorraine Winn [4510]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
M A Reohorn [4378]		Q15/04	<p>Site 4.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Risk of coalescence between settlements south of Shirley and Bromgrove. Lack of exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife. Adverse impact on Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>Loss of playing fields.</p> <p>Increase existing traffic issues and congestion. Risk to road safety. Road network in poor state.</p> <p>Parking inadequate in Dickens Heath for shops and facilities.</p> <p>Loss of tranquillity.</p> <p>Pressure on schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Loss of local businesses e.g. Akamba.</p> <p>Housing should be distributed fairly across the Borough.</p> <p>Density of housing will be out of character.</p> <p>Already had new developments at Dickens Heath, Tidbury Green and Cheswick Green.</p>
M J G Smith [3436]		Q15/04	<p>Local roads will not cope with the amount of traffic and there is limited public transport. The amount of traffic using the drawbridge is tremendous and I have seen cars queuing back to Haslucks Green Road and that is during the winter so during the summer it would be a major issue. Haslucks Green Road is already a notorious accident spot. All the roads in the area are not wide enough to take the traffic, especially roads like Drawbridge Road where cars frequently mount the pavement.</p> <p>Also need to ensure discussions are had with Bromsgrove.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Marianne Fogarty [4395]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green belt.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of housing, 41%, of new development in Shirley South area.</p> <p>Traffic increased significantly since last development in Dickens Heath were built out.</p> <p>Lots of road closures on Haslucks Green Road, this is what the future will be like if houses go ahead.</p> <p>Have you considered sharing growth across the Borough. Perhaps Brueton Park?</p>
Marie Kilgallen [4142]			Q15/04	<p>The proposals for South Shirley will require new schools and medical facilities and will impact on recreation areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Davies [4459]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>South of Shirley been allocated 2500+ homes; 41% of the Borough's allocation.</p> <p>Inconsistent with the spatial strategy and DLP policies.</p> <p>Fails to take into account impact on local services, infrastructure and the local community.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Lack of evidence that suitable alternatives been explored.</p> <p>Impact on existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools and GPs.</p> <p>Road and rail network at or near capacity.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 development.</p>
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/04	<p>SHELAA states site faces significant suitability constraints as 10-24% of site is LWS and is within or adjacent to freestanding rural village.</p> <p>Loss of recreational sport pitches contrary to Para. 74 of NPPF.</p> <p>Unaware of any assessment of sport requirements in the Borough.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark McCarron [3480]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Road infrastructure around Dickens Heath currently overloaded at peak times.</p> <p>Road surfaces and footways in disrepair.</p> <p>School bus blocks the clock roundabout every morning.</p> <p>Doctor and Dentist oversubscribed.</p> <p>Already lost large area of Green Belt to housing development.</p>
Mark Taft [3595]			Q15/04	Although the plan refers to retention of Green Belt buffers, no consideration or detail is given to allocations adjoining other local authorities, such as Site 4 adjoining Bromsgrove District, where neighbouring settlements would be merged resulting in more urban sprawl.
Martin Protty [4699]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as will exacerbate already bad traffic in area following developments at Dickens Heath and Aqueduct Road, main routes are rural and converge for example at the Drawbridge which already causes gridlock into Haslucks Green Road, compounded by flooding at Peterbrook Road/Aqueduct Road junction and new housing, whilst Trumans Heath Road is rural, subject to flooding and steep and icy in winter, road infrastructure, schools and medical services inadequate, and other bottlenecks at shops on Haslucks Green Road and road works creating hazard for pedestrians, parking at stations inadequate and results in loss of sports facilities.
Matt Ellis [4259]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 due to loss of green belt, green space for recreation and walking and sports facilities, wildlife habitats, and will result in area becoming overcrowded with increased traffic and fewer green areas.
Matt Nightingale [4549]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as the roads are already congested and dangerous around Majors Green and natural habitat will be lost forever.
Matt Stapleton [4281]			Q15/04	Object to concentration of 2500 new homes in South Shirley and Dickens Heath area as iniquitous and disproportionate and should be more evenly allocated across Borough, would have a huge detrimental effect on already congested roads in area and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Melissa Bradburn [4563]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/04	Loss of sports pitches; no reference to relocation or compensation. Development would result in coalescence of Dickens Heath with Majors Green which would be contrary to National Green Belt policy.
Miss Charlotte Drysdale [3834]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q15/04	I think the proposed changes in the Dickens Heath etc area will remove our green areas and we will end up merging into one site. The infrastructure was not developed to deal with this and Dickens Heath Village was never meant to be the size it is and already has a negative impact on travel. Much as I dislike the idea I think a purpose built new village with appropriate planned infrastructure would be the best solution.
Mr Justin Wilkes [3090]			Q15/04	Dickens Heath / Tidbury Green While I support the development of these areas, the current preferred area to the West of Dickens Heath would result in the closure of several important and well supported local amenities/businesses.
Mr & Mrs Abbotts [4492]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as will increase traffic on already overcrowded roads around Whitlocks End station which are dangerous for children and pedestrians, result in loss of green belt and wildlife habitats, increase pressure on already oversubscribed schools and medical practices leading to degradation of services, and loss of pitches will impact sports facilities for schools and clubs.
Mr & Mrs Biddlecombe [4503]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Mr & Mrs Batty [3397]			Q15/04	Erosion of the Green Belt around Majors Green. Will impact on local services including rail, schools and medical facilities. Local Council is already struggling to deliver services.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Evans [4491]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as will exacerbate already considerable traffic volumes on Haslucks Green Road coming from Dickens Heath especially at peak times. Should consider residents of established settlements by re-routing traffic through less populated areas.
Mr & Mrs Simons [4614]			Q15/04	Congestion and Traffic are being given as the main reasons for objecting to development in Shirley.
Mr & Mrs Woollard [4099]			Q15/04	Object to proposals for housing Site 4 as results in loss of green belt land forever, 41% of housing allocation in one area is unfair, negative impact on community through loss of green space and resultant well-being, increased transport problems on already overcrowded roads, overburdening of schools and medical services, and will be poorly located in relation to HS2 interchange compared with areas in east and north of Borough avoiding congested A34 and M42. Proposals should be cancelled or severely scaled back.
Mr A Jeffs [4708]			Q15/04	Object to housing in Dickens Heath/Shirley as will require vast amounts of expenditure on improving existing infrastructure to prevent an environmental disaster, with traffic congestion on unsuitable roads already from overdevelopment of Dickens Heath and restrictive bridges, flooding affecting land and roads, loss of green space. Developers should be required to build cycle paths on roads and Stratford canal and new parkland as well as improving roads and drainage.
Mr Adam Hunter [3332]			Q15/04	the location, size and scope of this proposed development will adversely effect the community and surrounding area, it will adversely effect local residents and will become overbearing and detrimental. It will remove precious green belt, a wild life haven and a natural corridor between local communities, it will damage the local character of the area. In my view this is an inappropriate development that will harm residents

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Adam Weber [3072]			Q15/04	<p>Conflicts with policies in existing SLP and proposed DLP.</p> <p>Disproportionate housing in Blythe Ward (45%) and Dickens Heath parish.</p> <p>Note no housing proposals in Dorridge & Hockley Heath ward.</p> <p>Not properly assessed all the SHELAA sites.</p> <p>No sustainable sequential test of sites been carried out.</p> <p>Replacement sports facility would be inadequate, but should not be taken out of Green Belt if goes ahead.</p> <p>Loss of high performing Green Belt and coalescence with Majors Green.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba Heritage Centre.</p> <p>Harm to rural village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Would contravene Para. 32 of NPPF. Traffic impacts would be severe.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Mr Barrie Stanyer [3641]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing proposals for South Shirley as 41% of new allocations in area is iniquitous and disproportionate and should be shared more evenly, additional homes would have detrimental effect on already congested roads especially at peak, school start/finish times and weekends, and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport.</p>
Mr Craig Armstrong [3190]			Q15/04	<p>cite reasons for why development should not take place in DH. These include negative impact of growth on existing amenities, traffic management and green belt</p>
Mr D Tabb [4499]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as area has taken massive development at Dickens Heath plus housing estates in Tidbury Green and totally wrong and unfair to propose more, there are many sites that need redevelopment rather than building on green belt land that is vital for wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>mr David Phillips [3001]</p>			<p>Q15/04</p>	<p>Tythe Barn Lane is already receiving too much traffic. It is too narrow and although the part where the proposed development is be built can be widened the DH end cannot as the houses are too close to the road.</p> <p>The other roads in DH are generally too narrow and cannot currently cope with the amount of traffic.</p> <p>The shopping area in DH is currently too small and parking is totally inadequate.</p> <p>Pressure in existing infrastructure which is at capacity including schools, dentist, GP</p> <p>Tythe Barn Lane currently houses several sports clubs. The Borough should not lose these facilities.</p>
<p>Mr Eric Homer [3721]</p>			<p>Q15/04</p>	<p>Large number of sports grounds to be lost.</p> <p>Site covers 3 nature reserves and 2 ancient woodlands.</p> <p>Understand benefit of building near Whitlocks End station, it has potential to adversely impact traffic flows down Haslucks Green Road.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr G Walters [2324]			Q15/04	<p>Conflicts with policies in existing SLP and proposed DLP.</p> <p>Disproportionate housing in Blythe Ward (45%) and Dickens Heath parish.</p> <p>Note no housing proposals in Dorridge & Hockley Heath ward.</p> <p>Not properly assessed all the SHELAA sites.</p> <p>No sustainable sequential test of sites been carried out.</p> <p>Replacement sports facility would be inadequate, but should not be taken out of Green Belt if goes ahead.</p> <p>Loss of high performing Green Belt and coalescence with Majors Green.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba Heritage Centre.</p> <p>Harm to rural village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Would contravene Para. 32 of NPPF. Traffic impacts would be severe.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Disproportionate concentration of housing South of Shirley.</p> <p>Threatens the wellbeing of the existing community through a loss of amenity and a significant strain on the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Parcels in this area perform highly against purpose A of Green Belt function.</p> <p>Risk of coalescence and loss of settlements' character.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Matthew Workman [2947]			Q15/04	Object to the destruction of the local environment around Dickens Heath Village through the number of houses being built, as village poorly serviced by roads with lack of parking around centre, area is beautiful mix of fields, woodland and canals which are home to allsorts of wildlife which will be lost, and if development goes ahead, then there needs to be improvements to all the roads, bypasses, better train services, more shops and medical services.
Mr Michael Hunter [3086]			Q15/04	DH would lose its village character. no effective separation of the village from the housing north of Whitlock's End Station. We do not believe that there are exceptional circumstances justifying housebuilding on the land west of the village centre.
Mr N Walters [2802]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - dickens heath is unique in that it is a planned new settlement with unique architecture, layout and style. - surrounding roads are at breaking point - do not agree that exceptional circumstances have been made/proven to allow for the loss of green belt - loss of sports and playing facilities
Mr Neale [4086]			Q15/04	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair, as will exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed, and contrary to national policy protecting green belt as other options for growth have not been explored or investigated.
Mr Peter Seddon [2409]			Q15/04	Will result in the loss of playing fields and sports amenities close to south Shirley and Dickens Heath. Research shows that "Regular physical activity reduces the risk of developing cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, dementia and some cancers by at least 30%." The Government has a clear policy to encourage people to take regular exercise to reduce the impact of obesity with its attendant impact on not only the health of our nation but the cost to the NHS in treating obesity. Open spaces, sports and leisure facilities should not be lost whilst the health of our population is declining.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the coalescence of settlements and have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing communities and infrastructure as well as the Green Belt and landscape.</p>
Mrs Lisa Gibbs [3314]			Q15/04	<p>The doubling of size of Dickens Heath (site 4), combined with the impact of sites 12 & 13 (Dog Kennel Lane/South of Shirley) will make traffic on the A34 between Marshall Lake Road and M42 even worse than it already is (regularly takes 10-15 minutes to get from Marshall Lake Road to the junction with Monkspath Hall Road).</p> <p>Furthermore, site 13 is a particularly valued local amenity as it is the only place in the local area where dogs can safely be exercised off lead which is not privately owned. Please do not deprive us of this!</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 7 and 8 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Refs 126 and 130 are Category 2; SHELAA Ref 176 is Category 3.</p> <p>Issues include: existing road needs upgrading, 10-24% is LWS, much of site not within or adjacent to settlement, includes sports pitches from which multiple football clubs operate, less than 50% is contaminated land, much is Grade 4 agricultural land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]</p>			<p>Q15/04</p>	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>2550 homes is large scale of development proposed for Shirley.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Whitlocks End station car park full.</p> <p>Overflow of vehicles from Shirley station car park onto neighbouring estates.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Health services under pressure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Development here will not benefit HS2.</p>
<p>Mrs Cecilia O'Brien [3825]</p>			<p>Q15/04</p>	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs DENISE HACKWORTH [2903]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of development in Blythe Ward.</p> <p>Great deal of housing 'patched' onto existing settlements.</p> <p>Roads already full with traffic.</p> <p>Scores 7-8 in Green Belt assessment, many other sites not as high.</p> <p>Protects Dickens Heath from urban sprawl and contains village.</p> <p>Existing boundary is natural one for Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Site 4 would not provide easy access to village amenities, therefore more traffic.</p> <p>Most homes have 2 cars, not everyone works in Birmingham, and most people would head to M42.</p> <p>Facilities in Dickens Heath cannot cope with further housing.</p> <p>Village will lose its identity.</p>
Mrs E Thompson O'Dowd [4557]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 due to impact on local roads which are already very congested, and the loss of sports clubs and facilities which are community hubs and play important role in adult and children's well being will have impact on physical and mental well being of local community, and relocation is unlikely to be successful due to high rate of participation decline.</p>
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q15/04	<p>The proximity of significant numbers of employment opportunities and transport links are much better in the Dicken Heath, Blythe Valley and Monkspath areas than some of the sites selected (e.g. Balsall Common, Knowle). I also believe that those areas would be better able to absorb expansion without damage to the character of the area. For example, Dickens Heath features modern housing developments already and additional similar developments would be in keeping with its current design/character.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs faye sharp [3845]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Mrs Geri Silverton [2911]			Q15/04	Whilst I understand the need for extra housing I feel Dickens Heath has had more than its fair share. These plans propose expanding it by 60% without any additional amenities and the infrastructure cannot cope, with car based journeys to the village centre where walking was envisaged. Loss of semi rural village character.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Hazel Reed [3279]		Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Erosion of gap with Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Government Housing White Paper states that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances, when all alternatives have been considered.</p> <p>Unreasonable to take 2000 homes of Birmingham's overspill. Numerous brownfield sites in Birmingham.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and green space.</p> <p>Loss of trees will reduce air quality.</p> <p>Loss of leisure facilities used by community.</p> <p>Development will put additional pressure on facilities in neighbouring Council areas.</p> <p>Majors Green already taken a significant amount of additional traffic and parking from Whitlocks End railway station.</p> <p>Roads cannot cope.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q15/04	<p>Flooding issues and impact on surrounding land.</p> <p>The road system in Shirley (and the wider impact on Solihull) would not cope with the amount of homes proposed in such a small area.</p> <p>Sites 4 and 13, have no real bus services and local train stations are overcrowded. The proposed increase number of residents, will not be able to use the trains and will therefore increase car use.</p> <p>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt and nature.</p> <p>Impact on health and well being from loss of community space.</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q15/04	<p>The proposed housing sites at the west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley should not be included due to the following reasons: loss of open countryside around the rural village of Dickens Heath; loss of the rural character of Dickens Heath; significant adverse impacts on the natural environment due to loss of ancient woodlands at Little Tyburn and Birch Leasow Coppice; significant negative impacts on the local biodiversity due to loss of hedgerows, mature native trees and ponds, and also potential for loss of habitats that support legally protected species including great crested newts, badger setts and bat roosts.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		Q15/04	<p>Conflicts with policies in existing SLP and proposed DLP.</p> <p>Disproportionate housing in Blythe Ward (45%) and Dickens Heath parish.</p> <p>Note no housing proposals in Dorridge & Hockley Heath ward.</p> <p>Not properly assessed all the SHELAA sites.</p> <p>No sustainable sequential test of sites been carried out.</p> <p>Replacement sports facility would be inadequate, but should not be taken out of Green Belt if goes ahead.</p> <p>Loss of high performing Green Belt and coalescence with Majors Green.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba Heritage Centre.</p> <p>Harm to rural village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Would contravene Para. 32 of NPPF. Traffic impacts would be severe.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Mrs Judith Chivers [3803]		Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as will result in additional traffic using Tilehouse Lane/Haslucks Green Road and road and footpath network, public transport and station park and ride facilities inadequate to cope with expansion.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Judy Hill [3463]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of 9 football pitches and 2 rugby pitches.</p> <p>Loss of opportunity to be involved in sport.</p> <p>Loss of only direct access to countryside.</p> <p>Loss of areas for children's play and recreation.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Where will football clubs re-locate?</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Already lost a lot.</p> <p>Will increase strain on local services, schools, doctors.</p> <p>Already congested roads.</p> <p>Reduction in quality of life.</p> <p>41% of development is disproportionate. Should share more fairly.</p> <p>Loss of tranquility.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
mrs julie white [3844]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection as:</p> <p>Object to the site for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - dickens heath is unique in that it is a planned new settlement with unique architecture, layout and style. - surrounding roads are at breaking point - do not agree that exceptional circumstances have been made/proven to allow for the loss of green belt - loss of sports and playing facilities - loss of green belt and SINC - unviable to deliver housing because of the geology of the area.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q15/04	<p>Far too many to be built on the green belt in the Shirley and Dickens Heath area. Also taking into account Blythe Valley and the houses already being built in Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green, the house numbers account for at least half are those to be built in Solihull. They should be spread out across the borough.</p>
Mrs Pamela Martin [3182]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Erosion of green belt between Solihull and Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Loss of football pitches and garden centre that benefits Majors Green residents.</p> <p>Infrastructure issues (see Q.16).</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
MRS REBECCA NICHOLLS [3789]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as inappropriate location for growth better close to HS2 Interchange and on brownfield land, area has already taken significant development with Dickens Heath, will have significant negative effect on residents, wildlife, trees and greenery, will increase volume, noise and danger of traffic on Haslucks Green Road in area subject to speeding, accidents, road rage incidents, additional people unlikely to walk to station due to poor quality pavements and increased parking, results in loss of countryside and rural walking areas, will increase pressure on overburdened schools and medical services, and will adversely affect property values.
Mrs Samantha Setchell [3741]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Significant increase in traffic volume and hazardous driving behaviour in Majors Green in last 15 years.</p> <p>Expanding Dickens Heath will make traffic worse as residents commute to Birmingham and elsewhere.</p> <p>Loss of football pitches. Impact on local children and opportunities for sport and recreation.</p> <p>Loss of green space</p>
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q15/04	The triangle of land adjoining proposed housing allocation 4, bounded by Houndsfield Lane, Tilehouse Lane and the railway line, which has not been included and should be considered as the land is lower performing in the Green Belt Assessment, there is already a proposed development near there, and it is significantly more convenient to access Whitlocks End railway station from this land than from proposed allocations 12 and 13.
Mrs Shirley Minal [3604]			Q15/04	Object to housing site 4 as will result in urban area being joined up with Dickens Heath, urban area being further from countryside and devalue property.
Mrs Una Cole [3840]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Muriel Lloyd [3318]			Q15/04	<p>objecting to this site principally on the basis of increased traffic leading to congestion, the loss of green space and impact on the health of residents of the area.</p> <p>Also concerned about the lack of PT in this area which would lead people to use their cars more.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
N T Clayson [4147]			Q15/04	Object to concentration of 2550 houses in close proximity to South Shirley as unfair and should be distributed across Borough, with wider green belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath retained.
Neville & Sue Walker [4022]			Q15/04	<p>Impact on transport infrastructure in Shirley. Will increase existing traffic congestion and queues.</p> <p>Parking at the railway station is impossible in peak periods.</p> <p>The impact on schools and health services will be seriously affected if these proposals go ahead.</p> <p>This is a further loss of Green Belt land in Shirley. These public open spaces are vital for the area.</p>
Nick & Abby Fox [4508]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Nigel Collett [4119]			Q15/04	Object to housing proposed for South Shirley, as development on this scale will cause the already massively congested roads in the area to become gridlocked, local rail stations do not have capacity for the extra demands with insufficient parking at Whitlocks End, Shirley and Earlswood at present, insufficient local infrastructure with lack of school places and medical facilities, will destroy many local amenities and recreational areas, including several sports fields, and local wildlife, and there are many more suitable alternatives including brownfield sites to the east and north closer the HS2 interchange.
Norman Hodgetts [4711]			Q15/04	Object to building such a large number of houses in one area. No consideration has been given to the effect on the Green Belt which will be eroded and see gaps between settlements close. Also the roads are at saturation point with the A34 at a standstill at times, leading to increased pollution.
Old Yardleians Rugby Club (Mr Shannon Killarney) [3738]			Q15/04	In an age of ever increasing obesity levels, I am specifically registering a concern about how the rugby facilities that stand to be lost due to housing development in Site 4 can be re-located to ensure equivalent or better rugby participation afterwards, especially considering the increased demand there will be for sporting and social club provision once all these new houses are built and occupied.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 7 and 8 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Refs 126 and 130 are Category 2; SHELAA Ref 176 is Category 3.</p> <p>Issues include: existing road needs upgrading, 10-24% is LWS, much of site not within or adjacent to settlement, includes sports pitches from which multiple football clubs operate, less than 50% is contaminated land, much is Grade 4 agricultural land.</p>
Paul & Julie Meaden [4528]			Q15/04	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.
Paul R Kimberley [4722]			Q15/04	Object to housing proposals in Shirley due to loss of green belt and recreational countryside, and will exacerbate already ridiculous traffic congestion in Bills Lane and Tanworth Lane.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q15/04	<p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Will close gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of flood storage.</p> <p>Loss of amenity and open space.</p> <p>Impact of increased traffic.</p>
Paula Price [4498]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as road network inadequate to cope with existing traffic and Haslucks Green Road suffers from speeding traffic and frequent accidents and additional housing will increase volume of traffic significantly putting safety of local residents at risk, Whitlocks End park and ride already full and public transport inadequate, area has taken significant growth in Dickens Heath and Shirley, increased pollution and health risks, loss of sports pitches used by active clubs and parkland/recreational areas and unclear these will be replaced adequately.</p>
Paula Quinn [3821]			Q15/04	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath.</p>
Pauline White [4195]			Q15/04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main reasons is the increased traffic that will come with the developments - also concerned about the impact on the schools and medical provision - increased demand and impact on train stations at whitlocks end and Shirley

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]</p>		<p>Q15/04</p>	<p>Site is deliverable.</p> <p>Able to provide numbers early in the plan.</p> <p>Delivery document could aid the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p>Existing key features would be retained or enhanced such as field boundary, footpath, topographical features, canal setting, acces points.</p> <p>Landscape Strategy to be developed.</p> <p>Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>Accessible and sustainable location.</p> <p>Can accomodate up to 120 dwellings.</p> <p>Opportunities for children's play and on-site green space.</p> <p>Protect trees and hedgerows where possible.</p> <p>Create strong, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Provide a mix of housing to meet lcoal needs.</p> <p>High quality development.</p> <p>Protect existing residential amenity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/04	Object concern about the impact on the function of Green Belt. There would coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlock End and Majors Green. It is also within a landscape character area of high sensitivity.
Peter & Eunice Simpson [4447]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Erosion of gap with Bromsgrove.</p> <p>High levels of existing congestion.</p> <p>Local roads used as rat runs, e.g. Drawbridge Road.</p> <p>Railway station carparks full at 8am.</p> <p>Existing traffic from Dickens Heath is already a problem.</p>
Phillip Shakles [3440]			Q15/04	<p>The roads aren't much more than lanes in some parts, with narrow footpaths. Pedestrians have to step into the road to pass each other. The roads are heavily used at peak times and there has been several bad accidents in the area.</p> <p>The area is being over developed by property developers who will cram as many houses as they can into the area and Solihull Council who see green fields as £ signs.</p> <p>Will schools, doctors, hospitals and other services & amenities that are stretched now be able to cope? Are there Plans to improve these services and facilities?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Prof Jon Binner [3054]			Q15/04	<p>I am concerned with the plans for an extension to Dickens Heath.</p> <p>The future inhabitants will clearly use Dickens Heath as for their facilities and I can find no indication of any plans to increase the latter, e.g. car parking, shops, pubs, restaurants, etc.</p> <p>Dickens Heath is already over-populated for its size and facilities (as is the railway station at Whitlock's End) and the roads are too narrow for yet more cars.</p> <p>Will destroy local community.</p> <p>Will cause coalescence between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p>
Rachael Icke [4617]			Q15/04	<p>Development on the sites is being objected to for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - further erosion of the Green Belt and open lands - impact of further houses on the existing residents (traffic, roads capacity) - Dickens Heath itself is already very congested
Ragni Gilbert [4613]			Q15/04	<p>not on the sports fields at Dickens Heath.</p>
Richard & Ruth Wise [4501]			Q15/04	<p>Object to amount of housing proposed in South Shirley which involves massive overdevelopment that is disproportionate and will result in loss of breathing space and qualities that make Solihull a desirable place to live.</p>
Richard Bailey [4095]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as overall proposals for South Shirley amounting to 41% of housing allocations are disproportionate and out of step with demands for HS2 development in NE of Borough, threaten to overwhelm current road, transport, schools and medical services infrastructure, being on top of current developments at Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and BVP, will impact on local residential roads that cannot sustain significant increases in commuter traffic and are already rat runs and will require significant increase in local public transport, educational and medical services.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/04	Continued approach to see Dickens Heath perform the role of a soft sponge for soaking up more and more housing to avoid having to find sites elsewhere. The expansion breaches the fundamental principle of preventing the merging of settlements. Majors Green should remain well separated from Dickens Heath and housing development along Tythe Barn Lane out to Tilehouse Lane would be a fatal erosion of that Green Belt gap. Dickens Heath centre is also in need of a fresh examination if it is to cope with any more housing.
Richard Cowie [4276]			Q15/04	Object to the concentration of new housing around south Shirley and unfair distribution across the Borough compared with areas such as Meriden and Dorridge, as Dickens Heath contributes to traffic congestion and impacts on wider area especially around Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane at peak times, highway infrastructure inadequate and will need reviewing, and medical services already oversubscribed and will need improvement.
Richard King [3340]			Q15/04	traffic increase on local roads, detrimental impact on infrastructure, sports facilities and loss of green belt.
Rita Gee [3335]			Q15/04	Objecting to the loss of green belt as a result of development

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Robert Street [3904]		Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4.</p> <p>Harm to Dickens Heath's village character and uniqueness.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, which scores highly in assessment, resulting in urban sprawl and coalescence.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion, e.g. Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Existing services are inadequate. SMBC not have a good track record. Particular concern are schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severely lacking in DH village and Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Flood risk.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities.</p> <p>Loss of Akamba.</p> <p>Overdevelopment in general.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Stafford [4398]			Q15/04	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>41% of new development in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair. Consider impacts on local community.</p> <p>Object to Solihull taking 2000 homes from Birmingham's housing requirement.</p> <p>Four allocations (4,11,12,13) will have detrimental impact on already congested roads.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for exercise, recreation, dog walking. Detrimental to health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of sports fields. Government trying to promote healthy living through exercise.</p> <p>Should replace sport facilities.</p> <p>Impact on schools, GPs and other local services.</p> <p>Solihull hospital and Heartlands already under pressure.</p> <p>High density housing not in-keeping with surrounding areas.</p>
Robin Hill [4621]			Q15/04	<p>The use of the 'TRW' site seems very logical. The land has limited recreational value and is clearly underutilised. Given the existing developments on the site it seems logical to extend the 3-4 storey buildings and provide housing local to the Shirley industrial area (including Cranmore) within walking distance.</p>
Roger Lock [4112]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as part of destruction of green belt land around Shirley, as developments at Parkgate, Powergen, the relocation of Shirley library, Sainsbury and KFC have already made it a less pleasant place to live, and further development will exacerbate traffic on already crowded roads in the area, although traffic surveys are mostly done outside peak periods when the problems are worst.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/04	Loss of sports pitches; no reference to relocation or compensation. Development would result in coalescence of Dickens Heath with Majors Green which would be contrary to National Green Belt policy.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/04	Loss of sports pitches; no reference to relocation or compensation. Development would result in coalescence of Dickens Heath with Majors Green which would be contrary to National Green Belt policy.
Russell East [4330]			Q15/04	Conflicts with policies in existing SLP and proposed DLP. Disproportionate housing in Blythe Ward (45%) and Dickens Heath parish. Note no housing proposals in Dorridge & Hockley Heath ward. Not properly assessed all the SHELAA sites. No sustainable sequential test of sites been carried out. Replacement sports facility would be inadequate, but should not be taken out of Green Belt if goes ahead. Loss of high performing Green Belt and coalescence with Majors Green. Loss of Akamba Heritage Centre. Harm to rural village character and uniqueness. Would contravene Para. 32 of NPPF. Traffic impacts would be severe. Loss of wildlife.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q15/04	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Added pressure on infrastructure: schools, medical and social support, transport.</p> <p>Reduction in quality of life.</p> <p>Loss of amenity land.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Development won't benefit HS2.</p>
S Ham [4126]			Q15/04	<p>Whilst the need for more housing is recognised, object to the level of new housing proposed for South Shirley as 41% of Borough total is extremely unfair and should be reviewed, is shocking on top of significant development already allowed at Dickens Heath and elsewhere, local schools and medical services are already at breaking point and extra housing will put more pressure on infrastructure, loss of green belt and local green space accessible without a car, and will exacerbate major transport problems on local roads during peak times.</p>
Sandra & Andrew Campbell [4494]			Q15/04	<p>Object to huge scale of housing growth proposed for 4 sites in South Shirley, which will have negative effect on community, result in loss of green space, and have detrimental impact on local roads, schools and medical services.</p>
Sara Shaw [4278]			Q15/04	<p>Object to housing Site 4 as concentration of growth in one area unbelievable, land is green belt, highway infrastructure unfit to take extra traffic with country lanes already breaking up, Whitlocks End station already over capacity at peak times, already suffering increase in accidents in Haslucks Green Road, use of roads by horse riders becoming unsafe, and need for proper risk analysis of plans to walkers/cyclists/horse riders.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Evans [3893]			Q15/04	<p>Objection to building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Heavily congested area.</p>
Sean Tompkins [3084]			Q15/04	<p>The road infrastructure would not support the development.</p> <p>Traffic congestion. Recommend reopening Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Need integration between neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Loss of local amenity space.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt and floodplain.</p> <p>Can the sewage system cope?</p>
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/04	<p>The loss of a number of sports fields for site 4 will deprive the local community of the opportunity of recreational activities and reduce open space.</p>
Sheryl Chandler [4179]			Q15/04	<p>Support Shirley Heath Objection as 41% of growth in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair and will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, should not take Birmingham requirement, loss of green belt not justified as other options such as urban area and brownfield not investigated, growth should be focussed on infrastructure improvements such as HS2/NEC, will exacerbate congestion on Stratford Road and surrounding routes, increase rat running, damage to Blackford Road and speeding made worse by Dickens Heath traffic, inadequate transport/school/medical infrastructure, loss of recreational facilities and open space, and development unlikely to meet affordable housing need.</p>
Shirley & Peter Hansen [4690]			Q15/04	<p>The present infrastructure is inadequate to support the huge impact of the proposed housing on south west Shirley. GP surgeries and education provision is already over-subscribed.</p> <p>Question where the access points to the sites will be and the highway changes involved. Traffic is already increasing at peak times and can be hazardous for pedestrians. The existing roads cannot cope and this will be exacerbated.</p> <p>The site is Green Belt and will reduce the gap between settlements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q15/04	<p>Proposals account for 2,600 homes at sites 4, 11, 12 and 13. Disproportionate allocation of homes within Shirley/Dickens Heath area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Coalescence with Majors Green.</p> <p>Already 200 homes built in Dickens Heath and consent for 200 in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Likely infrastructure requirements are vague.</p> <p>Aims to satisfy housing need and retain Borough's character are contradictory.</p> <p>Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and Tidbury Green will lose their identities.</p> <p>Dickens Heath infrastructure not able to cope.</p> <p>Site on a floodplain.</p>
Simon Rogers [4011]			Q15/04	<p>The road network will not cope and will exacerbate existing congestion.</p> <p>The rail network will not cope with additional passengers.</p> <p>Impact on local schools.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Q15/04	<p>700 homes is 33% extension to Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Reduce housing number to 550.</p> <p>Retain the area between Tythe Barn Lane and the Canal as Green Belt/designated to existing use or Recreation and Sports Grounds.</p> <p>Strong local support to retain AKAMBA.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure in Dickens Heath village centre, traffic and parking at Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Affordable housing for local needs in Dickens Heath.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Q15/04	<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <p>700 homes is 33% extension to Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Reduce housing number to 550.</p> <p>Retain the area between Tythe Barn Lane and the Canal as Green Belt/designated to existing use or Recreation and Sports Grounds.</p> <p>Strong local support to retain AKAMBA.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure in Dickens Heath village centre, traffic and parking at Whitlocks End station.</p> <p>Affordable housing for local needs in Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Tree Wardens (Mrs Carol Henrick) [3853]			Q15/04	Realise there is a need for affordable housing but the horrors of the intense building already in Dickens heath comes to mind. When building new developments there needs to be plenty of green space for children and adults to enjoy and of course we need to preserve as many of the existing trees as trees are essential to our well being. A mature canopy tree releases enough oxygen to sustain two human beings. Please with thoughtful planning we could provide a healthy environment where people can live.
Sonia Woodbridge Oliver [4500]			Q15/04	Object to amount of new housing proposed for South Shirley as area already suffers from growing congestion and concerned that pressures of thousands and new homes on local services, such as schools and medical services not taken into consideration, will result in loss of sports pitches and removal of recreational amenities and have impact on existing residents future.
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/04	Object due to the: Contribution it makes to the Green Belt; Site constraints in SHELAA; 700 dwellings should be dispersed elsewhere.
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q15/04	question the suitability of the site as it washes over/includes land currently occupied by sports pitches, playing fields, and Local nature Reserve.
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q15/04	Sport England are aware that work is currently underway on the completion of an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strateg(PPS). The PPS should be used to determine whether or not the playing fields proposed for allocation is surplus to sporting requirements by demonstrating that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment. If this cannot be demonstrated then the playing field or formal recreation land would need to be replaced with equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality. In the absence of evidence to justify the loss of sporting facilities, Sport England object.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q15/04	Richborough Estates Limited support the proposed allocation at West of Dickens Heath (Site 4) with any proposals being determined via a master planning approach. The allocation accords, or can be made to accord with the spatial strategy and sequential approach adopted in the Local plan review, the locational and accessibility criteria of Policy P7, and the criteria in Policy P8 for managing travel demand, reducing congestion and providing parking.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/04	Loss of sports pitches; no reference to relocation or compensation. Development would result in coalescence of Dickens Heath with Majors Green which would be contrary to National Green Belt policy.
Sue Dooley [3338]			Q15/04	concerned about the increased levels of traffic from existing developments at DH and Wythall will only be exacerbated by the new developments, as well as the loss of green belt land in the locality.
Sunya A Phillips [4177]			Q15/04	Object to housing in Green Belt in South Shirley as green belt should only be used when other land not available, Haslucks Green Road is far too busy to take extra traffic, there are no footpaths in places and developments on this scale are ridiculous.
Susan Cook [4486]			Q15/04	The proposed development at Sites 4 and 13 will exacerbate the traffic congestion on Haslucks Green Road, already causing gridlock in peak times following the Asda development and with the Powergen redevelopment to come, as occupiers will use Asda and/or route to Solihull/Birmingham so the road infrastructure is inadequate to support this level of development, and will remove green belt further from Shirley.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 7 and 8 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Refs 126 and 130 are Category 2; SHELAA Ref 176 is Category 3.</p> <p>Issues include: existing road needs upgrading, 10-24% is LWS, much of site not within or adjacent to settlement, includes sports pitches from which multiple football clubs operate, less than 50% is contaminated land, much is Grade 4 agricultural land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/04	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 7 and 8 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Refs 126 and 130 are Category 2; SHELAA Ref 176 is Category 3.</p> <p>Issues include: existing road needs upgrading, 10-24% is LWS, much of site not within or adjacent to settlement, includes sports pitches from which multiple football clubs operate, less than 50% is contaminated land, much is Grade 4 agricultural land.</p>
Tim Mason [4294]			Q15/04	Concerns on design of existing Dickens Heath Village and that further development will increase traffic and parking congestion.
Tina Ferran [4098]			Q15/04	Object to housing Site 4 as part of overall development of 4 sites in South Shirley as unsuitable for development, will have massive negative impact on community, destroy green space enjoyed by community, add to pressure on already congested roads within locality, and schools and medical services will be unable to cope with population increase.
V Healey Gwilliam [4283]			Q15/04	South Shirley area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.
Valerie Lynes [4054]			Q15/04	<p>Any development will add to the traffic on these already overcrowded roads.</p> <p>The site is Green Belt and would see Solihull extend right up to the Worcestershire border.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Viv Smith [4670]			Q15/04	<p>Object as disproportionate amount of housing in Blythe ward, contrary to Government's green belt policy and preference for smaller sites for local builders/self-build, contrary to green belt evidence and policy to protect key gaps between settlements/attractive rural settings, exceptional circumstances not demonstrated as no sequential test to identify more suitable sites, not in sustainable location as will encourage car traffic, no direct access to Dickens Heath village, loss of sports grounds which would not be adequately replaced, loss of local employment, impact on special character of village, rural setting, highway network, wildlife habitats and unsustainable building costs.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/04	<p>Includes Local Wildlife Sites (LWS): Tythebarn Lane Meadows and Little Tyburn Coppice which is also identified as ancient woodland.</p> <p>Note that these are identified as constraints.</p> <p>Further area in the north-west corner identified as a potential LWS. Should be prioritised for assessment against the LWS criteria, with the LWS team commissioned to survey the site at the earliest opportunity. In accordance with precautionary approach.</p> <p>All LWS should be protected and enhanced within any scheme for this area.</p> <p>Ancient woodland is likely to require a suitable semi-natural buffer. Should be included in list of requirements.</p>
Wythall Parish Council (Miss Kerie Harris) [1943]			Q15/04	<p>Object as will erode Green Belt, result in loss of local facilities including playing pitches, loss of buffer between Solihull and Bromsgrove, impact of increased traffic particularly through Majors Green and on Haslucks Green Road.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Zoe Murtagh [3083]			Q15/04	<p>Will ruin the character of Dickens Heath village and Shirley.</p> <p>Impact on local wildlife and leisure activities for local people.</p> <p>Flood risk issues.</p> <p>Increased traffic and future highway safety issues.</p> <p>Tythe barn Lane is too narrow.</p> <p>Future parking issues.</p> <p>Will be a shortfall of playing pitches in the area.</p> <p>Could the Tidbury Green sites accommodate more development?</p> <p>Schools and doctors are at capacity.</p> <p>Devalue property.</p>
Question 15/05 Chester Road/Moorend Avenue, Fordbridge				
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/05	<p>A no brainer, what on earth will happen to the existing road network and the traffic corridor for the Chester road/ Collector road especially with all the expected extra growth at the HS2 hub . traffic east bound on this route to bham will increase. The last road improvements on the chester road at Craig croft and the Timberley shops have been heavily criticised so the council dont have a great track record on roads in North Solihull. also you would not build on a large open island in South solihull so why is it ok in Chelmsley Wood.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q15/05	<p>the site includes what is a key intersection of the local road network. this would bring its deliverability into question and potentially lead to the DLP being challenged at a later stage.</p> <p>Also concerned about the potential loss of open space/LWS.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor D Evans [2240]			Q15/05	<p>I think the use of green space to build houses on is wrong.</p> <p>We have lost enough green space in the north of the borough.</p> <p>Enough is enough.</p>
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q15/05	<p>Site 5 - Chester Road / Moorend Avenue</p> <p>Development here has been considered for some time but generally in terms of community facilities with a small proportion of housing and major junction realignment. It's hard to see how, with 100 homes suggested, there would be any room for such well-needed community facilities. It's also likely that further recreational and biodiverse green space would be lost at the edges, which would be unacceptable to the local community given the scale of what has already been lost nearby.</p>
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15/05	<p>Support replacement of the roundabout. Given isolation from other residential areas and position on the highway network, an alternative commercial or retail use is suggested.</p>
Fordbridge Town Council (Mr N Millard) [1887]			Q15/05	<p>Site 5 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green and open space. Already lost a lot in Fordbridge.</p> <p>Loss of visual and recreational amenity.</p> <p>Would reduce size of Meriden Park.</p> <p>Intensify an already densely populated area.</p>
James Burn [2910]			Q15/05	<p>I object to development site 5 in Chelmsley Wood. Building here will likely cause air pollution and congestion.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/05	<p>Lack of detailed information on:</p> <p>the remodelling of the road junction;</p> <p>firm boundary details;</p> <p>impact on the floodplain;</p> <p>achievability of a development.</p> <p>Therefore, difficult to assess the potential success of this site.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/05	<p>Site allocation requires further clarification and explanation. Do not understand how it is possible to accommodate up to 100 dwellings on the site proposed. Would result in loss of green space.</p>
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/05	<p>SHELAA states the site faces significant suitability and achievability constraints.</p> <p>25-50% of site is within a LWS.</p> <p>Site is within Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Poor marketability.</p> <p>Major impact on nature conservation.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Landscape character has high sensitivity.</p> <p>Unlikely to meet yield of 100 dwellings.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/05	<p>Lack of detailed information on:</p> <p>the remodelling of the road junction;</p> <p>firm boundary details;</p> <p>impact on the floodplain;</p> <p>achievability of a development.</p> <p>Therefore, difficult to assess the potential success of this site.</p>
Miss Sally Simpson [3074]			Q15/05	<p>The beautiful green space and nature areas of chelmsley wood are being destroyed. The Chester Road moored avenue area is adjacent to the nature area by the river Cole. It's beautiful and part of the local community used for dog walking exercise and playing. This is the same for the land at the back of Hawksworth crescent and kite green close. Give us quality of life in the north of the borough as well as the south</p>
Mr Jason Millar [3036]			Q15/05	<p>LPR 5 (A452 / Moorend Av. Junction) proposed development concerns me as the HS2 development 2 miles away will result in increased traffic past the location and resultant noise, vibration and pollution, a poor location for housing.</p> <p>As a local resident I have already been affected by increased traffic delays from the recent single lane running downgrading of the adjoining A452 past the Chelmunds Cross development. Any junction modelling must take account of future road expansion and not further constrict it exacerbating traffic issues. Once developed it will be difficult to re-develop as required by increased traffic flow.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/05	<p>Site allocation requires further clarification and explanation. Do not understand how it is possible to accommodate up to 100 dwellings on the site proposed. Would result in loss of green space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/05	Lack of detailed information on: the remodelling of the road junction; firm boundary details; impact on the floodplain; achievability of a development. Therefore, difficult to assess the potential success of this site.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/05	Lack of detailed information on: the remodelling of the road junction; firm boundary details; impact on the floodplain; achievability of a development. Therefore, difficult to assess the potential success of this site.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/05	<p>Lack of detailed information on:</p> <p>the remodelling of the road junction;</p> <p>firm boundary details;</p> <p>impact on the floodplain;</p> <p>achievability of a development.</p> <p>Therefore, difficult to assess the potential success of this site.</p>
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15/05	<p>SHELAA identifies the site as facing significant suitability and achievability constraints, notably almost 50% of site within Flood Zone 2 and 25-50% of Site in a LWS.</p> <p>Poor marketability and/or viability.</p> <p>Limited developable land.</p> <p>Unlikely to come forward in first 10 years of plan period.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the comments above, if site should come forward, potential only for 100 dwellings.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/05	<p>The majority of this site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site; Cole Bank Park.</p> <p>The Wildlife Trust therefore objects to the inclusion of this site allocation on the basis that it does not appear possible for a development scheme to avoid an impact on the LWS.</p> <p>SHELAA states that 'this site is considered to be unsuitable and unachievable'.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/06 Meriden Road, Hampton in Arden				
Arden Wood Shavings Ltd [3899]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q15/06	Support the allocation of the Meriden Road Depot as part of site 6. The boundary of the allocated site should be adjusted to reflect the Depot site boundary, through the development of the concept masterplan for the site. To ensure delivery, clarification of the site's relationship with site 24 in the SLP2013 is required
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q15/06	Object to housing site 6 as together with Site 24 in the SLP2013 the target number for the combined site would increase housing stock by some 25% and be unsustainable with current facilities, fails to meet accessibility criteria in Plan, fails to acknowledge contribution of several housing developments in the Parish that have been agreed/completed to overall housing number, and fails to provide compensating open space to replace that proposed in the SLP2013. However, would have no objection to sympathetic development of combined site incorporating significant open space which retains and enhances footpath access to village.
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q15/06	Object to housing site 6 as together with Site 24 in the SLP2013 the target number for the combined site would increase housing stock by some 25% and be unsustainable with current facilities, fails to meet accessibility criteria in Plan, fails to acknowledge contribution of several housing developments in the Parish that have been agreed/completed to overall housing number, and fails to provide compensating open space to replace that proposed in the SLP2013. However, would have no objection to sympathetic development of combined site incorporating significant open space which retains and enhances footpath access to village.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/06	<p>Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local Plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or</p> <p>if not available an alternative development solution delivering additional open space was forthcoming.</p> <p>This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation.</p> <p>Viability may be affected by contamination issues due to previous use.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/06	Not a logical site to redevelop as it is physically separated from the edge of Meriden. Narrow site frontage would make it difficult for development to have any street presence or positive contribution to the street scene.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/06	<p>Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local Plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or</p> <p>if not available an alternative development solution delivering additional open space was forthcoming.</p> <p>This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation.</p> <p>Viability may be affected by contamination issues due to previous use.</p>
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q15/06	<p>Packington Estate supports the inclusion of 'proposal allocation' Site 6, Meriden Road, Hampton-in-Arden to include the addition of the extension areas to the south and east.</p> <p>In reviewing the evidence based documents that will support the Local Plan, it is evident that additional evidence is required.</p>
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd [400]	Mr Will Charlton	Brooke Smith Planning (Mr Will Charlton) [3646]	Q15/06	Packington Estate supports the removal of the land from the Green Belt and the allocation of the extended Meriden Road site for housing but does not consider the delivery timescale to be appropriate or justified.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/06	Not a logical site to redevelop as it is physically separated from the edge of Meriden. Narrow site frontage would make it difficult for development to have any street presence or positive contribution to the street scene.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/06	<p>Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local Plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or</p> <p>if not available an alternative development solution delivering additional open space was forthcoming.</p> <p>This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation.</p> <p>Viability may be affected by contamination issues due to previous use.</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/06	<p>Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local Plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or</p> <p>if not available an alternative development solution delivering additional open space was forthcoming.</p> <p>This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation.</p> <p>Viability may be affected by contamination issues due to previous use.</p>
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/06	<p>Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local Plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or</p> <p>if not available an alternative development solution delivering additional open space was forthcoming.</p> <p>This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation.</p> <p>Viability may be affected by contamination issues due to previous use.</p>
Question 15/07 Kingshurst Village Centre				
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/07	Yes if its done sensitively and enhances kingshurst. but if the homes are more modern Bellway shoeboxes like at Woodlands next to smiths wood college then it is a waste of an opportunity.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q15/07	support the inclusion of this site for residential but question the overall number of housing included in the DLP. Do not want the recently built new homes included in the final allocation/site.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q15/07	Site 7 - Kingshurst Village Centre This site definitely represents an opportunity for beneficial redesign of place with incorporation of new housing. The various options likely to be available are probably of widely varying viability so care would need to be taken to get the balance right here. I'd be concerned at any proposals to demolish recently built homes in the immediate vicinity.
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q15/07	Support provision of homes in this location by 100 seems too difficult to deliver. Question accuracy of maps - seek clarity that homes on Church Close, Colling Walk and Overgreen Drive are included as an error.
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15/07	The inclusion of all of Kingshurst Village Centre, including buildings which the Council is actively working to rebuild or refurbish and even some recently built housing, may generate opposition out of all proportion to the small number of houses proposed for this area. Using general boundaries is unhelpful, rather than the area to be developed. Propose that these and similar sites should either be designated as mixed use or the relevant areas of concern removed from the areas included within the site boundaries.
Question 15/08 Hampton Road, Knowle				
Alan Kirby [3615]			Q15/08	Object to the level of growth proposed in Knowle which at over 1,000 dwellings not including sites that have already received planning permission is disproportionate across the Borough and will exacerbate the already horrendous traffic problems, roadside parking and gridlock.
Alison Leah [3517]			Q15/08	The proposed developments for new housing in Knowle are inappropriate and contradictory to the Council's stated criteria.
Ana & Mark Spittle McGuire [4693]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Anne Hewitt [4324]			Q15/08	Site 8 Objection. Support submission by KDBH Neighbourhood Forum.
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	Would have a significant impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, on Landscape Character, heritage assets and recreation facilities. The proposed allocations will represent an over-concentration of growth in Knowle which will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure. Would question how a population growth proposed by the allocations will satisfactorily assimilate into the village.
Charlotte Richmond [4631]			Q15/08	Site 8 Objection as the development is not for the benefit of the village and its residents - will erode and lead to the loss of green belt - transport and infrastructure is not appropriate - increased pressure on medical resources, parking in the area and recreational resources - causes a rise in petty crime and anti-social behaviour -
Cheryl & Philip Buck [4317]			Q15/08	Site 8 Objection. Support KDBH Forum's response to DLP. Knowle will no longer be a village, and will be part of Solihull/Birmingham conurbation. Roads in Knowle and Dorridge cannot cope. Knowle High Street will be constant pinchpoint.
Chris Abberley [3769]			Q15/08	object to the sites (endorsing KDBH views)

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Codev Homes [4643]	Mr Michael Davies	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Q15/08	Support. However, the draft allocation should be amended to include an extended area of land on the south side of Hampton Road (as shown in the submitted plan).
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 sites. Larger site to the north not considered within/adjacent to free standing village. Trees will need to be considered.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 7. Should be 11 to account for significant contribution football club makes to GB. Other sites, e.g. have lower scores.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Development would lead to net ecological loss.</p> <p>Loss of well-used sports facility.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/08	Contrary to Green Belt policy and Council policy to protect 'urbs in rure' character, unsustainable location dependent on car travel, would harm attractive open countryside, remove opportunities for quiet recreation, loss of playing fields/sports grounds and drainage issues and impact on flood risk.
Daniel Gallagher [4625]			Q15/08	Site 8 Objection - AS PER THE KDBH FORUM RESPONSE
David Johnson [4746]			Q15/08	<p>Know the Government has said we need to build new houses in Knowle.</p> <p>Land around Knowle cannot cope with new housing.</p> <p>Schools and doctors are full.</p> <p>Parking an existing problem.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Sharpe [4444]			Q15/08	<p>Objection to Site 8.</p> <p>Mismatch between areas identified for economic growth and those for housing development.</p> <p>New housing should be close to economic growth areas, or where transport links are already in place or can be improved.</p> <p>Need assessment of infrastructure/transport improvements required to enable housing developments. This cannot be left to a later date.</p> <p>Knowle should not be the default option.</p>
Dr A Jickells [2008]			Q15/08	<p>Object to Site 8 which should be reduced in size in line with responses to local consultation, to reduce impact on green belt, character of Knowle, services, traffic and risk of accidents on Hampton Road and at junction with Warwick Road, and to exclude protected trees, Purnells Brook and flood plain, and the Streamside Trust area thereby avoiding development at highest point of village.</p>
Dr Andrea Collins [4511]			Q15/08	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
DR David Gentle [4632]			Q15/08	<p>Support the rep made by KDBH</p> <p>specific points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increases the housing stock in Knowle by over 25%, -any large development (over 400, for instance) should be adjoining urban areas to minimise detrimental impact and the 'smaller' developments (100-400) -detrimental impact on the identity, character and appearance of Knowle -already problems with parking, traffic congestion at peak times and access to primary medical care -a need for just under 2 additional forms of entry at primary school level -retail facilities are not adequate
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q15/08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sites are at the least accessible end of the scale and poor in locational terms. - Development here would be beyond the built-up area of Knowle and a significant encroachment into open countryside. - sites are the two best performing parcels of Green
Elizabeth & Gregg Harley [4512]			Q15/08	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q15/08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sites are at the least accessible end of the scale and poor in locational terms. - Development here would be beyond the built-up area of Knowle and a significant encroachment into open countryside. - sites are the two best performing parcels of Green
Georgina & Fergal O'Gara [4576]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Gill Corns [4448]			Q15/08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sites are at the least accessible end of the scale and poor in locational terms. - Development here would be beyond the built-up area of Knowle and a significant encroachment into open countryside. - sites are the two best performing parcels of Green
Gordon Harvey [4190]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support the representation made by KDBH forum - this opposes the development in scale in the KDBH area.
Graham Edwards [4191]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concerned about green belt (loss of) - endorses the KDBH forum representation

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Graham Jones [3354]			Q15/08	<p>The Hampton Road site in Knowle should not proceed. The current road does not have capacity for the traffic generated by the new houses or for the traffic generated by the proposed new football/sports centre. As noted elsewhere no public transport options have even been considered in the plan.</p> <p>The Arden triangle site in Knowle could proceed at a lower size (450 house, say).</p>
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/08	<p>Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.</p>
Ian Fisher [4590]			Q15/08	<p>Whilst recognises need for housing, uncomfortable with total proposed for Knowle and would like to see number of houses reduced, but supportive of 2 allocations that offer significant community benefits, which need to be highlighted to make case, with explanations/proposals for how issues such as increased traffic and parking demands will be managed, and includes some detailed suggestions for traffic, highway and parking improvements.</p>
Jane Watts [4358]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection.</p> <p>Endorse views of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Janet Royle [4227]			Q15/08	<p>1. Green Belt designated as whole - not as 'parcels'</p> <p>2. Many Refined Parcels owned by developers and speculators.</p> <p>3. scoring of parcels subjective and does not account for major Green Belt aims- encourage the recycling of derelict and urban land.</p> <p>4. RP39 / Arden Triangle has scored only moderately (compared to other local RPs), yet has a strong rural outlook with much wildlife. attractive green entry into Knowle; very close to Historic centre.</p> <p>5. owners of RP39 and Arden Academy to gain financially if land developed.</p> <p>6. will irrevocably change character of area; will increase pressure on local amenities.</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q15/08	Would result in the loss of sporting amenities or recreational areas. This seems to go against the policy objective of "Supporting the retention and protection of facilities which promote healthy lifestyles such as open space, including public rights of way to open space, playing pitches and allotments;"
Jo McGrory [4577]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Joan & Graham Campbell [4665]			Q15/08	Object to housing Site 8 as proposals to build some 1,500 houses in Knowle/Dorridge/Bentley Heath area involves a disproportionate expansion of existing villages.
Joanne Collins [4496]			Q15/08	I think the proposed relocation of the Knowle Football club is a much better idea than Site 9.
John Findlay [4218]			Q15/08	Support the representation submitted by the KDBH NF

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/08	<p>No definitive firm and logical green belt boundary being identified to the north of the site, west of Hampton Road therefore no conclusions can be drawn on housing numbers.</p> <p>Loss of sports pitch. No proposed relocation on land to east of Hampton Road.</p> <p>Therefore difficult to assess overall target housing figure/capacity.</p>
Knowle Streamside Trust (Alan Rebeiro) [3467]			Q15/08	<p>The Knowle Streamside Trust Committee has responsibility for the management of the Wychwood Avenue Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>Proposed housing allocation, Site 8, Hampton Road, extends over the LWS.</p> <p>Seek confirmation that inclusion of LWS in Site allocation is an error.</p> <p>Committee concerned about possible impact of large scale housing development next to LWS, e.g. no surface run-off from development will adversely affect Purnells Brook.</p>
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q15/08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sites are at the least accessible end of the scale and poor in locational terms. - Development here would be beyond the built-up area of Knowle and a significant encroachment into open countryside. - sites are the two best performing parcels of Green

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 sites. Larger site to the north not considered within/adjacent to free standing village. Trees will need to be considered.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 7. Should be 11 to account for significant contribution football club makes to GB. Other sites, e.g. have lower scores.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Development would lead to net ecological loss.</p> <p>Loss of well-used sports facility.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p>
Laura Davies [4547]			Q15/08	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Laura Manton [4525]			Q15/08	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Leighton Jones [3252]			Q15/08	<p>The plans for a huge number of additional houses in Knowle is preposterous and in no way justified. They ignore many of the Council's own policies and would cause much harm to the environment and amenity of the area, while completely altering its character. The size and concentration of the proposals, as well as the density of the proposed housing, are completely out of character for the area. I strongly support the submission of the Neighbourhood Forum, which has itself been almost completely ignored, in contravention of Government policies.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lesley Murtagh [4553]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Liz Moloney [4564]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, and Hockley Heath as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority, and requests involvement in master planning process.
Lorraine Winn [4510]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
M Dunn [4139]	Toby Haselwood	Sworders (Toby Haselwood) [2641]	Q15/08	consider that the allocation of two large sites in the settlement and across the piece in the DLP will leave the DLP unsound in terms of deliverability of 5year housing supply. Also consider that the housing trajectory is overly optimistic.
Martin Carter [4168]			Q15/08	Site 8 Objection

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mel Starling [4325]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection.</p> <p>1000 new homes will massively increase size of village.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Rebuilding of sport facilities at Hampton Road will push Green Belt boundary towards Hampton-in-Arden.</p> <p>Government said it's committed to preserving the Green Belt.</p> <p>Construction will disrupt village life.</p> <p>Site 8 too far from amenities and railway station.</p> <p>Local demand to Knowle FC is small. Club is financially unsound. Improvements not been made.</p> <p>No need for community hub as lots of meeting places in KDBH.</p> <p>Past rejections of site based on topography and impact on skyline.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Impact on canal.</p>
Melissa Bradburn [4563]			Q15/08	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority, and for improvements to road infrastructure including Knowle High Street as currently inadequate for proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Doble [3296]			Q15/08	Additional traffic on Warwick Road and High Street. Hampton Road is already too busy and its junction with Wootton Close, Arden Vale Road and the existing Football Pitch is an accident waiting to happen. Current street parking creates poor visibility and interrupted traffic flow. High Street/Hampton Road/Lodge Road junction is a notorious bottleneck. Problems will be exacerbated with the additional homes. Site 8 should be 3 separate proposals. Use of S106 money for alternative sports complex would be inappropriate. Site opposite Grimshaw Hall is unnecessary extension into Green Belt. Proposals should be limited to the Hampton Road football pitch only.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/08	No definitive firm and logical green belt boundary being identified to the north of the site, west of Hampton Road therefore no conclusions can be drawn on housing numbers. Loss of sports pitch. No proposed relocation on land to east of Hampton Road. Therefore difficult to assess overall target housing figure/capacity.
Miss Charlotte Drysdale [3834]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mr & Mrs Biddlecombe [4503]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mr & Mrs Peter & Betty Ewin [3237]			Q15/08	Objection to site 8 as they do not see that it can be the right location for development. Cite that Suggest that there are other locations in the borough that are better suited to development.
Mr Bob Holtham [3530]			Q15/08	Support representation of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum as no reason to concentrate allocation on just 2 sites when areas at Bentley Heath and Widney Manor better located to Solihull and transport infrastructure, more limited and dispersed approach which would ensure greater variety and quality of new development, and smaller brownfield and edge of settlement infill sites in green belt should be used to provide for housing need.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Lloyd [3278]			Q15/08	<p>Objection to Site 8.</p> <p>1,050 homes in Knowle will destroy its village character and overwhelm its infrastructure.</p> <p>Site 8 would destroy an important wildlife area.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Proposed football club too far from village centre.</p> <p>Suggest areas already blighted e.g. by motorway service area, should be subject to development.</p>
Mr David Pickering [3400]			Q15/08	<p>I do not agree that the Hampton Road Knowle site should be developed. It is Green Belt, which should be preserved, and, together with plans for South of Knowle, it will add over 1000 houses to Knowle, increasing the size of Knowle by around 25% in 10 years. The existing schools are over-full, with residents finding it very difficult to get local places for their children. Hampton Road is not suitable for the big increase in traffic implied by the development. There is no obvious provision of additional green spaces or local facilities, just a large soul-less housing estate.</p>
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q15/08	<p>Object to Site 8 as a bad example of urban sprawl, is remote from the village and has no compensating community benefits, unless you are a footballer.</p>
Mr Martin Archer [3315]			Q15/08	<p>so I would accept this development as reasonable if infrastructure issues can be resolved</p>
MR Robert James [3013]			Q15/08	<p>There is no provision for increased car parking in Knowle. 1050 new homes will surely lead to at least 1000 extra cars driving on local roads and needing to park near to local shops. Current parking arrangements are inadequate for today's needs, with inappropriate parking on pavements and grass verges, and this can only get worse. While bus services and cycle lanes are a good thing the reality is that the majority of journeys will be by car for the convenience, speed and ability to convey heavy shopping loads.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Would have a significant impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, on Landscape Character, heritage assets and recreation facilities.</p> <p>The proposed allocations will represent an over-concentration of growth in Knowle which will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure. Would question how a population growth proposed by the allocations will satisfactorily assimilate into the village.</p>
Mr Terry Grove [3698]			Q15/08	<p>Objecting to the site as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - eats into the green belt - current infrastructure (roads) is not able to cope-
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 sites. Larger site to the north not considered within/adjacent to free standing village. Trees will need to be considered.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 7. Should be 11 to account for significant contribution football club makes to GB. Other sites, e.g. have lower scores.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Development would lead to net ecological loss.</p> <p>Loss of well-used sports facility.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p>
Mrs Amanda Jenkins [3640]			Q15/08	<p>Disagree with Neighbourhood Forum representation as additional housing is required and some should be in Knowle, it makes sense that this should be built closer to the village centre and if the outcome is a new school for the future of the KDBH area then a legacy will be built rather than a development, social housing is part of any new development, but number of homes to be provided needs to be managed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Cecilia O'Brien [3825]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mrs E Hedley [3516]			Q15/08	<p>Objection to Site 8.</p> <p>1000-1400 new homes in Knowle is disproportionate.</p> <p>Impact on local services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Inadequate consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>Allocations do not accord with Council's own policies</p> <p>Loss of high performing Green Belt</p> <p>Includes Wychwood Avenue Local Wildlife Site - must make sufficient buffer to LWS and Purnells Brook.</p> <p>Football club wants to sell land for housing.</p> <p>Football pitch in excellent condition and not overused.</p> <p>4 full size pitches excessive for a club of this size.</p> <p>Proposed site over 1km from public transport.</p> <p>Car parking inappropriate use of Green Belt</p> <p>Proposed Site 9 better for relocation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [3869]			Q15/08	Housing allocations in Knowle go far beyond what current infrastructure can cope with, which will increase congestion and pollution through High Street and threaten damage to historic buildings, result in green belt being lost and destroy nature of area and village, do not reflect vision of spreading development across Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath, densities proposed likely to lead to traffic problems and issues relating to lack of storage areas for cars/cycles/recycling and green space.
Mrs Faye Doble [4650]			Q15/08	<p>-so many new homes in Knowle will wreck the semi rural character of the VILLAGE</p> <p>-very few employment opportunities in the area</p> <p>-infrastructure is unsuitable for such developments</p> <p>-the additional traffic caused by the proposed housing will make Hampton</p>
Mrs faye sharp [3845]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mrs Jane Starling [3207]			Q15/08	<p>- object to the proposal in the Solihull Local Plan to build 1000 + houses on two sites in Knowle - site number 8 Hampton Road and 9 land to the South of Knowle known as the Arden Triangle</p> <p>- Do we really want to entrust new green belt to a club which app</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jill Collins [3784]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection.</p> <p>Sympathise will need to plan for 6500 new homes.</p> <p>1050 in Knowle is not acceptable, it is full.</p> <p>Parking extremely difficult.</p> <p>Few employment opportunities.</p> <p>Parking at Dorridge station is full.</p> <p>Encourages more car journeys.</p> <p>Added pressure to M42.</p> <p>More sensible to build houses where jobs are.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Further growth will impact community cohesion in Knowle.</p>
Mrs Linda Grove [4551]			Q15/08	<p>Object to housing Site 8 as proposed housing numbers for Knowle are excessive and disproportionate in the context of the overall plan and could not be supported by the village's current infrastructure, in particular the road network, and endorse KDBH Forum response.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q15/08	Site 8 cannot be supported and should be removed as represents disproportionate suggested growth in the size of Knowle as a village, will be largely car dependent, scores poorly for sustainability, and against the Council's own tests for effect on the landscape and character of Knowle. SMBC is running scared of judicial review and has been seduced by the opportunistic approaches of a local football club which cannot promise the community will benefit in perpetuity from new community facilities.
Mrs Ruth Knowles [3413]			Q15/08	Disproportionate building in Knowle village. It would increase traffic, pollution, increase demand on GP surgeries, schools etc.
Mrs Una Cole [3840]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Nick & Abby Fox [4508]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q15/08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sites are at the least accessible end of the scale and poor in locational terms. - Development here would be beyond the built-up area of Knowle and a significant encroachment into open countryside. - sites are the two best performing parcels of Green

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Ager [3055]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection.</p> <p>1,050 houses proposed for Knowle is excessive, and out of scale with other locations.</p> <p>20% increase in size of village.</p> <p>Consider allocations for Dorridge or Bentley Heath. Prefer dispersed growth.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>50% affordable housing is pointless in such an affluent area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>
Nick Crowe [3569]			Q15/08	<p>Far too many houses in Knowle as a proportion of the total proposed (over 1,000 out of 6,000)</p> <p>- The proposed housing is too densely packed</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 sites. Larger site to the north not considered within/adjacent to free standing village. Trees will need to be considered.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 7. Should be 11 to account for significant contribution football club makes to GB. Other sites, e.g. have lower scores.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Development would lead to net ecological loss.</p> <p>Loss of well-used sports facility.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Patrick Wells [4396]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>High density developments.</p> <p>Loss of last remaining green areas in the Village.</p> <p>Knowle will become satellite dormitory town to Solihull.</p> <p>Traffic problems will increase.</p> <p>Government policy is that incursions in the green Belt should only happen in exceptional circumstances. Not yet reached that situation.</p> <p>Unimplemented planning permissions for 700,000 dwellings in the country.</p> <p>Should compel housebuilders to complete these first.</p> <p>Not considered impact on local community.</p>
Paul & Julie Meaden [4528]			Q15/08	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Paul & Julie O'Meara [3295]			Q15/08	<p>do not agree with the development of site as it would lead to destruction of the local wildlife habitat. also concerned about increase in traffic along Hampton Lane, and key junctions as well as the impact on infrastructure and distance from railway station</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paula Quinn [3821]			Q15/08	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Prue Findlay [4591]			Q15/08	support the Forum representation
R G Ellis [4452]			Q15/08	Site 8 Objection. Disproportionate number of homes in Knowle.
Ron Shields [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/08	No definitive firm and logical green belt boundary being identified to the north of the site, west of Hampton Road therefore no conclusions can be drawn on housing numbers. Loss of sports pitch. No proposed relocation on land to east of Hampton Road. Therefore difficult to assess overall target housing figure/capacity.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/08	No definitive firm and logical green belt boundary being identified to the north of the site, west of Hampton Road therefore no conclusions can be drawn on housing numbers. Loss of sports pitch. No proposed relocation on land to east of Hampton Road. Therefore difficult to assess overall target housing figure/capacity.
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q15/08	the number of houses should be lower than that included in the DLP

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q15/08	<p>Sport England are aware that work is currently underway on the completion of an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strateg(PPS).</p> <p>The PPS should be used to determine whether or not the playing fields proposed for allocation is surplus to sporting requirements by demonstrating that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment.</p> <p>If this cannot be demonstrated then the playing field or formal recreation land would need to be replaced with equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality.</p> <p>In the absence of evidence to justify the loss of sporting facilities, Sport England object.</p>
Stephen Boulton [4594]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection</p> <p>- apparently going to be no additional primary schools, doctors,roads or parking or other infrastructure.</p>
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/08	<p>No definitive firm and logical green belt boundary being identified to the north of the site, west of Hampton Road therefore no conclusions can be drawn on housing numbers.</p> <p>Loss of sports pitch. No proposed relocation on land to east of Hampton Road.</p> <p>Therefore difficult to assess overall target housing figure/capacity.</p>
Stuart Webb [4642]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection</p> <p>I am a member of the Knowle Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum and fully support the KDBH Forum response to the Local Plan Review consultation.</p>
Terry Corns [4446]			Q15/08	<p>- sites are at the least accessible end of the scale and poor in locational terms.</p> <p>- Development here would be beyond the built-up area of Knowle and a significant encroachment into open countryside.</p> <p>- sites are the two best performing parcels of Green</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 sites. Larger site to the north not considered within/adjacent to free standing village. Trees will need to be considered.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 7. Should be 11 to account for significant contribution football club makes to GB. Other sites, e.g. have lower scores.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Development would lead to net ecological loss.</p> <p>Loss of well-used sports facility.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p>
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q15/08	<p>In relation to Site 8:</p> <p>Well defined parcels of land: Only meets this criterion if take both parcels together.</p> <p>Preventing towns merging: Knowle already linked to Dorridge and Bentley Heath. 2 miles from Hampton-in-Arden and Chadwick End.</p> <p>Checking unrestricted sprawl: Does not comply with this, except for Knowle Football Club.</p> <p>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: Does not comply except for extending the settlement boundary as a result of proposed development.</p> <p>Preservation of the setting of historic towns: Site will cause considerable harm to village and its Conservation Area.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Q15/08	<p>Site 8 objections:</p> <p>North eastern boundary is located on one of Knowle's highest points. 2-3 storey dwellings will create an unacceptable skyline in Knowle.</p> <p>Mixed development will create an image of a town rather than village.</p> <p>Will detract from Conservation Area status.</p> <p>Village status will be lost due to vast increase in population.</p> <p>Unlikely that density can be achieved due to hard constraints such as trees.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife. Will require land for wildlife buffer.</p> <p>Will require traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Enlarged sports complex is inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Scale of development will create urban sprawl.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/08	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 sites. Larger site to the north not considered within/adjacent to free standing village. Trees will need to be considered.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 7. Should be 11 to account for significant contribution football club makes to GB. Other sites, e.g. have lower scores.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Development would lead to net ecological loss.</p> <p>Loss of well-used sports facility.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p>
Tim Richmond [4630]			Q15/08	<p>Site 8 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic and congestion from the development will only serve to increase and add to the existing problems - detrimental impact on conservation area - ALL small, well run, community football teams would like to see themselves playing in facilities to rival Manchester United and I understand why they would seek to move to enhanced facilities. But quite simply it is wrong and incompatible with village life - floodlights damage (light pollution) the surrounding environment
Trevor Smallwood [4672]			Q15/08	<p>Object to Site 8 as proposal of poor quality, lacks rigour, fails to address many of the key issues associated with development such as infrastructure provision, and will create an unsustainable situation. Adds full support to KDBH Forum response.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/08	<p>Contain a potential Local Wildlife Site; Purnell Brook Meadows.</p> <p>The LWS panel should be commissioned to survey and assess this site against the LWS criteria as a priority so as to inform the scheme design.</p> <p>LWS areas should be protected and enhanced as part of the development.</p> <p>Object to the loss of LWS.</p> <p>Suggest that the 'protection and enhancement of both Purnells Brook Woodland and Meadows is included within the likely infrastructure requirements.</p>
Question 15/09 Land South of Knowle				
A Andrews [4851]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built providing less than 500 dwellings as don't wish to see area overcrowded.
A Whitfield [4960]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to maximum of 500 houses as infrastructure could not cope with more.
Adam Barlow [4853]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable a new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 dwellings.
Alan Kirby [3615]			Q15/09	Object to housing site 9 which entails the demolition of Arden school despite the investment undertaken in recent years and which could easily be modernised at a fraction of the cost, St George & Theresa school and the Mind centre which has been established for 20 years and would not be replaced. The scale of development with 750 dwellings is out of proportion with other parts of the Borough, and would be totally destructive, will exacerbate the already horrendous traffic problems, roadside parking and gridlock, change the character of Knowle for ever and duplicates sports facilities proposed with Site 8.
Alan McWilliam [4868]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as the Arden school should not be part of the solution for the national housing shortage, Knowle/Dorridge cannot accommodate such expansion and there are already public sports facilities available in the Borough.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alex King [4942]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Alison Leah [3517]			Q15/09	The proposed developments for new housing in Knowle are inappropriate and contradictory to the Council's stated criteria.
Ana & Mark Spittle McGuire [4693]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Andrew Foulkes [4906]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>I think there should be a mixture of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses, maybe some maisonettes as well.</p> <p>The new school needs to be future proof. Is the site big enough for the proposed capacity until 2030? Will the school have flexible spaces for multiple uses?</p>
Andrew Hinsley [4918]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site. The optimum number should be built that delivers the best facilities for the local community.</p> <p>This is a once in a lifetime opportunity for the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath community to build excellent community facilities that will serve the local population for future generations.</p>
Andrew Hodge [3103]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.
Andy McCabe [4865]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as should be less than 500 houses, Knowle will be over-developed and additional traffic will add to existing heavy congestion.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Marie Pryce [4879]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9.
Anne Hewitt [4324]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection.</p> <p>Support submission by KDBH Neighbourhood Forum.</p> <p>Development at Arden School site will cause gridlock and add to existing traffic problems in Knowle.</p>
Antoinette Morgan [4954]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses, more information on impact on wider community as village centres, centre and station car parks cannot accommodate current population and do not wish to see upheaval for medical practice.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q15/09	welcome proposals to release site 9 from Green Belt to enable the provision of a new start of the art centre for community learning and residential development.
Ashdone Khan [4947]			Q15/09	<p>Unsure about site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>Smaller, cost effective and affordable for younger / first time buyers</p>
B Swales [5000]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site. I agree that the money needed by selling land for homes should go towards a new school but am concerned that the land identified for the new school appears smaller than the current site and is locked by other developments.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Beckie Johnson [4936]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	Would have a significant impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, on Landscape Character, heritage assets and recreation facilities. The proposed allocations will represent an over-concentration of growth in Knowle which will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure. Would question how a population growth proposed by the allocations will satisfactorily assimilate into the village. Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions to existing facilities over recent years which undermines any need and cost justification for a brand new secondary school facility on a new site.
Ben Merrell [4875]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as should be less than 500 houses.
Bernadette Pekins [4975]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses.
Bernadette Pruden [4978]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses unless roads are widened, extra parking provided in Knowle centre and additional health care facilities provided. May need additional parking for new school as further to walk for many children.
Bill Lord [4952]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 houses, avoidance of over-development and equal provision of infrastructure.
C Blakey [4866]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 dwellings.
C Rose [4993]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Charles Harrison [4927]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site. Be innovative and forward thinking and not too dense.</p>
Charlie Smith [4999]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Charlotte Floate [4844]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing to enable a new secondary school.</p> <p>Under 500 homes should be built.</p> <p>Village already changing into size of a town.</p> <p>Infrastructure already struggling.</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Business school,</p> <p>Technology suite,</p> <p>Outdoor sports facilities.</p> <p>Current school already has lots of facilities.</p> <p>Investment already made would be wasted.</p> <p>Size of current school is large enough.</p> <p>Disagree with taking children in from outside the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Charlotte Richmond [4631]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection as the development is not for the benefit of the village and its residents - will erode and lead to the loss of green belt - transport and infrastructure is not appropriate - increased pressure on medical resources, parking in the area and recreational resources - causes a rise in petty crime and anti-social behaviour
Cheryl & Philip Buck [4317]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection. Support KDBH Forum's response to DLP. Knowle will no longer be a village, and will be part of Solihull/Birmingham conurbation. Roads in Knowle and Dorridge cannot cope. Knowle High Street will be constant pinchpoint.
Chris Hughes [4857]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as too large, should be less than 500 houses and school should restrict catchment area.
Chris Abberley [3769]			Q15/09	see questionnaire
Chris Abberley [3769]			Q15/09	objecting to the sites (endorsing KDBH forum views)
Chris Kirk [4862]			Q15/09	Object to development on Site 9 as road, parking, shopping infrastructure of Knowle is insufficient to cope with more than an extra 50 houses, will destroy village feel of Knowle/Dorridge, and school is centre of community and should act responsibly in this process.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Christina Hyde [4925]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>The infrastructure doesn't exist for a bigger development - traffic public transport, doctor's etc.</p>
Claire Mitchell [4965]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses, as too many will put additional strain on already oversubscribed medical, educational, shopping, parking and green space facilities.</p>
Claire Perkins [4979]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses.</p>
Clare Hope [4921]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>With increase in traffic, poor parking facilities that mean workers are parking on the roads, Knowle is becoming already over-loaded with traffic entering and leaving through the village. Increase in houses = more traffic = dangerous roads for our children.</p>
Cliff Topham Steele [4956]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses, and improvements to local infrastructure based on transport study and incorporating bypass with high quality, safe footways, cycle paths and crossings, funded by developers.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 site. Comments that comprehensive masterplan is proposed. 10-24% of site is in LWS.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Should be increased to 6 and 7 as close to other settlements.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Site includes over 20ha of high quality agricultural land, ecological interest, close to noise sources, visually prominent setting.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions recently.</p> <p>Undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q15/09	suggest the land occupied by MIND is removed from the overall site.
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15/09	It is essential that the other impacts of such a large development are taken into account, particularly the traffic impacts in Knowle and Bentley Heath Centres. It is also vital that good links, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians are provided into Knowle. The acceptability of this proposal depends on the detailed plan for this area.
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/09	Contrary to Green Belt policy and Council policy to protect 'urbs in rure' character, unsustainable location dependent on car travel, would harm attractive open countryside, remove opportunities for quiet recreation, loss of playing fields/sports grounds and drainage issues and impact on flood risk.
Craig Vincent [4957]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
D Enticott [4902]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
D Le Saint [4894]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Can't comment on the number of houses that should be built on this site.
Daniel Gallagher [4625]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection - AS PER THE KDBH FORUM RESPONSE
Daniel Walker [4958]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built.
Darion Walters [4884]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as should be restricted to less than 500 houses, and have serious reservations about the new school being located adjacent the Solihull Mental Health Trust's facilities.
Daron Gay [4545]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/09	While there may be reasons behind Site 9 in terms of replacing the present Arden School buildings, that is no reason to destroy the countryside to the east of Knowle to the extent proposed.
David Johnson [4746]			Q15/09	Know the Government has said we need to build new houses in Knowle. Land around Knowle cannot cope with new housing. Schools and doctors are full. Parking an existing problem.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Knowles [3742]			Q15/09	<p>Object to the number of houses proposed for Knowle as disproportionate and unsustainable and is not justified by the Council's methodology, and in particular, the proposal for Arden Academy to have new school premises funded by large scale housing is completely unacceptable, as to lose such a large site to housing will cause significant loss of valuable and attractive landscape as well as eroding our sense of village community as we become more and more like a town!</p> <p>Access to the site would be via Knowle High Street adding to the pollution and congestion residents already experience.</p>
David Norris [4877]			Q15/09	<p>Object to development of Site 9 as land is and should be retained as green belt, Knowle would lose its village character, and the relationship with a property developer appears open to corruption.</p>
David Sharpe [4444]			Q15/09	<p>Objection to Site 9.</p> <p>Mismatch between areas identified for economic growth and those for housing development.</p> <p>New housing should be close to economic growth areas, or where transport links are already in place or can be improved.</p> <p>Arden Academy could be improved; but proposals are opportunistic. Not based on local need or linked to economic growth.</p> <p>Need assessment of infrastructure/transport improvements required to enable housing developments. This cannot be left to a later date.</p> <p>Knowle should not be the default option.</p>
David Tait [5003]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Deniz Barczak [4826]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with new housing on Site 9 to enable a new secondary school.</p> <p>Under 500 homes should be built.</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Swimming pool,</p> <p>Gymnasium,</p> <p>Tennis court,</p> <p>Bigger library.</p>
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q15/09	<p>Object to development of Site 9 for housing/new school as together with Site 8 will mean at least 2000 more people and their cars which will increase traffic and impact on environment in Knowle village and along Station Road, parking and medical services will be inadequate, character of village will be changed for the worse, and results in Solihull Mind losing most of their current space negating good work undertaken over 20 years undermining mental health provision.</p>
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection</p>
Dr A Jickells [2008]			Q15/09	<p>Object to Site 9 as the scale of development is total out of proportion with Knowle and will seriously degrade the character of the area, local services will be unable to cope, the area is currently part of the green belt around the village and should not be developed, and the local consultation proposed small developments across the Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath area whereas this is just one huge development and is unacceptable.</p>
Dr Andrea Collins [4511]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
DR David Gentle [4632]			Q15/09	<p>Support the rep made by KDBH</p> <p>specific points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increases the housing stock in Knowle by over 25%, -any large development (over 400, for instance) should be adjoining urban areas to minimise detrimental impact and the 'smaller' developments (100-400) -detrimental impact on the identity, character and appearance of Knowle -already problems with parking, traffic congestion at peak times and access to primary medical care - retail facilities are inadequate
Dr Deborah Hope [3133]			Q15/09	<p>Green belt boundary should not be moved. The character of the village will be spoiled. Increased traffic will crowd the roads, reducing child safety and adding pollution.</p> <p>If it has to happen consider a fourth village with its own name to provide a sense of identity. A new primary school and local shops should be built to reduce pressure on Knowle Village centre.</p> <p>The Solihull Mind Horticultural Field and Buildings which have been working for the past 20 years to support local people must be retained.</p>
Dr P Johnson [2408]			Q15/09	<p>Allocation 9, 750 homes south of Knowle completely underestimates how much highways work is required. Before starting any more development work new roads and access from Warwick Road and Grove Road are required. If any further development is planned using access via Middlefield Avenue and Hertford Way it will make the current disaster there even worse.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q15/09	<p>A view is emerging that a new school could be of benefit to the community but the price to pay for those benefits in terms of the consequential impacts on infrastructure, landscape, and access to countryside that would result from 750 houses is unnecessarily high.</p> <p>- too many basic questions being left unanswered for the NF to reach a view on what a reasonable reduced housing number might be.</p> <p>- site is poor in accessibility terms and represents an unacceptable location for new housing development.</p>
Dr Sue Houghton [3802]			Q15/09	The MIND field off the bridleway from Station Road has been a beautiful and beneficial facility helping vulnerable people with mental health needs over the past 20 years - it is appreciated widely, has been the product of a great deal of hard, creative work. It is vital that this space is allowed to continue in its current form.
Dr Victor Hu [3661]			Q15/09	I recognise that there is a pressing need for further affordable housing. I am strongly supportive of the building of a new Arden Academy in Knowle and support the building of 750 new houses on the old school site. Unfortunately, I missed participating in the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum review. I do not agree with their conclusion that, "The scale of 750 houses is not justified by the Council's evidence base: nor is it justified by the need to fund the new Academy. On this basis, the NF objects to the proposed allocation."
E Atkins [4846]			Q15/09	Support housing on Site 9 in principle to enable new secondary school subject to roads, road safety, parking and new medical provision being high on Council's list of priorities.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
E Bennett [4822]			Q15/09	<p>Agree to houses being built on Site 9.</p> <p>Under 500 homes should be built.</p> <p>Would rather provide outdoor social and play areas than tightly packed with properties.</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities built:</p> <p>Swimming pool</p> <p>leisure centre/gym</p> <p>outdoor pitches/astro turf for hire, with flood lights.</p> <p>Youth club.</p> <p>Access to such facilities would be economically attractive to residents.</p> <p>Agree we need more housing, especially affordable, to include some social housing.</p>
E Whitehill [4885]			Q15/09	<p>Object to development of Site 9 as the principle of building new houses to support a new school required because of additional housing is farcical and involvement of developer suggests a deal has been done.</p>
Elizabeth & Gregg Harley [4512]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Elizabeth Adam [4845]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of housing Site 9 to enable new secondary school but should be restricted to less than 500 dwellings.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ellie Rylah [4991]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Emma & Marc Lorne [4479]			Q15/09	Object to housing Site 9 and relocation of Arden school as will destroy the semi rural environment and local community, school does not need redevelopment, and there are more appropriate areas for modern housing such as Dickens Heath.
Emma Chee [4890]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 houses as infrastructure will not cope with more due to road congestion, demands on train services, shopping and community facilities, and primary school places.
Emma Johnson [4941]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Emma Sibbing [4995]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q15/09	- A view is emerging that a new school could be of benefit to the community but the price to pay for those benefits in terms of the consequential impacts on infrastructure, landscape, and access to countryside that would result from 750 houses is unness
F Gerard [4907]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Fazle Chowdhury [4887]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 as will help to address housing crisis and existing school is inadequate to meet future needs of students in terms of space and facilities.
Frances Bate [4872]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 dwellings.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
G Cantone [4892]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Providing there are detached / semi-detached and large enough for a family, as many as will fit on the land should be built.</p> <p>This is a rare opportunity that should be taken for the benefit of the school and the local area.</p>
Gavin Perkins [4972]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 houses with reasonable garden space in keeping with character of local area.</p>
Gemma Small [4996]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Over 500 would be too crowded.</p>
Georgina & Fergal O'Gara [4576]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Gill Corns [4448]			Q15/09	<p>- A view is emerging that a new school could be of benefit to the community but the price to pay for those benefits in terms of the consequential impacts on infrastructure, landscape, and access to countryside that would result from 750 houses is unness</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gillian Griggs [3964]			Q15/09	<p>No evidence has been presented to substantiate the numbers of houses needed to fund the school, the housing numbers generally or why funding from other sources could not contribute to the costs, thereby reducing the number of houses required to enable the development.</p> <p>Unclear whether the new Academy is dependent on other landowners to provide adequate land for playing fields and access. Could be a ransom situation and if not, question whether the area could accommodate a new Academy.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, impact on landscape and local character.</p> <p>Lack of evidence on environmental, social and transportation impacts.</p>
Gordon Harvey [4190]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection</p> <p>- Support the representation made by KDBH forum - this opposes the development in scale in the KDBH area.</p>
Graham Edwards [4191]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection</p>
Greenlight Developments & Gardner Family [4483]	Philip Rawle	Greenlight Developments (Philip Rawle) [3908]	Q15/09	<p>Greenlight Developments has a land interest in Site 9.</p> <p>Greenlight Developments and the Gardner Family supports this housing allocation, and is of the opinion, that this parcel of land is integral to the delivery of the southern element of the site.</p>
Gregory Kirby [3489]			Q15/09	<p>see response</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gregory Kirby [3489]			Q15/09	<p>High street in Knowle and Station Road to Dorridge would be unable to cope with traffic impact of new housing development.</p> <p>Large volume of traffic commuter traffic already towards Birmingham City Centre and motorway.</p> <p>If solution is to build more major roads and bridges then LA should be transparent.</p> <p>Where will Â£30M come from for new Arden School? Already been enhanced and refurbished in recent years.</p> <p>Current school could be opened up to more community use, e.g. Knowle F.C.</p>
H Vaughton [4883]			Q15/09	<p>Object to development of Site 9 as Knowle has suffered from estates being built since 1970s, and is already far too busy with parking a nightmare.</p>
Harriet Endley [4899]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site. If this was exceeded I would be worried about the detrimental effect on local amenities and on traffic, parking and house prices.</p> <p>Question whether the school would be able to cater for all the children in the local area and if not, where would they go.</p> <p>Lots of flats/apartments would add diversity to the population of the area. This could be viewed positively or negatively and needs further consideration.</p>
Harvey Jagpal [4929]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>The community needs more homes and will bring jobs to the community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/09	Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.
Iain Jackson [4932]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. More than 500 would mean the school would be oversubscribed before it was even built.
Ian Fisher [4590]			Q15/09	Whilst recognises need for housing, uncomfortable with total proposed for Knowle and would like to see number of houses reduced, but supportive of 2 allocations that offer significant community benefits, which need to be highlighted to make case, with explanations/proposals for how issues such as increased traffic and parking demands will be managed, and includes some detailed suggestions for traffic, highway and parking improvements.
Ian Harper [4913]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Ian Moseley [4966]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, but should not be high density, be in keeping with surrounding area and not exclusive gated developments.
J & A Creba [4753]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.
J Griggs [4755]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Hughes [4915]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>It will become too crowded and traffic on Station Road will increase.</p>
J Plain Jones [4931]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>About 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>Not necessarily houses but mixed homes to cater for younger people.</p>
Jack Macey [4961]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built.
Jackie Howson [4856]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as should be less than 500 houses with no flats/apartments, well spaced with at least one garage and 2 parking spaces to reduce risk of parking on road, with reasonable sized pavement (submission incomplete).
James Lethbridge [4951]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 subject to diverse types including affordable family homes and social housing, and good non-car based transport links, with cycle ways and walking routes enabling safe access to school and providing leisure routes.
Jane Watts [4358]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection.</p> <p>Endorse views of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum.</p>
Jane Watts [4358]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Janet Royle [4227]			Q15/09	<p>1. Green Belt designated as whole - not as 'parcels'</p> <p>2. Many Refined Parcels owned by developers and speculators.</p> <p>3. scoring of parcels subjective and does not account for major Green Belt aims- encourage the recycling of derelict and urban land.</p> <p>4. RP39 / Arden Triangle has scored only moderately (compared to other local RPs), yet has a strong rural outlook with much wildlife. attractive green entry into Knowle; very close to Historic centre.</p>
Janice Murphy [4967]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built.
Jayne Craven [4889]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 subject to less than 500 dwellings.
Jean Moon [4963]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses as educational provision in sufficient for greater number.
Jeevan Bhurra [4867]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 subject to less than 500 dwellings.
Jill Hutchinson [4924]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Does it have to be housing development only?</p>
Jo Visor [4241]			Q15/09	Object to housing Site 9 as whilst recognise need to redevelop and refurbish parts of the Arden campus, oppose demolition of newly built teaching and sports facilities which have benefitted from public investment in recent years for the purposes of house building, and any further housing development should be subject to a comprehensive plan showing road and parking improvements, better public transport and primary school provision.
Jo McGrory [4577]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joan & Graham Campbell [4665]			Q15/09	Object to housing Site 9 as proposals to build some 1,500 houses in Knowle/Dorridge/Bentley Heath area involves a disproportionate expansion of existing villages.
Joanne Collins [4496]			Q15/09	Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing to enable a new secondary school. No houses should be built on site, relocation of Knowle Football Club is a better idea. Too many houses that will affect the roads and facilities, to the detriment of the area.
Jodie Lee Wilson [4953]			Q15/09	Too many houses proposed which will result in additional traffic when current position is already bad especially at peak times, and will result in loss of recently developed buildings at Arden school. School should focus on parking facilities, escalator provision, IT equipment and larger canteen.
Joe Craven [4839]			Q15/09	Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing to enable a new secondary school. Under 500 homes should be built. Would like to see following community facilities at new school: Theatre, Gym.
Joe Stanway [4997]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. The number of houses should be however many will fit in liveable conditions with enough space. Also there should be new green space there.
Johanne Boles [3719]			Q15/09	Support development of site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 houses, as current school too small and fragmented and cannot accommodate the large number of pupils it takes.
John Findlay [4218]			Q15/09	Support the KDBH NF representation, and does not agree that the overall allocation for the settlement is proportionate.
Jonathan Stott [4882]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as area has unique charm that is being ruined by continued development, there are already numerous schemes including affordable housing which will reduce desirability of area, and provision of further facilities at Arden school should not be at expense of further housing estates.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julia Carter [4870]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to provision of affordable housing and improvements to infrastructure such as schools and medical services to serve increased population.
K Price Feraid [4881]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as current infrastructure is inadequate for number of houses proposed which should be reduced to less than 500, the school does not need to be rebuilt as already fit for purpose and able to maintain current high standards, green field land/green spaces and Solihull MIND site should be protected
Karen Farragher [4337]			Q15/09	Support Site 9. Support re-development of Arden Academy. Not enough homes to meet current demands, will get worse in the future. Arden Academy can be community focus.
Kate Fleming [4904]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Kathryn Green [4911]			Q15/09	Unsure whether site 9 should be developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Over 500 houses should be built on this site. More small, affordable houses.
Katie Davie [4897]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. It shouldn't be too overcrowded. Originally I was against the idea, thinking it was unnecessary, a waste of money. However, with more information provided it sounds like a very ambitious and exciting plan.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Katrina & John Parkin [4623]			Q15/09	Support new development if there is also a new Arden Academy school built, as would be of great value to the local community in many ways, subject to less than 500 houses and assurances that new development close to existing properties will avoid overlooking.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/09	Support the site allocation. It is a lower performing area of Green Belt.
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q15/09	- A view is emerging that a new school could be of benefit to the community but the price to pay for those benefits in terms of the consequential impacts on infrastructure, landscape, and access to countryside that would result from 750 houses is unness
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 site. Comments that comprehensive masterplan is proposed. 10-24% of site is in LWS.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Should be increased to 6 and 7 as close to other settlements.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Site includes over 20ha of high quality agricultural land, ecological interest, close to noise sources, visually prominent setting.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions recently.</p> <p>Undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Laura Davies [4547]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Laura Manton [4525]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Lauren Reilly [4980]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses.
Leighton Jones [3252]			Q15/09	The plans for a huge number of additional houses in Knowle is preposterous and in no way justified. They ignore many of the Council's own policies and would cause much harm to the environment and amenity of the area, while completely altering its character. The size and concentration of the proposals, as well as the density of the proposed housing, are completely out of character for the area. I strongly support the submission of the Neighbourhood Forum, which has itself been almost completely ignored, in contravention of Government policies.
Lesley Murtagh [4553]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Linda Burroughs [4829]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing.</p> <p>School is perfectly adequate as it stands, and a great deal of funds have been invested already.</p> <p>Not necessary for community facilities to be built at school as all are available close by in Solihull and Warwick.</p> <p>Will add to congestion.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Page [4974]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses so that there is space for houses within rural setting.
Liz Bernard [4819]			Q15/09	As received from Arden Academy - Partial printout. Disagree with Site 9 being developed. Continue to improve facilities at the existing Arden school. Fail to understand how local authority is allowed to spend millions on Arden over 6 years and think it's ok to pull down a perfectly adequate school to make a few pounds and try and disguise it as a benefit to our community.
Liz Cantone [4869]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 dwellings and provision of smaller affordable housing for first time buyers.
Liz Moloney [4564]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, and Hockley Heath as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority, and requests involvement in master planning process.
Lorraine Winn [4510]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Louise Price [4313]			Q15/09	Support Site 9 if new secondary school built. Under 500 houses.
Louise Smith [5006]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Too many houses could cause over-population.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lucy Slaney [5005]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Too many houses could cause over-population.
Lynne & Gordon Ramsay [4992]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Any more than 500 would have a detrimental effect on the local area. Significant development would require major investment in the area's infrastructure including, but not limited to school places, school premises and health care provision.
M Biggs [4859]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to saving village feel and community, green space and countryside.
M Dunn [4139]	Toby Haselwood	Sworders (Toby Haselwood) [2641]	Q15/09	the existing Arden Academy wish to provide a new replacement academy, the first phase of which is to build the new academy which is likely to cost as much as £30,000,000. The 'school first' phased approach currently put forward looks unlikely to be viable in terms of funding, and if indeed this is the approach then the proposed housing delivery will be even slower, further exasperating the Council's likely delivery issues.
M Haroon [4916]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
M Holden [4914]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Smaller development in keeping with the rest of Knowle.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mandy Gaffney [4850]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed to enable a new secondary school.</p> <p>Under 500 homes should be built (sic).</p> <p>Arden Academy is already very successful, and received significant investment in recent years.</p> <p>State of the art facilities do not equal results.</p> <p>Knowle is a village, this scale of development will turn it into a town.</p> <p>Facilities are already in Solihull.</p> <p>Will ruin village character.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Mantisson Limited (Mr Malcolm Priest) [3760]			Q15/09	<p>concerns over the use of the bridleway as an access route into the new school.</p> <p>Additional housing will be very detrimental to the character of Knowle.</p> <p>Will create further pressure on existing transport, education and medical facilities and necessitate even more development.</p>
Mantisson Limited (Mr Malcolm Priest) [3760]			Q15/09	<p>Do not support the inclusion of the Land that is the 'Mind Site'. This is a valuable community facility.</p>
Margaret Murphy [4970]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to densities in line with Four Ashes development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/09	<p>SHELAA states that site performs well against suitability, availability and achievability criteria.</p> <p>Consider more evidence is required for latter two tests.</p> <p>Availability: Not all landowners have been notified of proposal or confirmed their support.</p> <p>Achievability: Access has been identified as an issue by promoters.</p> <p>At KDBH Neighbourhood Form meeting on 07.12.16 Arden Academy stated that only 450 homes are needed to deliver a new school, but they do not control all of required land.</p> <p>Do not consider medical centre off Station Road as suitable access to new school.</p> <p>Seek clarification on funding sources.</p> <p>Southern parts of site have low accessibility.</p>
Martin Carter [4168]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection
Martin Dedicoat [4896]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Mary Ing [4949]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Matt Stephens [4998]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mel Starling [4325]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection.</p> <p>1000 new homes will massively increase size of village.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Government said it's committed to preserving the Green Belt.</p> <p>Construction will disrupt village life.</p> <p>Providing a new Arden School could be argued as exceptional circumstances for changing Green Belt boundary, but would like to see evidence for this. Millions of pounds already been spent on improvements.</p> <p>Site 9 is preferable to Site 8. Should not push into Green Belt in two directions.</p>
Melissa Bradburn [4563]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority, and for improvements to road infrastructure including Knowle High Street as currently inadequate for proposal.</p>
Michael Doble [3296]			Q15/09	<p>There would still be adequate space for the proposed development of up to 750 new homes.</p>
Michael Swann [4880]			Q15/09	<p>Object to development of Site 9 as less than 500 houses should be built.</p>
Michelle Eden [4239]			Q15/09	<p>Object to housing Site 9 as the replacement school should not take up any more space than existing and should not include more houses in the area.</p>
Miss Charlotte Drysdale [3834]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Elizabeth Brace [3102]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection.</p> <p>Southern part of triangle is rural in nature, remote from Knowle village and should be retained as farmland. Forms a through route for wildlife to Cuttle Brook from South of Grove Road.</p> <p>Topography means new development will impact views on approach to Knowle.</p> <p>Disproportionate number of dwellings. Will destroy village character and rural surroundings.</p> <p>Loss of Mind site and its many community benefits.</p> <p>750 homes unjustified for new school. Density too high.</p> <p>50% affordable housing too high.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Capacity of sewage treatment facility on Norton Green Lane been considered?</p> <p>Pollution risks.</p>
Mr & Mrs Biddlecombe [4503]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Mr & Mrs D Green [4909]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site. The more houses, the better facilities will be for the school, and they have to go somewhere.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs . Jogi [4930]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>Need to be mindful of the impact on local amenities and landscape of the community.</p>
Mr & Mrs A E Millner [4876]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as should be less than 500 houses and concerned about level of provision for social housing and how development would affect planned footpath diversion.
Mr & Mrs A V Kirby [4860]			Q15/09	Object to development of site 9 as should remain as green fields.
Mr & Mrs D & K Tomkins [4757]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.
Mr & Mrs Guy Fathers [4843]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing.</p> <p>Better to improve the existing than build new.</p> <p>Knowle is a small village, close to Solihull and Birmingham that have fantastic facilities.</p> <p>Knowle already a busy, bustling village. Concerned about added traffic and demand on services and space.</p>
Mr & Mrs M Mladenovic [4754]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.
Mr & Mrs N Harris [4854]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as would be detrimental to village character, the area has taken ample new housing over last few years, and there is no need for a new school.
Mr & Mrs N & L Treadwell [4764]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.
Mr & Mrs R & B Ethell [4763]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.
Mr & Mrs T & L Baines [4760]			Q15/09	Support Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Alan Chandler [3374]			Q15/09	<p>Agree that site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Mr B Bohanna [2056]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses, lower density than proposal and better infrastructure with safer access.</p>
Mr Bob Holtham [3530]			Q15/09	<p>Support representation of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum as no reason to concentrate allocation on just 2 sites when areas at Bentley Heath and Widney Manor better located to Solihull and transport infrastructure, more limited and dispersed approach which would ensure greater variety and quality of new development, smaller brownfield and edge of settlement infill sites in green belt should be used to provide for housing need, Site 9 allocation arbitrary, contrived and unjustified, unclear that new school could be adequately funded, would not protect southern approach to Knowle, and topography and visible profile unsuited to large area of development.</p>
Mr Chris Batiste [4821]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing.</p> <p>Will cause increase in traffic through Knowle.</p> <p>Medical services oversubscribed.</p> <p>Added pollution from extra 500 cars.</p>
Mr Chris Jones [4939]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>Concern about access on the Warwick Road as this is the main road that leads to the M42 and will cause traffic issues. Not safe for pedestrian access.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Lloyd [3278]			Q15/09	<p>Objection to Site 9.</p> <p>1,050 homes in Knowle will destroy its village character and overwhelm its infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Suggest areas already blighted e.g. by motorway service area, should be subject to development.</p>
Mr G Edwards [3167]			Q15/09	<p>Support Site 9 - Arden Triangle as best solution.</p> <p>The site seems a logical place to put houses as it would generate money for benefits but should keep number to minimum required.</p> <p>Worst option would be to build small numbers of houses all over the area as would affect more areas of green belt and growth would be harder to contain in the future.</p>
Mr Gibbons [4910]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site to fulfil housing needs without draining existing resources.</p>
Mr Harpreet Atwal [4848]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built.</p>
Mr Harvey Scriven [3790]			Q15/09	<p>Object to housing site 9 as building 700 houses in Knowle is ill conceived, case has not been made to build on green belt, which is contrary to Government policy, and is only being pursued because a developer is effectively 'bribing' the council and Arden school with a so called 'land swap'. Site is not well served by public transport and, therefore, the impact of the additional traffic through Knowle village, Station Road and the Warwick Road will be significant and has not been appropriately considered in the plan.</p>
Mr Jason Gardner [2909]			Q15/09	<p>Fully support the Council's objectives with regard to Site 9. My family own property in that area at 1928 Warwick Road and are happy to work with the Council where possible in order to achieve these objectives. We have no objections to the land being used for residential development.</p>
Mr John Cooper [3014]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 - Arden Triangle. concerns on traffic and parking.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr M Glithero [4908]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site which would help to keep the village atmosphere.</p> <p>Appropriate off-road parking, allowing at least 2 cars per house should be provided and it should not adversely affect traffic in Knowle village.</p>
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q15/09	<p>Support Site 9 the Arden Triangle, because it has ideal and totally defensible boundaries. It can provide not only the replacement Arden Academy, but a new public park, a final solution to the unsatisfactory Rotten Row junctions, and a new section of Grove Road, to improve traffic flows to Dorridge and Bentley Heath.</p>
Mr Martin Archer [3315]			Q15/09	<p>I think 350 houses are the absolute maximum that should be built on that site together with the school rebuilds</p>
Mr Martin Murphy [3070]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built as good for the community.</p>
Mr Matthew Bragg [3069]			Q15/09	<p>Area 9, to the south of Knowle is true greenbelt. Its conversion to housing will be out of keeping with the area and blight what is a bulging village already</p>
Mr Morris Arnold [3722]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Should use brownfield sites first.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be sorted first, car parking, primary schools, doctor surgeries.</p> <p>Solihull must not become a Birmingham overspill area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Nick Houghton [3528]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 - The Arden Triangle states that it preserves the rural fringe to Knowle from the approach roads.</p> <p>The land proposed rises up above the A4141 on the approach to Knowle from the South - and is highly visible.</p> <p>Therefore the visible current rural fringe will then be lost. This statement is therefore wrong.</p>
Mr Nick Houghton [3528]			Q15/09	<p>The Arden triangle site on the green belt in Knowle is currently extensively used to give Knowle residents access to open countryside via the bridleway on Station Road. This would be lost if the scheme goes ahead.</p> <p>In addition the provision of Mental Health facilities through Solihull Mind on the Arden triangle is an important provision and has taken 20 years of development on the site. With increasing requirement for mental health provision this should be developed rather than removed at this point in time.</p>
MR Robert James [3013]			Q15/09	<p>There is no provision for increased car parking in Knowle. 1050 new homes will surely lead to at least 1000 extra cars driving on local roads and needing to park near to local shops. Current parking arrangements are inadequate for today's needs, with inappropriate parking on pavements and grass verges, and this can only get worse. While bus services and cycle lanes are a good thing the reality is that the majority of journeys will be by car for the convenience, speed and ability to convey heavy shopping loads.</p>
mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q15/09	<p>Object to development of Site 9 as green belt land, requires new/larger school, and road infrastructure is at times unable to cope with existing volume of traffic without an additional 2000 vehicles.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr Roger Cook [2962]		Q15/09	<p>In response to Arden Questionnaire:</p> <p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing to enable a new secondary school.</p> <p>No houses should be built there as Green Belt.</p> <p>Knowle village cannot sustain 1000 dwellings. Infrastructure can't cope, other locations to build in Borough.</p> <p>Residents of Knowle should not have to 'pay' for failure of school to keep up with current standards.</p> <p>Sajid Javid is shelving plans to build on Green Belt.</p> <p>Landowner will only provide land for playing field.</p> <p>£30M revenue for housing is questionable; 450 houses at £200K only amounts to £90M. 1/3 of profit lost.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q15/09	<p>The indicative pedestrian access is unsuitable for children and would have highway safety implications.</p> <p>Station Road would be used to drop off children and add to congestion along the road.</p> <p>It includes a notional site for a catholic primary school on the existing MIND site and will be a further loss of green space.</p> <p>The imposition of between 450 and 750 new dwellings will have a devastating effect on Knowle Village.</p> <p>Knowle is already stretched regarding parking facilities and this will exacerbate the problem and increase traffic congestion.</p> <p>Area unsuitable - would destroy character of Knowle/Dorridge/Bentley Heath.</p>
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	<p>Would have a significant impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, on Landscape Character, heritage assets and recreation facilities.</p> <p>The proposed allocations will represent an over-concentration of growth in Knowle which will have an unacceptable adverse impact on the existing community and infrastructure. Would question how a population growth proposed by the allocations will satisfactorily assimilate into the village. Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions to existing facilities over recent years which undermines any need and cost justification for a brand new secondary school facility on a new site.</p>
Mr Stephen Duffield [3180]			Q15/09	<p>owner/ occupier of part of proposed site do not anticipate their site will be available for development in the short to medium term.</p> <p>Also suggest proposed allocation should be smaller in size for this site, provide a number of reasons - wildlife, flora.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr T Pritchard [4977]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses and consideration of access as all traffic will go through village.
Mr Terry Grove [3698]			Q15/09	see replies to questions
Mr Terry Grove [3698]			Q15/09	Objecting to the site as it: - eats into the green belt - current infrastructure (roads) is not able to cope
Mrs D Hull [4922]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Over 500 houses should be built on this site.
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	Review of evidence: SHELAA - Category 1 site. Comments that comprehensive masterplan is proposed. 10-24% of site is in LWS. GBA - Combined score of 5. Should be increased to 6 and 7 as close to other settlements. LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change. Interim SA - Site includes over 20ha of high quality agricultural land, ecological interest, close to noise sources, visually prominent setting. Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF. Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions recently. Undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Alison McWilliam [3726]			Q15/09	see response
Mrs Amanda Jenkins [3640]			Q15/09	Disagree with Neighbourhood Forum representation as additional housing is required and some should be in Knowle, it makes sense that this should be built closer to the village centre and if the outcome is a new school for the future of the KDBH area then a legacy will be built rather than a development, social housing is part of any new development, but number of homes to be provided needs to be managed.
Mrs Ann O'Reilly [3665]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to addressing infrastructure concerns.
Mrs C M Arnold [4820]			Q15/09	Disagree with new housing on school. Present infrastructure unable to cope. Disregard for Government's stated intention that brownfield sites should be developed first.
Mrs C Watt [4959]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to limit to 450 houses.
Mrs Cecilia O'Brien [3825]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mrs D Baynham [4855]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 dwellings, development that is in keeping with area.
Mrs Daphne Morgan [3871]			Q15/09	Aware of need for housing but with 3,000 new houses proposed in the catchment of St George and St Teresa school which is already oversubscribed so not all siblings get a place denying children a Catholic education and increasing need to travel. There is a need for expanded 2 form entry school, either on same site or in Arden triangle and this should be afforded high priority in addressing needs of development.
Mrs E Hedley [3516]			Q15/09	Proposed Site 9 better for relocation of football club currently on Site 8.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [3869]			Q15/09	Housing allocations in Knowle go far beyond what current infrastructure can cope with, which will increase congestion and pollution through High Street and threaten damage to historic buildings, result in green belt being lost and destroy nature of area and village, do not reflect vision of spreading development across Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath, densities proposed likely to lead to traffic problems and issues relating to lack of storage areas for cars/cycles/recycling and green space.
Mrs Faye Doble [4650]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection</p> <p>so many new homes in Knowle will wreck the semi rural character of the VILLAGE</p> <p>-very few employment opportunities in the area</p> <p>-infrastructure is unsuitable for such developments</p> <p>-the additional traffic caused by the proposed housing will make Hampton Road a bottleneck. Other infrastructure such as schools and doctors are already stretched and I understand all Knowle Schools are oversubscribed</p> <p>-</p>
Mrs faye sharp [3845]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mrs Jane Starling [3207]			Q15/09	Reluctantly agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Against the taking of more Green Belt but if this is mostly achieved by land swap, I would not protest, subject to infrastructure issues being addressed. Concerned about all the areas within the triangle marked for future development. Knowle may need a new school, but not at the expense of turning the village into an urban sprawl and losing the village feel. We don't need 1000 houses.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jill Collins [3784]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection.</p> <p>Sympathise will need to plan for 6500 new homes.</p> <p>1050 in Knowle is not acceptable, it is full.</p> <p>Parking extremely difficult.</p> <p>Few employment opportunities.</p> <p>Parking at Dorridge station is full.</p> <p>Encourages more car journeys.</p> <p>Added pressure to M42.</p> <p>More sensible to build houses where jobs are.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Further growth will impact community cohesion in Knowle.</p> <p>Principal of Arden Academy has given assurance there will be sufficient secondary school places for new residents in Knowle.</p> <p>Concerned about sufficient primary school places if new development not provide additional capacity.</p>
Mrs Linda Grove [4551]			Q15/09	<p>Object to housing Site 9 as proposed housing numbers for Knowle are excessive and disproportionate in the context of the overall plan and could not be supported by the village's current infrastructure, in particular the road network, and endorse KDBH Forum response.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q15/09	Site 9 cannot be supported and should be removed as represents disproportionate suggested growth in the size of Knowle as a village contrary to views of Neighbourhood Forum, will be largely car dependent, scores poorly for sustainability, and against the Council's own tests for effect on the landscape and character of Knowle. SMBC is running scared of judicial review and has been seduced by the opportunistic approaches of school which cannot promise the community will benefit in perpetuity from new community facilities.
Mrs Louise Kindon [3630]			Q15/09	Concerned that whilst Arden school needs investment current approach seems haphazard as will involve demolition of a number of buildings developed in recent years and this investment would have been better elsewhere, this is fundamental mismanagement of public money and gives little confidence in current management's ability to manage long term strategy for Arden, and that road infrastructure of Knowle and surrounding area suffers increasing congestion, which means it cannot accommodate further traffic, so how is traffic from new housing to be managed, and parking around centre is insufficient and leads to dangerous parking that will become worse.
Mrs Marjorie Archer [3558]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection. Generally support the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum submissions. Would support the rebuilding of Arden Academy and constructing up to 450 homes, but more than that would destroy area's current ambience. Opposed to loss of Solihull Mind. Very important facility.
Mrs Ruth Knowles [3413]			Q15/09	Disproportionate building in Knowle village. It would increase traffic, pollution, increase demand on GP surgeries, schools etc. Loss of Green Belt and open fields. The Council needs to look at other areas for house building. It needs to identify all these empty properties that could be used to house people, or even convert some of the empty business into habitual properties. This would take up some of the demand.
Mrs S Butcher Jones [4861]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 dwellings, as existing school not fit for purpose.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs S Larkin [4948]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>A too large development would have a negative impact on local traffic as well as services. The developers need to be required to consider sustainability, active travel and provision of green spaces and play areas. The houses built should include bike storage, utilise solar energy where possible and the whole area needs to be designated a 20mph zone.</p>
Mrs Una Cole [3840]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Nick Spence [4973]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site. I believe it would benefit the area to build on this site and to ensure that with more houses that more affordable housing is created in the area because of this. Something that I think is currently lacking and would benefit from massively.</p>
Nick Williams [4950]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses and consideration of other infrastructure needs such as medical services, parking and shopping facilities.</p>
Nick & Abby Fox [4508]			Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q15/09	<p>- A view is emerging that a new school could be of benefit to the community but the price to pay for those benefits in terms of the consequential impacts on infrastructure, landscape, and access to countryside that would result from 750 houses is unnecess</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Ager [3055]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection.</p> <p>1,050 houses proposed for Knowle is excessive, and out of scale with other locations.</p> <p>20% increase in size of village.</p> <p>Will change from village character to a small town.</p> <p>Consider allocations for Dorridge or Bentley Heath. Prefer dispersed growth.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>50% affordable housing is pointless in such an affluent area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of visual amenity.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>750 houses is not justified by evidence base; contrary to Landscape Character Assessment.</p>
Nick Ager [3055]			Q15/09	<p>The proposed housing development in Knowle at the Arden Triangle is not the right location as it is not a sustainable location, will cause significant loss of valuable Greenbelt landscape, exacerbate already unacceptable congestion in Knowle. A dispersed pattern of new housing development would be far more suitable for the area involving Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Nick Crowe [3569]		Q15/09	<p>I am resident on Station Road, Knowle and will be directly impacted by Proposed Housing Allocation 9</p> <p>I object to the proposal and support the views submitted by the KDBH Forum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate evaluation procedures by SMBC - allocation not in line with Spatial strategy; SA states large scale expansion of rural settlements is a poor option - Impact on GreenBelt - building on GB should be last resort - Negative impact on infrastructure - increase traffic on high street; increased demand on doctors, schools - disproportionate number of houses in Knowle
Nicola Dugmore [4898]		Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
P & C Benniman [4751]		Q15/09	<p>support. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments. Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 site. Comments that comprehensive masterplan is proposed. 10-24% of site is in LWS.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Should be increased to 6 and 7 as close to other settlements.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Site includes over 20ha of high quality agricultural land, ecological interest, close to noise sources, visually prominent setting.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions recently.</p> <p>Undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p>
Patrick Taylor [4955]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Patrick Wells [4396]			Q15/09	<p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>High density developments.</p> <p>Loss of last remaining green areas in the Village.</p> <p>Knowle will become satellite dormitory town to Solihull.</p> <p>Traffic problems will increase.</p> <p>Government policy is that incursions in the green Belt should only happen in exceptional circumstances. Not yet reached that situation.</p> <p>Unimplemented planning permissions for 700,000 dwellings country-wide.</p> <p>Should compel housebuilders to complete these first.</p> <p>Disagree with proposal to demolish Arden School and rebuild. Waste of millions of pounds of taxpayer money that has been spent on the school. Should restrict catchment to Knowle and Dorridge.</p> <p>Not considered impact on local community.</p>
Patrick Wells [4396]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsey [4654]		Q15/09	<p>The growth proposed will impact on the character and appearance of the Knowle Conservation Area</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt and valuable Arden Landscape.</p> <p>The Arden Academy proposals do not include an independent assessment of the need for new secondary school premises, including existing building condition surveys, which should be commissioned. An independent assessment of statutory educational need across Solihull Borough should be commissioned to substantiate the proposals for a new 10 form entry secondary school.</p> <p>The proposals for site 9 do not reflect the vision and aspirations of local communities.</p> <p>Impact on existing services and infrastructure.</p>
Paul & Julie Meaden [4528]		Q15/09	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Eden [4841]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing as set out in current plan.</p> <p>Under 500 homes should be built on site.</p> <p>Scale of housing is too large, and too onerous a trade off for the new school.</p> <p>My view would change if plans revised.</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Gym,</p> <p>Pool.</p> <p>Current plans would change character of village.</p>
Paul Lamaison [4863]			Q15/09	Object to additional houses proposed for Site 9.
Paul Rylah [4994]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Paula Quinn [3821]			Q15/09	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/09	Support. It is a lower performing area of Green Belt.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Dowding [3264]			Q15/09	see replies to questions
Peter Dowding [3264]			Q15/09	site 9 - Arden Triangle objection for a number of reasons, principally traffic.
Peter & Penny Coggan [4888]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 houses as more would drastically alter character of Knowle, overload infrastructure and constitute significant overdevelopment, and provision of a range of house types and affordable housing.
Peter Glynn [4852]			Q15/09	site 9 objection
Peter Royle [3250]			Q15/09	Object to housing Site 9 as is valuable, well-established attractive green belt land with wildlife and community facilities, exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated as required by Government policy, the Green Belt Assessment scoring system is subjective, only proposed because Arden Academy wants to expand and landowners a profit, school has already had 4 major developments in recent years touted as of benefit to the wider community, further development unlikely to be beneficial but will be detrimental through increasing traffic, congestion, parking problems and oversubscribed facilities, green fields should not be developed given amount of brownfield land in West Midlands.
Peter Whitfield [4886]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as there is adequate space on existing site to develop school, inadequate infrastructure in Knowle to support proposed housing and more needs to be done to address access and congestion or numbers reduced, no justification provided for loss of green belt and alternative options should be considered to protect green belt, no adequate environmental protection in place, and impact on wider community will not be compensated by any additional facilities on relatively small site.
Phil Henrick [4427]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection. Focus of Arden 2020 project (rebuilding Arden Academy) should be exclusively on the pupils and driving up standards of education in Solihull. Would be more appropriate to leave Arden Academy where it is and meet demand for secondary school places on another site? The competition between the two would drive up standards. A super-school will not benefit children's education.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Prue Findlay [4591]			Q15/09	AS PER THE KDBH forum response
R G Ellis [4452]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection. Disproportionate number of homes in Knowle.
R Ilyas [4928]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Rachael Jackson [4933]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Too many houses will de-value those already here and over-stretch roads and services.
Rachel Caswell [4187]			Q15/09	can you take my views into consideration regarding the potential new Arden School with the funding stemming from new housing in the area. I support a thoughtful and considered approach to the new school build which may involve the building of several hundred houses on the site of Arden school that would fund a new school, further down Station road. I have one child at Arden and two planning on going in the next few years and have many friends in the community at the same stage. A new school, I believe, would serve the community well.
Rachel Caswell [4871]			Q15/09	Site 9 Objection
Rachel Caswell [4871]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built.
Rebecca England [4901]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Over 500 houses should be built on this site.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rev Carol Hibberd [3835]			Q15/09	It would be insupportable if the Mind horticultural site is included in the Arden Plan. The loss of such a wonderful facility for a group of vulnerable people, those with mental health issues, goes against all that you say in the Health and Supporting Local Communities section of the document. I'm a service user at the site and it is a haven of calm, being outdoors and being part of the natural world. We learn good skills too. The site must not be touched or reduced in size in any way. It is a community resource for a disadvantaged group.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/09	The site will destroy the character and setting of Knowle. It will massively impact on the visual aspect of Knowle from the east. The allocation should not extend to the Warwick Road or beyond the Middlefield development. The remaining balance of numbers can be found by adopting a dispersal approach using smaller or medium sized sites.
Robert Blackadder [4825]			Q15/09	Disagree with houses being built on Site 9. Developing more houses is not the only way of funding the appropriate provision and improvement of school facilities in the village. Oppose new school; facilities promoted in Arden's 2020 vision are overambitious and disproportionate. School's current position is due to piecemeal development on the site. Most sustainable solution is to redevelop on site in a modular programme.
Ruth Kirby [4945]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
S Olsen [4971]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses as major concerns about increasing population by too much and impact on traffic levels.
Sarah Bees [4858]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built, subject to less than 500 dwellings.
Senior Public Health Consultant (Mrs S Leahy) [2489]			Q15/09	Solihull GPs have also been consulted on the proposals and have raised concerns that the Solihull MIND facility may need to be closed due to local development plans on the land.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sheena Holland [4920]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>Should be a variation of housing including 1-bed to 5 bed houses. Not too many apartments.</p>
Shelia Andrews [4849]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built providing less than 500 dwellings and the preservation of the land occupied by Solihull MIND.</p>
Simon Bore [4864]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built.</p>
Simon Gates [4847]			Q15/09	<p>Disagree with Site 9 being developed for housing to enable new secondary school.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on site.</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Swimming pool,</p> <p>Theatre/arts centre.</p>
Siobhan Williams [3683]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses. Should include relocation of St George & St Teresa primary school, as need to increase primary school facilities for new housing proposals, and St George and St Teresa school has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, with its catchment going beyond Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed.</p>
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q15/09	<p>Our project lies within the Greenfield site of the Arden Triangle development and losing it would not only damage the 'Guiding Principle' relating to supporting developments which 'contribute to the health and Well-being of communities'; but also to the Guiding Principle stated in 'not in Support' where a development challenges 'the protecting, conserving, enhancing and restoring environmental assets' as our project has taken derelict and unused field and turned it into a community asset which would be destroyed if the development was to proceed as planned.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q15/09	the number of houses on this site should be lower than the 750 in the DLP. the density of 36 dwellings per hectare is considered unsuitable fro Knowle.
St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School (Office Administrator) [4171]			Q15/09	<p>As part of our request for a two form entry school and our interest in a new site off Grove Road, Knowle - we wish to remain part of the review process as you work on the concept Masterplan for Site 9 Arden/Grove Road development.</p> <p>We believe we can demonstrate a need for our catholic school to expand in line with the local policy and proposed infrastructure requirements. Our catchment area includes Knowle and Dorridge, Bentley Heath, parts of Hockley Heath (Rural South) and the area up to, surrounding and including Balsall Common (Rural East).</p>
Stephen Beck [2637]			Q15/09	<p>supports Arden Triangle site. Lower impact of a small number of large developments than a large number of small developments.</p> <p>Provision of local infrastructure in the locality of the development.</p>
Steven Dugmore [4895]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Stuart Webb [4642]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection</p> <p>I am a member of the Knowle Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum and fully support the KDBH Forum response to the Local Plan Review consultation.</p>
T Phillips [4976]			Q15/09	Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built subject to less than 500 houses.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q15/09	<p>Have land interest on part of Site 9 and consider it suitable for further development to accommodate expansion and growth of Knowle.</p> <p>Part of land is subject to planning permission: PL/2015/52196/PPFL.</p> <p>Well defined landscaped boundaries.</p> <p>No listed buildings on-site.</p> <p>Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>Indicative work on landscape and ecology to be undertaken.</p> <p>Not considered to have significant constraints to prevent development.</p> <p>Promotional document also submitted.</p>
Terry Corns [4446]			Q15/09	<p>- A view is emerging that a new school could be of benefit to the community but the price to pay for those benefits in terms of the consequential impacts on infrastructure, landscape, and access to countryside that would result from 750 houses is unnecess</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>The Client [4521]</p>	<p>Laura Pohl</p>	<p>Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]</p>	<p>Q15/09</p>	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 site. Comments that comprehensive masterplan is proposed. 10-24% of site is in LWS.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Should be increased to 6 and 7 as close to other settlements.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Site includes over 20ha of high quality agricultural land, ecological interest, close to noise sources, visually prominent setting.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions recently.</p> <p>Undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p>
<p>The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]</p>			<p>Q15/09</p>	<p>In relation to Site 9:</p> <p>Well defined parcels of land: meets this criterion if all parcels of land taken together.</p> <p>Preventing towns merging: Knowle already linked to Dorridge and Bentley Heath. 2 miles from Hampton-in-Arden and Chadwick End.</p> <p>Checking unrestricted sprawl: Does not comply with this.</p> <p>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: Does not comply except for extending the settlement boundary as a result of proposed development.</p> <p>Preservation of the setting of historic towns: Site will cause considerable harm to village and its Conservation Area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 objections:</p> <p>Public knowledge that Arden Academy is seeking to relocate to a new complex called Arden Centre for Community Learning.</p> <p>Assume that part of Site 9 has been assigned to this complex, as lower density proposed.</p> <p>Concern that Complex already taken as a statement of fact. Much work still needs to be completed for inclusion in a planning application, and may not be built at all.</p> <p>Unacceptable if gap between housing and new school site.</p> <p>A singular access to site would be unacceptable.</p>
Theresa Dacombe [4893]			Q15/09	<p>Don't know whether agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. But under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>The roads in Knowle and Dorridge are already congested and Station Road currently is quite dangerous when Arden School comes out.</p>
Thomas Macey [4962]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built with better facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/09	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>SHELAA - Category 1 site. Comments that comprehensive masterplan is proposed. 10-24% of site is in LWS.</p> <p>GBA - Combined score of 5. Should be increased to 6 and 7 as close to other settlements.</p> <p>LCA - Considered a 'low' capacity to accommodate change.</p> <p>Interim SA - Site includes over 20ha of high quality agricultural land, ecological interest, close to noise sources, visually prominent setting.</p> <p>Removal from Green Belt not justified by NPPF.</p> <p>Arden Academy has undergone a significant number of upgrades and extensions recently.</p> <p>Undermines need and cost justification of brand new secondary school.</p>
Tim & Morwenna Hocombe [4917]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Tim Knight [4943]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p> <p>The local infrastructure is struggling to cope as it is. The roads will not cope, given the location of the housing with more than the initial 350 units planned.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tim Richmond [4630]			Q15/09	<p>Site 9 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic and congestion from the development will only serve to increase and add to the existing problems - detrimental impact on conservation area - arden schools facilities are fine and the school doesn't require to be developed/upgraded
Toby Green [4912]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site.</p>
Tom Bridge [3540]			Q15/09	<p>In Knowle on land earmarked for Arden School there is a field run by Mind for those with mental health issues. This was leased to the charity several years ago and thanks to staff and users, has been transformed into a facility used regularly by its clients, old and new. No local alternative has been offered to Mind as a consequence of the Plan. Given the importance the Government has attached to improve mental health I firmly believe Mind should be allowed to remain and continue to offer an invaluable service to mental health users in our community.</p>
Tony Moon [4964]			Q15/09	<p>Support development of Site 9 to enable new secondary school to be built providing facilities for housing numbers managed.</p>
Trevor Smallwood [4672]			Q15/09	<p>Object to Site 9 as proposal of poor quality, lacks rigour, fails to address many of the key issues associated with development such as infrastructure provision, and will create an unsustainable situation. Adds full support to KDBH Forum response.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15/09	<p>SHELAA reveals not all landowners been contacted.</p> <p>Request confirmation of landowner involvement before site is allocated.</p> <p>No evidence that feasibility studies were carried out prior to proposed allocation in DLP.</p> <p>Concur with promoters that access to site is major constraint.</p> <p>Seems unlikely that NHS/CCG would allow 1500+ pupils to gain access to school through their grounds.</p> <p>Landscape and topography issues.</p> <p>Better to disperse 750 dwellings between Site 9 and SHELAA Site 207.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/09	<p>Contains a potential Local Wildlife Site; Meadows nr. Landsdowne Farm.</p> <p>The LWS panel should be commissioned to survey and assess this site against the LWS criteria as a priority so as to inform the scheme design.</p> <p>LWS areas should be protected and enhanced as part of the development.</p>
West Santisook [5007]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Over 500 houses should be built on this site. Provide as many houses for the community as possible.</p>
Youseff Hennous [4919]			Q15/09	<p>Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built.</p> <p>Under 500 houses should be built on this site. Due to the housing crisis, this project will alleviate the pressure of housing demand and improve Arden Academy site and facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Yvonne & Stephen Palin [4878]			Q15/09	Object to development of Site 9 as would like Knowle to remain as it is with green areas and treed walkways, and catchment to school should be limited to Knowle and Dorridge to avoid unnecessary traffic, but if unavoidable should be less than 300 houses with design of school in keeping with Knowle, entrance to Grove Road to avoid conflict with emergency vehicles using Station Road, and additional parking required.
Zaki Fergusson [4903]			Q15/09	Agree with site 9 being developed for housing that would enable a new secondary school to be built. Under 500 houses should be built on this site.
Question 15/10 West of Meriden				
Judy McCall [4217]			Q15/10	development is not supported on this site as it: - increases pressure/demand on schools and medical facilities - increase in traffic - parking in the village already at a premium - effect on character of village More needs to be done to find brownfield land in the urban area before building on greenfield.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowner Land at Birmingham Road Meriden [4529]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/10	<p>Allocation will meet objectives of Growth Option F.</p> <p>Will meet national policy requirements to delivery sustainable development on available, suitable, viable and achievable land.</p> <p>Represents a logical sustainable westwards expansion of Meriden.</p> <p>Clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>No known legal or physical constraints.</p> <p>Could be brought forward in first five years of plan period.</p> <p>No site specific designations.</p>
Landowner Land at Birmingham Road Meriden [4529]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/10	<p>Review of evidence -</p> <p>SHELAA Ref. 19:</p> <p>Unclear why contaminated land/landfill is mentioned. No reference on EA's website.</p> <p>Erroneous reference to a LWS on-site.</p> <p>Suitability score should be changed to 3.</p> <p>Broadly agree with SA, except erroneous reference to LWS onsite.</p> <p>Agree with findings in Green Belt Assessment, Accessibility Study, Landscape Character Assessment.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q15/10	Support for LPR site allocation 10. The site of the former garage on the north side of Birmingham Road, already has planning permission for housing. The adjacent land currently used for caravan parking and part of the adjoining field could form an attractive small housing development near the centre of the village, local shops and transport. Its accessibility and proximity to shops and other facilities would make it an ideal location for more older persons' accommodation in the village.
Miss Katie Mitchell [2932]			Q15/10	Happy that more houses are to be built in Meriden. Need build to rent sector in Meriden.
Morrison Mobile home Ltd [3116]	Mr Ronald Perrin	Mr Ronald Perrin [2684]	Q15/10	Site 10 Meriden. Need additional mobile homes at the existing residential mobile home site at Meriden Hall Mobile Home Park. Green Belt boundary of Meriden also needs to be amended in this location.
Mr David McGrath [3508]			Q15/10	Views of Meriden residents expressed at a public meeting on 6 December 2016, supporting rejection of around 10 submitted sites, supporting some small scale developments to meet local needs, such as older persons accommodation, expressing concern about additional traffic and parking problems and engineering solutions to resolve them, further strain on schools, nursery places and medical practices, cumulative impact of developments at Balsall Common and Arden Cross which should be addressed or the development opposed, and noting that whilst site 10 is in the green belt, evidence indicated this was not a strongly performing area.
Mr Neil McCall [3551]			Q15/10	development is not supported on this site as it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increases pressure/demand on schools and medical facilities - increase in traffic - parking in the village already at a premium - effect on character of village More needs to be done to find brownfield land in the urban area before building on greenfield.
Rebecca Billingsley [3219]			Q15/10	Object to the site allocation for a number of reasons, including that developments are leading to an increase in the crime levels.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/10	Support inclusion of Firs, Maxstoke Lane, part of allocated site 10.
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/10	<p>Contains fields that are identified as a potential Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The LWS panel should be commissioned to survey and assess this site against the LWS criteria as a priority so as to inform the scheme design.</p> <p>LWS areas should be protected and enhanced as part of the development.</p> <p>Protection and enhancement of the LWS should be added to the likely infrastructure requirements.</p>
Question 15/11 TRW/The Green				
A & V Blake [4304]			Q15/11	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Should be fairer distribution of housing.</p> <p>Recent development in Cheswick Green and Dickens Heath already added to congestion.</p> <p>Proposed development of 2550 houses will increase strain on road infrastructure, including air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of green space for community benefit and health.</p> <p>Loss of green corridor to canal and countryside.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Retain Green Belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
A J Edgeworth [4106]			Q15/11	Object to proposals for 2,500 new houses in South Shirley as area already suffers from loss of green belt and extra congestion from Dickens Heath, will result in additional pollution from vehicles when we should be reducing harm to health, road infrastructure in area will be unable to cope with extra traffic, significant development is already taking place in Earlswood area, and there must be brownfield and green field sites elsewhere that can take a share.
Alison Robbins [4062]			Q15/11	Object to disproportionate and unfair housing levels in Shirley South, unrelated to major infrastructure improvements such as HS2, whilst local rail stations are unfit for purpose with inadequate parking, will exacerbate major congestion affecting all roads in area including traffic from Dickens Heath, schools and medical practices are already at capacity requiring more green field land for expansion, loss of amenity and wildlife habitat prone to flooding. Understand that numerous other options have not been explored and question why these are considered unsuitable.
Andrea Hopcraft [3651]			Q15/11	A reasonable compromise would be to leave green belt land in allocation 13 untouched and proceed with the housing on allocations 11 and 12.
Andrew Beadsworth [4063]			Q15/11	Object to housing development in Shirley, as area is taking an unfair proportion compared with elsewhere in Borough, will exacerbate congestion on already busy roads, public transport, infrastructure, schools and medical facilities will be adversely affected, health and well being will be impacted with loss of green space for leisure and recreation on top of loss of land at Shirley Park, will increase urban sprawl towards Dickens Heath, whilst development of brownfield sites or more equitable spread across Borough is less considered.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Barry & Jenny Jennings [4300]			Q15/11	<p>Site 4, 11, 12 and 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath and Shirley would merge into one huge suburb, which wasn't the vision for Dickens Heath Village.</p> <p>Considerable development already threatening gaps between Dickens Heath, Wythall and Earlswood.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development increased traffic on Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Haslucks Green Road.</p> <p>Roads could not cope with more traffic.</p> <p>Need to keep green spaces for wellbeing.</p> <p>Look for brownfield sites.</p>
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the coalescence of settlements and have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing communities and infrastructure as well as the Green Belt and landscape.</p> <p>No evidence for accepting loss of employment on this site. Capacity is over ambitious.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed mixed use and housing development of this site is questionable. There is consequently a need to identify alternative sites to accommodate the potential shortfall arising from proposed Allocation 11.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Bradley Healey Gwilliam [4286]			Q15/11	South Shirley area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.
C A Frost [4006]			Q15/11	<p>Already a massive problem with traffic congestion in the local area. If you add a further concern about the capacity of the local NHS system and the underfunding of schools in the area, then the proposal to build over 2500 new homes seems to be totally absurd.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the national requirement for new homes, it is wrong to blindly pursue the delivery of numbers and ignore the quality of life of existing and new residents.</p> <p>Hope that a more moderate approach can be found which will avoid turning Shirley into a new town on the edge of Solihull.</p>
Carol Edgeworth [4101]			Q15/11	Whilst new housing is very much needed, object to 2550 homes in 4 sites so close together as local schools, medical services and roads will be unable to cope and the green belt will be a concrete jungle when there are brownfield sites that should be used first.
Carolyn Locke [4096]			Q15/11	Object to housing Site 11 as part of overall 41% of housing allocations in South Shirley as unfair and should be spread more fairly across Borough, will add to already congested roads causing higher levels of pollution implicated in various chronic conditions, increase pressure on struggling medical services, require significant investment in new schools and impact on catchments, increased number of residents travelling long distances to Waste & Recycling Centre, impact on natural environment, wildlife and flooding, on top of developments already taking place will undermine attractiveness, health and well-being of the area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Isaacs [4450]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>2500 houses in Shirley area is disproportionate.</p> <p>Agree some housing should be here, but not to this degree.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues will be exacerbated, e.g. Stratford Road congestion.</p> <p>Site 11 less unacceptable than Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Consider golf courses for development.</p>
Christina Lawlor [4252]			Q15/11	No objection to the building of homes along Dog Kennel Lane.
Christopher Taylor [4473]			Q15/11	Object to scale of growth proposed for South Shirley on top of recent supermarket and retail park developments which is unfair, involves loss of so much green belt land in one area when other areas unaffected, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A34 and local roads, there is inadequate public transport to carry increased population or parking provision at local stations and inadequate provision for school places and is clearly not in best interests of local residents.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>Overconcentration of development south of Shirley.</p> <p>SHELAA - ref. 124 is a Category 2 site. Report observes that housing would result in loss of existing employment land uses on site, which needs to be found acceptable in planning terms. We have found no up-to-date evidence to substantiate this. Estimates capacity as 226 dwellings only.</p> <p>Unlikely that 400 dwellings can come forward without prejudice to existing uses.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15/11	This site is probably the least controversial of the sites impacting upon Shirley South. My main concern is that there would be a significant loss in green open space which is currently used by local residents as a valuable amenity.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/11	Of all the sites in and around Shirley this is the one that I find least controversial. It is existing an brownfield site and has good transport connectivity.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/11	Capacity underestimated as some commercial uses likely to give way to residential.
Cpt D A Benton [4097]			Q15/11	Object to housing Site 11 as part of horrendous proposals for 2550 houses in South Shirley, which will exacerbate traffic already overloaded by Dickens Heath development, local shops, medical services, schools and parking infrastructure will be inadequate to support additional population, developments will result in loss of open space, countryside and peace and fresh air. Only benefit is extra employment and rates income, Council should make case to Government that enough development already and find more suitable areas.
D Wilkinson [4001]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection - together with allocations 4, 12 & 13 there is an over-allocation of proposed houses in a small area of the borough, on mainly on precious green space.</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with this extra demand to the local area. Will exacerbate existing traffic problems, increase pollution and impact on community infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p> <p>This scheme adds little value to the HS2 access plans and will make the M42 unbearable and more like London's M25.</p> <p>Request that the plans be considerably scaled back to a sensible build programme.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Paddock [3988]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 (general South of Shirley) Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p>
David Parkinson [4562]			Q15/11	<p>Object to proposals for an additional 2550 houses in Shirley area as will have detrimental impact on area through loss of green area/countryside, highway infrastructure is already struggling to cope with current traffic levels especially during peak times, lack of school places to meet expected demand never mind growth which will lead to larger classes and poorer education, and medical and police services at capacity.</p>
David Smith [4043]			Q15/11	<p>The needs and requirements of existing residents must be taken into consideration regarding health, quality of life and the effect on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Additional cars will add to existing problematic congestion.</p> <p>Additional school and nursery places and health facilities will be required.</p>
Debbie Stokes [4255]			Q15/11	<p>Object to housing in South Shirley as concentration of 41% of new housing in one small area is unfair, 2,500 plus houses will exacerbate severe traffic congestion on A34, Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road, and the impact will have a severe detrimental affect on local schools, medical services and transport.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Earlwood & Forshaw Heath Residents Association (Jennifer Buckley) [4439]			Q15/11	<p>Object to Site 4.</p> <p>Contrary to Government manifesto 2015 on protecting Green Belt and countryside.</p> <p>No evidence of cross-boundary consultation or discussion as prescribed by the Localism Act.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and quality of life of residents in Earlwood & Forshaw Heath not been taken into account.</p> <p>Developments by SMBC in last 20 years had dramatic impact on rural parish and none for the better.</p> <p>No recompense to Stratford District Council for impacts of these developments, e.g. traffic on roads.</p> <p>SDC should be compensated.</p>
Edward Fraser [4138]			Q15/11	<p>Object to housing Site 11 as proposed as together with other sites in South Shirley will cause major traffic problems and exacerbate existing unacceptable delays, overload medical services and impact on local schools. Whilst it is recognised that housing is required, Shirley has more than its fair share and is not the place for growth associated with HS2. Housing on Site 11 only or with reduced Site 4 area may be feasible.</p>
Elizabeth Padgett [4610]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic is already dire - Green belt land and wildlife are more important to people than houses which they cannot afford - Traffic pollution is not good for anyone's health or safety
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q15/11	<p>Object to amount of land proposed for development in Shirley, as the area south of Stratford Road is already congested and will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic, there are insufficient transport connections such as railway links, and loss of green areas will reduce Shirley's image from the lovely 'town in the country' it always was.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Elizabeth Yates [3274]			Q15/11	If development is required, I can agree with the TWR site being utilised, at least the site would have access to the Stratford Road, being adjacent to it.
Geoff Hickman [3515]			Q15/11	Objection to Site 11.
Graham Roberts [4108]			Q15/11	Object to concentration of housing around Shirley/Cheswick Green/BVP, instead of sharing across Borough, which will create problems of lack of medical services, and overloaded roads not fit for increasing traffic.
Gurmeash Kaur [4015]			Q15/11	Not happy with the housing plans in Shirley, especially around the green belt areas. I feel the green areas should be preserved. Furthermore this housing expansion will have a detrimental impact on schooling and GP surgeries, where problems with waiting lists exist.
Howard Maine [4172]			Q15/11	Object to development of 2,250 additional houses around South Shirley as will have detrimental impact on transport problems, schools and already stretched hospitals, and exacerbate already frightening volume of traffic on A34 and surrounding local roads.
J D Green [3195]			Q15/11	site 11 TRW -support.
J Hall [4109]			Q15/11	Object to the level of housing proposed for the Shirley area, as the densities are too high, the roads and lanes will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic generated, concern that there will be insufficient schools and medical services, and loss of green fields for enjoyment.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Jacqueline Harris [4320]</p>			<p>Q15/11</p>	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>41% of development in area around Shirley is disproportionate.</p> <p>Should be spread more fairly across Borough.</p> <p>Heavy congestion on Stratford Road, M42 and surrounding roads will get worse.</p> <p>Poor public transport links.</p> <p>More pollution.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at railway stations.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Local schools, nurseries, doctor surgeries and hospital already unable to cope. Will need new school and surgery.</p> <p>Feels Shirley is forgotten part of Solihull.</p> <p>Look for options with better transport links and more direct access to M42 and A34.</p>
<p>Jane & Alan Horton [4443]</p>			<p>Q15/11</p>	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>Development will join Dickens Heath, Majors Green, Tidbury Green and Shirley.</p> <p>Will be one giant housing estate.</p> <p>Traffic volume on Haslucks Green Road is major hazard.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jane Mills [4134]			Q15/11	Object to housing in South Shirley as over 2,500 houses or 41% of proposed allocations is unfair and will have negative affect on local community through increased traffic on all local roads, Shirley station car park is currently inadequate let alone for a huge increase in users, increased noise, pollution and rat running on local roads across Shirley, construction traffic will be intrusive and unwelcome, and local schools and medical services unlikely to have capacity for increase in population.
Janett Reynolds [4664]			Q15/11	Objects to building of 2,550 new houses in South Shirley area which amounts to 41% of total allocations and is grossly unfair, will have serious impact on already congested roads, will affect local schools and medical services, result in loss of 6 sports and recreational grounds and high density housing will lead to disputes over parking, noise and other social issues through lack of space.
Jen Hickman [3522]			Q15/11	Objection to Site 11.
Jennifer Archer [4016]			Q15/11	<p>Road network cannot cope with existing traffic.</p> <p>Cycling is hazardous and allocations are not on established public transport routes.</p> <p>Employment opportunities in Shirley would not be sufficient to meet increased population.</p> <p>Parking is at capacity at local railway stations. More parking will impact on the water table.</p> <p>More convenient locations with better road links are required.</p>
Joanne Hale [4400]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>Understand the need for housing.</p> <p>2550 houses in such a small congested area is excessive.</p> <p>Consider highways impact.</p> <p>Not a good location to get to HS2.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>Allocations 4, 11, 12, 13 will all have a very large impact on the area with respect to transport, schooling and healthcare facilities such as GPs in what is an already congested and high density of dwellings area.</p> <p>Would not benefit from HS2.</p> <p>Development should be more evenly spread across the Borough.</p>
John & Julie Russell [4238]			Q15/11	<p>Object to proposal to locate 41% of proposed houses in South Shirley as inordinate amount compared with elsewhere in Borough, will destroy green field sites, extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion on A34 and surrounding roads especially at peak times, demand for places at oversubscribed schools, demands on already crowded local rail services and inadequate parking, construction will cause extra traffic/noise/disruption, and will degrade the area with loss of character that makes it attractive.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Dancer [4303]			Q15/11	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Recognise urgent need for housing.</p> <p>41% development in Shirley/Dickens Heath is disproportionate.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of Green Belt land; contrary to central government policy.</p> <p>Lots of brownfield land available in Birmingham.</p> <p>Lots of opportunity elsewhere for infilling.</p> <p>DLP not consider impacts on local infrastructure, including roads, parking, congestion, hospitals.</p> <p>3000+ cars will increase air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of trees to absorb pollution.</p> <p>Reducing recreational and public amenity space.</p> <p>Loss of 9 sports pitches.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Junctions 4 to 6 of M42 already at capacity.</p>
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/11	<p>Identified as an employment site allocation in the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and again in the Draft Plan 2016 but caveated in respect of a potential mixed use site in the next iteration of the Plan following the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>Considerable doubt therefore exists over the housing numbers identified for this site as well as the potential conflict with employment policy P3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Robbins [4272]			Q15/11	Object to proposed 41% growth for Shirley South that is disproportionate and unacceptable, more appropriate alternatives yet to be considered including those near infrastructure improvements such as UKC/HS2, area suffers from severe congestion, and housing will compound issue and increase rat running, local rail stations are too small and have inadequate parking, unlikely to meet need for smaller homes, and should look at alternative of smaller sites across Borough.
Julie Betts [3173]			Q15/11	Object to these developments, which will mean the whole of Shirley South being engulfed with further housing instead of lovely countryside, will make existing traffic congestion and noise much worse, will result in loss of recreational green space, and for which there is inadequate school places or opportunities for expansion.
Julie Jones [3659]			Q15/11	Object to housing sites in Shirley as unfair that 41% of new houses are proposed on Green Belt land adjacent to Shirley when other areas are more suitable, the developments will be on top of the huge increase in new homes in recent years and local infrastructure, including roads such as Bills Lane, schools and medical facilities will be unable to cope, the area is overdeveloped and very busy so the adjacent Green Belt is vital in bringing many benefits to the area.
K J Hewitt [4733]			Q15/11	Object to housing proposals for Shirley as infrastructure of area will not allow this intensity of development and needs more consideration, most of new residents will need to use Blackford Road, which is already seriously affected by traffic from Dickens Heath and retail park and has been closed on a number of occasions for repairs due to damage to sewers, and plans are likely to change so that improvements may not end of being delivered.
K Neale [4085]			Q15/11	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair, as will exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, and local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kay Wilkes [4000]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 (general South of Shirley) Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p>
Kim Cowie [4399]			Q15/11	<p>Agree with TRW site.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>Overconcentration of development south of Shirley.</p> <p>SHELAA - ref. 124 is a Category 2 site. Report observes that housing would result in loss of existing employment land uses on site, which needs to be found acceptable in planning terms. We have found no up-to-date evidence to substantiate this. Estimates capacity as 226 dwellings only.</p> <p>Unlikely that 400 dwellings can come forward without prejudice to existing uses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lauren Bosworth [3998]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>Detrimental to local community and way of life.</p> <p>Increase in crime rate in Dickens Heath since new development been finished.</p> <p>HS2 already destroying other parts of local countryside.</p> <p>Council object to new developments in the Green Belt, why treat one house different from over 2000?</p>
Margaret Chadderton [4743]			Q15/11	<p>Unfair that so many houses will be in the Shirley area.</p> <p>Will only exacerbate existing problems with traffic.</p> <p>Pressure on schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Other areas of Solihull should take their fair share.</p>
Margaret Lewis [4611]			Q15/11	<p>Please take into account that all the housing you propose to put in our local community, will have a detrimental impact on our schools and doctors, it will create awful transport problems along Haslucks green rd. Bills lane Burman rd. Tamworth lane and Blackford rd.</p>
Marianne Fogarty [4395]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of housing, 41%, of new development in Shirley South area.</p> <p>Traffic increased significantly since last development in Dickens Heath were built out.</p>
Marie Kilgallen [4142]			Q15/11	<p>The proposals for South Shirley will require new schools and medical facilities and will impact on recreation areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Davies [4459]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>South of Shirley been allocated 2500+ homes; 41% of the Borough's allocation.</p> <p>Inconsistent with the spatial strategy and DLP policies.</p> <p>Fails to take into account impact on local services, infrastructure and the local community.</p> <p>Lack of evidence that suitable alternatives been explored.</p> <p>Impact on existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools and GPs.</p> <p>Road and rail network at or near capacity. Will be unable to access A34 or M42.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 development.</p> <p>Site already occupied by local businesses.</p> <p>Why sacrifice local jobs for housing? Need jobs for residents to be able to afford new homes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/11	<p>Proposal is currently vague on how 400 dwellings will be accommodated.</p> <p>Need to be clearer on relationship between existing employment uses and proposed residential development. Clarity also sought on other potential uses such as retail, motor dealership etc.</p> <p>Consider available land for housing is 8.81ha. At 36dph and 80% land uptake, yield is 253 dwellings.</p> <p>If apartments or terraced housing provided, this could increase to 350 dwellings.</p> <p>Shortfall will need to be met elsewhere.</p> <p>Plan needs to specifically state whether it is a housing or mixed use site.</p>
Mark Taft [3595]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 TRW is ideal for development with good transport connections and should be developed with a range high density 1 and 2 bedroom apartments, enabling access to Green Belt amenity land to be maintained.</p>
Matt Stapleton [4281]			Q15/11	<p>Object to concentration of 2500 new homes in South Shirley area as iniquitous and disproportionate and should be more evenly allocated across Borough, would have a huge detrimental effect on already congested roads in area and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport.</p>
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/11	<p>Identified as an employment site allocation in the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and again in the Draft Plan 2016 but caveated in respect of a potential mixed use site in the next iteration of the Plan following the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>Considerable doubt therefore exists over the housing numbers identified for this site as well as the potential conflict with employment policy P3.</p>
Mr & Mrs Vernon & Phyllis Brookes [3181]			Q15/11	<p>Object to site as the amount of housing in the vicinity has almost doubled already including loss of some green space, and whilst there is a need for housing, locating 41% of the housing proposed in Shirley is much too high, and will exacerbate already horrendous traffic.</p>
Mr & Mrs Simons [4614]			Q15/11	<p>Congestion and Traffic are being given as the main reasons for objecting to development in Shirley.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Woollard [4099]			Q15/11	Object to proposals for housing Site 11 as 41% of housing allocation in one area is unfair, negative impact on community through loss of green space and resultant well-being, increased transport problems on already overcrowded roads, overburdening of schools and medical services, and will be poorly located in relation to HS2 interchange compared with areas in east and north of Borough avoiding congested A34 and M42. Proposals should be cancelled or severely scaled back.
Mr A Jeffs [4708]			Q15/11	Object to housing in Dickens Heath/Shirley as will require vast amounts of expenditure on improving existing infrastructure to prevent an environmental disaster, with traffic congestion on unsuitable roads already from overdevelopment of Dickens Heath and restrictive bridges, flooding affecting land and roads, loss of green space. Developers should be required to build cycle paths on roads and Stratford canal and new parkland as well as improving roads and drainage.
Mr Barrie Stanyer [3641]			Q15/11	Object to housing proposals for South Shirley as 41% of new allocations in area is iniquitous and disproportionate and should be shared more evenly, additional homes would have detrimental effect on already congested roads especially at peak, school start/finish times and weekends, and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport.
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q15/11	Of all the site in and around Shirley, this is the one that I consider to be a good location. It is an existing brownfield site and has good transport connectivity.
Mr Michael Hunter [3086]			Q15/11	We would not object to development of the land north of the Miller and Carter, as there would still be some green belt protecting the village on that side.
Mr Neale [4086]			Q15/11	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair, as will exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, and local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed.
Mr Neill Jongman [3118]			Q15/11	Allocation 11, we understand the need to develop on this allocation - but we wish to object to the high intensity of the proposal
Mr Paul Bowkett [4707]			Q15/11	Object to housing sites in and around Shirley as concerned that the proposals do not take account of the impact of additional traffic on already overcrowded roads, and pressures on local and wider medical services and schools.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the coalescence of settlements and have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing communities and infrastructure as well as the Green Belt and landscape.</p> <p>No evidence for accepting loss of employment on this site. Capacity is over ambitious.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed mixed use and housing development of this site is questionable. There is consequently a need to identify alternative sites to accommodate the potential shortfall arising from proposed Allocation 11.</p>
Mr Stephen Carter [2941]			Q15/11	<p>Objection to Site 11.</p> <p>Schools already oversubscribed, how to accommodate 2500 new households?</p> <p>Dog Kennel Lane is either a standstill or a race track, exceeding speed limit of 40mph. Particularly congested at rush hour including surrounding roads. Traffic makes crossing roads difficult for pedestrians, especially Tanworth Lane towards Cheswick Green. Traffic on Tanworth Lane already increased since Mount Dairy Farm development.</p> <p>Previous correspondence with Council's Highways team about highway safety concerns.</p> <p>Privacy will be adversely affected.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>Overconcentration of development south of Shirley.</p> <p>SHELAA - ref. 124 is a Category 2 site. Report observes that housing would result in loss of existing employment land uses on site, which needs to be found acceptable in planning terms. We have found no up-to-date evidence to substantiate this. Estimates capacity as 226 dwellings only.</p> <p>Unlikely that 400 dwellings can come forward without prejudice to existing uses.</p>
Mrs Alison McWilliam [3726]			Q15/11	favours brownfield sites such as TRW
Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>2550 homes is large scale of development proposed for Shirley.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Overflow of vehicles from Shirley station car park onto neighbouring estates.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Health services under pressure.</p> <p>Parkgate development resulted in loss of part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Development in Shirley will not benefit HS2.</p>
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q15/11	Site 11 (TRW) I have no objections with.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q15/11	The impact of additional congestion on the local roads from the proposed new housing sites needs to be assessed. The internal roads within Dickens Heath are already experiencing congestion during peak hours in the morning and do not have the capacity to accommodate additional traffic from the proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley. Proposed sites 12 and 11 would also worsen the existing congestion and cause traffic to back up into Dickens Heath.
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]			Q15/11	Increased housing would not sustain the attractiveness of the area or existing properties; Increased traffic would not assist tackling climate change; Increased traffic would reduce accessibility; Increased population would add pressure on local services; Increased flooding; New housing in Shirley area will not benefit HS2;
MRS REBECCA NICHOLLS [3789]			Q15/11	Object to housing Site 11 as inappropriate location for growth better close to HS2 Interchange and on brownfield land, area has already taken significant development with Dickens Heath, will have significant negative effect on residents, wildlife, trees and greenery, will increase volume, noise and danger of traffic on Haslucks Green Road in area subject to speeding, accidents, road rage incidents, additional people unlikely to walk to station due to poor quality pavements and increased parking, results in loss of countryside and rural walking areas, will increase pressure on overburdened schools and medical services, and will adversely affect property values.
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q15/11	Object to amount of development focussed on South Shirley as traffic congestion already extremely bad at peak times with traffic from Dickens Heath, will be compounded by extra housing and employment on Site 11 and A34/M42 already suffering gridlock, will create extra pollution increasing health problems such as asthma, and poorly located and inconvenient for train travel without using car to get to stations, where parking already oversubscribed.
N T Clayson [4147]			Q15/11	Object to concentration of 2550 houses in close proximity to South Shirley as unfair and should be distributed across Borough, with wider green belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath retained.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nigel Barney [4583]			Q15/11	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will change character of area.</p> <p>Alternative sites not been explored before release of Green Belt.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 as too far away.</p> <p>High levels of existing congestion on local roads.</p> <p>Public transport not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Schools and doctors oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded and Heartlands a long distance.</p> <p>Houses will not be affordable for young people.</p> <p>Sites 11, 12 and 13 in tight area will be disastrous.</p>
Nigel Collett [4119]			Q15/11	<p>Object to housing proposed for South Shirley, as development on this scale will cause the already massively congested roads in the area to become gridlocked, local rail stations do not have capacity for the extra demands with insufficient parking at Whitlocks End, Shirley and Earlswood at present, insufficient local infrastructure with lack of school places and medical facilities, will destroy local wildlife, and there are many more suitable alternatives including brownfield sites to the east and north closer the HS2 interchange.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>Overconcentration of development south of Shirley.</p> <p>SHELAA - ref. 124 is a Category 2 site. Report observes that housing would result in loss of existing employment land uses on site, which needs to be found acceptable in planning terms. We have found no up-to-date evidence to substantiate this. Estimates capacity as 226 dwellings only.</p> <p>Unlikely that 400 dwellings can come forward without prejudice to existing uses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Balsom [4041]			Q15/11	<p>Any building work would cripple the road network around here which is already busy at peak times down Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road during school run and work rush hour times.</p> <p>Also green belt land was one of the reason we moved here so to see fields carved up for housing and having the potential for being overlooked and also security issues is very worrying. There is also significant wildlife there and this would affect that.</p>
Paul R Kimberley [4722]			Q15/11	<p>Object to housing proposals in Shirley due to loss of green belt and recreational countryside, and will exacerbate already ridiculous traffic congestion in Bills Lane and Tanworth Lane.</p>
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q15/11	<p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Impact of increased traffic.</p>
Phillip Shakles [3440]			Q15/11	<p>The roads aren't much more than lanes in some parts, with narrow footpaths. Pedestrians have to step into the road to pass each other. The roads are heavily used at peak times and there has been several bad accidents in the area.</p> <p>The area is being over developed by property developers who will cram as many houses as they can into the area and Solihull Council who see green fields as £ signs.</p> <p>Will schools, doctors, hospitals and other services & amenities that are stretched now be able to cope? Are there Plans to improve these services and facilities?</p>
R Reed [3682]			Q15/11	<p>Object to housing sites 11, 12 and 13 as a disproportionate number of the Borough's housing requirement are targeted on the South Shirley area, development will destroy valuable green spaces which provide for healthy exercise and mental well being, the areas proposed provide a green buffer between South Shirley and Dickens Heath and development will destroy the distinctiveness of individual communities, development will increase traffic significantly on country roads and loss of wildlife habitats.</p>
R W & J M Harbach [4705]			Q15/11	<p>Object to the unfair distribution of proposed new housing with 41% in South Shirley area, which should be spread evenly across the whole of Solihull to allow amenities, schools and medical services to grow and necessary road improvements, and developments will exacerbate traffic congestion already increased with Dickens Heath development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rachel Critcher [4058]			Q15/11	Object to new housing sites in Shirley as there is inadequate infrastructure, with the roads in the area, especially Haslucks Green Road gridlocked for much of the day, medical practices at breaking point with delays in appointments, and schools oversubscribed and children having to travel further from home. Should use brownfield rather than green field sites or ensure infrastructure is right before any development.
Raymond Evason [4229]			Q15/11	- shocked, and very worried about the sheer scale of the proposed building of over 2,500 houses between Dickens Heath, and Majors Green - semi rural aspect of the area will be turned into a town - increase in traffic, pollution, and noise
Richard & Ruth Wise [4501]			Q15/11	Object to amount of housing proposed in South Shirley which involves massive overdevelopment that is disproportionate and will result in loss of breathing space and qualities that make Solihull a desirable place to live.
Richard Bailey [4095]			Q15/11	Object to housing Site 11 as overall proposals for South Shirley amounting to 41% of housing allocations are disproportionate and out of step with demands for HS2 development in NE of Borough, threaten to overwhelm current road, transport, schools and medical services infrastructure, being on top of current developments at Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and BVP, will impact on local residential roads that cannot sustain significant increases in commuter traffic and are already rat runs and will require significant increase in local public transport, educational and medical services.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/11	Loss of one of the few remaining modern employment sites so close to Shirley. Retaining and/or redeveloping it as an employment site would offer continued opportunities for employment for those occupying the new houses proposed off Dog Kennel Lane and the South of Shirley site, rather than removing those employment opportunities altogether.
Richard Cowie [4276]			Q15/11	Object to the concentration of new housing around south Shirley and unfair distribution across the Borough compared with areas such as Meriden and Dorridge, as Dickens Heath contributes to traffic congestion and impacts on wider area especially around Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane at peak times, highway infrastructure inadequate and will need reviewing, and medical services already oversubscribed and will need improvement. Would not object if proposals reduced by removing Site 13 from Plan.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Hopcraft [3653]			Q15/11	Site 11, with Site 12, is fair and reasonable amount of new homes for this part of Shirley and is not on Green Belt land.
Robert Stafford [4398]			Q15/11	<p>Site 11 Objection.</p> <p>41% of new development in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair. Consider impacts on local community.</p> <p>Object to Solihull taking 2000 homes from Birmingham's housing requirement.</p> <p>Four allocations (4,11,12,13) will have detrimental impact on already congested roads.</p> <p>Impact on schools, GPs and other local services.</p> <p>Solihull hospital and Heartlands already under pressure.</p> <p>High density housing not in-keeping with surrounding areas.</p>
Robin Hill [4621]			Q15/11	, I can't see how the scheme is supposed to work sustainably without understanding the plan for additional services and roads.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/11	<p>Identified as an employment site allocation in the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and again in the Draft Plan 2016 but caveated in respect of a potential mixed use site in the next iteration of the Plan following the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>Considerable doubt therefore exists over the housing numbers identified for this site as well as the potential conflict with employment policy P3.</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/11	<p>Identified as an employment site allocation in the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and again in the Draft Plan 2016 but caveated in respect of a potential mixed use site in the next iteration of the Plan following the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>Considerable doubt therefore exists over the housing numbers identified for this site as well as the potential conflict with employment policy P3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q15/11	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Added pressure on infrastructure: schools, medical and social support, transport.</p> <p>Reduction in quality of life.</p> <p>Development won't benefit HS2.</p>
S Ham [4126]			Q15/11	<p>Whilst the need for more housing is recognised, object to the level of new housing proposed for South Shirley as 41% of Borough total is extremely unfair and should be reviewed, is shocking on top of significant development already allowed at Dickens Heath and elsewhere, local schools and medical services are already at breaking point and extra housing will put more pressure on infrastructure, and will exacerbate major transport problems on local roads during peak times.</p>
Sandra & Andrew Campbell [4494]			Q15/11	<p>Object to huge scale of housing growth proposed for 4 sites in South Shirley, which will have negative effect on community, result in loss of green space, and have detrimental impact on local roads, schools and medical services.</p>
Sarah Evans [3893]			Q15/11	<p>site 11 objection.</p> <p>Objection to building on Green Belt (sic).</p> <p>Heavily congested area.</p> <p>A large number of SMBC employees occupy the ground floor of one of the office spaces at 3, The Green. Are they aware of this project?</p> <p>lit will have an effect on them getting into work.</p>
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/11	<p>Object to proposed 41% growth for Shirley South that is disproportionate and unfair, more appropriate alternatives yet to be considered including those near infrastructure improvements such as UKC/HS2, area suffers from severe congestion, and housing will be catastrophic and increase rat running, local rail stations are too small and have inadequate parking, schools and medical facilities at capacity, and unlikely to meet need for smaller homes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sheryl Chandler [4179]			Q15/11	Support Shirley Heath Objection as 41% of growth in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair and will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, should not take Birmingham requirement, growth should be focussed on infrastructure improvements such as HS2/NEC, will exacerbate congestion on Stratford Road and surrounding routes, increase rat running, damage to Blackford Road and speeding made worse by Dickens Heath traffic, inadequate transport/school/medical infrastructure, and development unlikely to meet affordable housing need.
Shirley & Peter Hansen [4690]			Q15/11	The present infrastructure is inadequate to support the huge impact of the proposed housing on south west Shirley. GP surgeries and education provision is already over-subscribed. Question where the access points to the sites will be and the highway changes involved. Traffic is already increasing at peak times and can be hazardous for pedestrians. The existing roads cannot cope and this will be exacerbated.
Simon Heath [3403]			Q15/11	lists several reasons why development should not happen on this site. these include capacity of existing roads, loss of open space and impact of existing infrastructure.
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/11	Concentration of 2550 homes in this area is excessive.
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/11	Concentration of 2550 homes in this area is excessive.
Sonia Woodbridge Oliver [4500]			Q15/11	Object to amount of new housing proposed for South Shirley as area already suffers from growing congestion and concerned that pressures of thousands and new homes on local services, such as schools and medical services not taken into consideration, will result in loss of sports pitches and removal of recreational amenities and have impact on existing residents future.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/11	<p>Identified as an employment site allocation in the Solihull Local Plan 2013 and again in the Draft Plan 2016 but caveated in respect of a potential mixed use site in the next iteration of the Plan following the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>Considerable doubt therefore exists over the housing numbers identified for this site as well as the potential conflict with employment policy P3.</p>
Susan & Paul Knight [4235]			Q15/11	<p>Objection to Site 11.</p> <p>Proposed development for Shirley South is ca. 30% of the total 6150 dwellings proposed in Solihull by 2033.</p> <p>Unfair distribution in one square mile of 68.8 square miles of the Borough.</p> <p>Added to new proposed care home by Sans Souci, Tanworth Lane.</p> <p>Why such a targeted area?</p> <p>Impact on local community.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>Overconcentration of development south of Shirley.</p> <p>SHELAA - ref. 124 is a Category 2 site. Report observes that housing would result in loss of existing employment land uses on site, which needs to be found acceptable in planning terms. We have found no up-to-date evidence to substantiate this. Estimates capacity as 226 dwellings only.</p> <p>Unlikely that 400 dwellings can come forward without prejudice to existing uses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/11	<p>Overconcentration of development south of Shirley.</p> <p>SHELAA - ref. 124 is a Category 2 site. Report observes that housing would result in loss of existing employment land uses on site, which needs to be found acceptable in planning terms. We have found no up-to-date evidence to substantiate this. Estimates capacity as 226 dwellings only.</p> <p>Unlikely that 400 dwellings can come forward without prejudice to existing uses.</p>
Tina Ferran [4098]			Q15/11	<p>Object to housing Site 11 as part of overall development of 4 sites in South Shirley as unsuitable for development, will have massive negative impact on community, destroy green space enjoyed by community, add to pressure on already congested roads within locality, and schools and medical services will be unable to cope with population increase.</p>
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15/11	<p>Active businesses should be excluded from red line site.</p> <p>Our calculations demonstrate ca. 8.8ha of developable land, or 253 dwellings at 36dph and 80% NDA.</p> <p>Clarification required whether uplift is due to high density apartments/Extra Care etc.</p> <p>Unclear how Policy P3 and P5 work in relation to this site. Current allocation would conflict with Policy P3 as clarification required on use, type and amount on the site.</p> <p>Draft allocation does not reflect uses in Call for Sites form.</p>
V Healey Gwilliam [4283]			Q15/11	<p>South Shirley area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.</p>
Viv Smith [4670]			Q15/11	<p>Object as disproportionate amount of housing proposed in Blythe ward and will place excessive burden on small area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Vivienne & Maurice Hadley [4745]			Q15/11	<p>Overdevelopment in Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Government have reconfirmed their commitment to Green Belt.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion, e.g. Stratford Road.</p> <p>Remember 'Urbs in Rure' motto.</p>
Question 15/12 Land South of Dog Kennel Lane				
A & V Blake [4304]			Q15/12	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Should be fairer distribution of housing.</p> <p>Recent development in Cheswick Green and Dickens Heath already added to congestion.</p> <p>Proposed development of 2550 houses will increase strain on road infrastructure, including air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of green space for community benefit and health.</p> <p>Loss of green corridor to canal and countryside.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Retain Green Belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
A J Edgeworth [4106]			Q15/12	Object to proposals for 2,500 new houses in South Shirley as area already suffers from loss of green belt and extra congestion from Dickens Heath, will result in additional pollution from vehicles when we should be reducing harm to health, road infrastructure in area will be unable to cope with extra traffic, significant development is already taking place in Earlswood area, and there must be brownfield and green field sites elsewhere that can take a share.
Adrian Cox [4295]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Central Government targets are set on housebuilding which results in erosion of Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Roads around Dog Kennel Lane and Blackford Road are already over contested (sic) by traffic accessing Dickens Heath village.</p> <p>Complete disregard of speed bumps on Blackford Road; hazardous to children.</p> <p>Local doctor surgeries are overrun.</p> <p>When Dickens Heath was built it was agreed there should be a Green Belt buffer to keep Shirley and Dickens Heath separate.</p> <p>Green Belt should be protected; plenty of other sites which can be redeveloped.</p>
Alison Robbins [4062]			Q15/12	Object to disproportionate and unfair housing levels in Shirley South, unrelated to major infrastructure improvements such as HS2, whilst local rail stations are unfit for purpose with inadequate parking, will exacerbate major congestion affecting all roads in area including traffic from Dickens Heath, schools and medical practices are already at capacity requiring more green field land for expansion, loss of amenity and wildlife habitat prone to flooding. Understand that numerous other options have not been explored and question why these are considered unsuitable.
Andrea Hopcraft [3651]			Q15/12	A reasonable compromise would be to leave green belt land in allocation 13 untouched and proceed with the housing on allocations 11 and 12.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew Beadsworth [4063]			Q15/12	Object to housing development in Shirley, as area is taking an unfair proportion compared with elsewhere in Borough, will exacerbate congestion on already busy roads, public transport, infrastructure, schools and medical facilities will be adversely affected, health and well being will be impacted with loss of green space for leisure and recreation on top of loss of land at Shirley Park, will increase urban sprawl towards Dickens Heath, whilst development of brownfield sites or more equitable spread across Borough is less considered.
Barry & Jenny Jennings [4300]			Q15/12	<p>Site 4, 11, 12 and 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath and Shirley would merge into one huge suburb, which wasn't the vision for Dickens Heath Village.</p> <p>Considerable development already threatening gaps between Dickens Heath, Wythall and Earlswood.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development increased traffic on Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Haslucks Green Road.</p> <p>Roads could not cope with more traffic.</p> <p>Need to keep green spaces for wellbeing.</p> <p>Look for brownfield sites.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>There is no defensible Green Belt Boundary. It represents a significant extension to Shirley's urban area reducing the green belt gap between the settlements of Shirley, Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath, Majors Green and Whitlock's End.</p> <p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the coalescence of settlements and have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing communities and infrastructure as well as the Green Belt and landscape.</p>
Bradley Healey Gwilliam [4286]			Q15/12	<p>South Shirley area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.</p>
Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]			Q15/12	<p>Objection to Site 12.</p> <p>Concerns about coalescence with settlements such as Majors Green close to Bromsgrove/Solihull boundary; and undermining Green Belt functions contrary to NPPF.</p>
C A Frost [4006]			Q15/12	<p>Already a massive problem with traffic congestion in the local area. If you add a further concern about the capacity of the local NHS system and the underfunding of schools in the area, then the proposal to build over 2500 new homes seems to be totally absurd.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the national requirement for new homes, it is wrong to blindly pursue the delivery of numbers and ignore the quality of life of existing and new residents.</p> <p>Hope that a more moderate approach can be found which will avoid turning Shirley into a new town on the edge of Solihull.</p>
Carol Edgeworth [4101]			Q15/12	<p>Whilst new housing is very much needed, object to 2550 homes in 4 sites so close together as local schools, medical services and roads will be unable to cope and the green belt will be a concrete jungle when there are brownfield sites that should be used first.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Carolyn Locke [4096]			Q15/12	Object to housing Site 12 as part of overall 41% of housing allocations in South Shirley as unfair and should be spread more fairly across Borough, will add to already congested roads causing higher levels of pollution implicated in various chronic conditions, increase pressure on struggling medical services, require significant investment in new schools and impact on catchments, increased number of residents travelling long distances to Waste & Recycling Centre, impact on natural environment, wildlife and flooding, on top of developments already taking place will undermine attractiveness, health and well-being of the area.
Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]			Q15/12	<p>Objections to the scale of proposed development on this site, grounds for objecting include unknown impact of existing developments and outline planning permissions granted for new developments, loss of green belt and local landscape, urban sprawl, increased congestion and inability of existing infrastructure to cope with increased road usage.</p> <p>No defensible southern boundary, potentially leaving open land to south for future development.</p> <p>Flooding to be an issue</p>
Chris Isaacs [4450]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>2500 houses in Shirley area is disproportionate.</p> <p>Agree some housing should be here, but not to this degree.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues will be exacerbated, e.g. Stratford Road congestion.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Consider golf courses for development.</p>
Christina Lawlor [4252]			Q15/12	No objection to the building of homes along Dog Kennel Lane.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Christopher Taylor [4473]			Q15/12	Object to scale of growth proposed for South Shirley on top of recent supermarket and retail park developments which is unfair, involves loss of so much green belt land in one area when other areas unaffected, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A34 and local roads, there is inadequate public transport to carry increased population or parking provision at local stations and inadequate provision for school places and is clearly not in best interests of local residents.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Reference 1007, classified as Category 2. Recognises that development of larger site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Cheswick Green. Less than 50% of site is considered contaminated land/landfill. 10-25% of site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15/12	This is an extensive site and whilst not used to the same extent by the community as site 13, it still plays an important function. Light Hall Farm is a building of historic significance to the area. This area is still used regularly by walkers and is important to the residents of Cranmore
Councillor M Allen [2632]			Q15/12	Impact on traffic Congestion and air quality on A34 and on surrounding local roads. Impact on Green Belt.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/12	This is an extensive site and whilst not used to the same extent by the community as site 13, it still plays an important function. Light Hall Farm is a building of historic significance to the area. This area is still used regularly by walkers and is important to the residents of Cranmore.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/12	Should be developed along with Site 11, with perimeter road further south, restricting overall area to 30-35ha at 55 dph providing up to 1900 dwellings.
Cpt D A Benton [4097]			Q15/12	Object to housing Site 12 as part of horrendous proposals for 2550 houses in South Shirley, which will exacerbate traffic already overloaded by Dickens Heath development, local shops, medical services, schools and parking infrastructure will be inadequate to support additional population, developments will result in loss of open space, countryside and peace and fresh air. Only benefit is extra employment and rates income, Council should make case to Government that enough development already and find more suitable areas.
D Wilkinson [4001]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection - together with allocations 4, 11 & 13 there is an over-allocation of proposed houses in a small area of the borough, on mainly on precious green space.</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with this extra demand to the local area. Will exacerbate existing traffic problems, increase pollution and impact on community infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p> <p>This scheme adds little value to the HS2 access plans and will make the M42 unbearable and more like London's M25.</p> <p>Request that the plans be considerably scaled back to a sensible build programme.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Paddock [3988]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 (general South of Shirley) Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Need to exhaust alternatives before building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p>
David Parkinson [4562]			Q15/12	<p>Object to proposals for an additional 2550 houses in Shirley area as will have detrimental impact on area through loss of green area/countryside, highway infrastructure is already struggling to cope with current traffic levels especially during peak times, lack of school places to meet expected demand never mind growth which will lead to larger classes and poorer education, and medical and police services at capacity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Smith [4043]			Q15/12	<p>The needs and requirements of existing residents must be taken into consideration regarding health, quality of life and the effect on local infrastructure.</p> <p>A mass programme such as proposed on the Green Belt surrounding south Shirley will have a massive destructive effect on all the residents living within a huge radius.</p> <p>Additional cars will add to existing problematic congestion.</p> <p>Additional school and nursery places and health facilities will be required.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt between South Shirley and Dickens Heath that will see the 2 areas merging without open spaces.</p>
Debbie Stokes [4255]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing in South Shirley as concentration of 41% of new housing in one small area is unfair, 2,500 plus houses will exacerbate severe traffic congestion on A34, Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road, the impact will have a severe detrimental affect on local schools, medical services and transport, and loss of recreational facilities used by many local children.</p>
Earlswood & Forshaw Heath Residents Association (Jennifer Buckley) [4439]			Q15/12	<p>Object to Site 4.</p> <p>Contrary to Government manifesto 2015 on protecting Green Belt and countryside.</p> <p>No evidence of cross-boundary consultation or discussion as prescribed by the Localism Act.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and quality of life of residents in Earlswood & Forshaw Heath not been taken into account.</p> <p>Developments by SMBC in last 20 years had dramatic impact on rural parish and none for the better.</p> <p>No recompense to Stratford District Council for impacts of these developments, e.g. traffic on roads.</p> <p>SDC should be compensated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Edward Fraser [4138]			Q15/12	Object to housing Site 12 as totally unacceptable as will deplete the green belt with its intrinsic benefits, cause major traffic problems and exacerbate existing unacceptable delays, overload medical services and impact on local schools. Whilst it is recognised that housing is required, Shirley has more than its fair share and is not the place for growth associated with HS2.
Elizabeth Padgett [4610]			Q15/12	Site 12 Objection on the grounds that: - traffic is already dire - Green belt land and wildlife are more important to people than houses which they cannot afford - Traffic pollution is not good for anyone's health or safety
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q15/12	Object to amount of land proposed for development in Shirley, as too much on green belt, the area south of Stratford Road is already congested and will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic, there are insufficient transport connections such as railway links, and loss of green areas will reduce Shirley's image from the lovely 'town in the country' it always was.
Elizabeth Yates [3274]			Q15/12	If development is required, I can agree reluctantly with the Lighthall Farm site, at least the site would have access to the Stratford Road, being adjacent to it.
Geoff Hickman [3515]			Q15/12	Objection to Site 12.
Graham Roberts [4108]			Q15/12	Object to concentration of housing around Shirley/Cheswick Green/BVP, instead of sharing across Borough, which will create problems of lack of medical services, overloaded roads not fit for increasing traffic, and result in loss of green belt contrary to Government policy.
Gurmeash Kaur [4015]			Q15/12	Not happy with the housing plans in Shirley, especially around the green belt areas. I feel the green areas should be preserved. Furthermore this housing expansion will have a detrimental impact on schooling and GP surgeries, where problems with waiting lists exist.
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/12	Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Howard Maine [4172]			Q15/12	Object to development of green belt to provide 2,250 additional houses around South Shirley as will have detrimental impact on transport problems, schools and already stretched hospitals, and exacerbate already frightening volume of traffic on A34 and surrounding local roads.
J D Green [3195]			Q15/12	objection site 12
J Hall [4109]			Q15/12	Object to the level of housing proposed for the Shirley area, as the densities are too high, the roads and lanes will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic generated, concern that there will be insufficient schools and medical services, and loss of green fields for enjoyment.
Jacqueline Harris [4320]			Q15/12	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>41% of development in area around Shirley is disproportionate.</p> <p>Should be spread more fairly across Borough.</p> <p>Heavy congestion on Stratford Road, M42 and surrounding roads will get worse.</p> <p>Poor public transport links.</p> <p>More pollution.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at railway stations.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Local schools, nurseries, doctor surgeries and hospital already unable to cope. Will need new school and surgery.</p> <p>Feels Shirley is forgotten part of Solihull.</p> <p>Look for options with better transport links and more direct access to M42 and A34.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jane & Alan Horton [4443]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Development will join Dickens Heath, Majors Green, Tidbury Green and Shirley.</p> <p>Will be one giant housing estate.</p> <p>Traffic volume on Haslucks Green Road is major hazard.</p>
Jane Mills [4134]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing in South Shirley as over 2,500 houses or 41% of proposed allocations is unfair and will have negative affect on local community through loss of precious green belt, increased traffic on all local roads, Shirley station car park is currently inadequate let alone for a huge increase in users, increased noise, pollution and rat running on local roads across Shirley, construction traffic will be intrusive and unwelcome, and local schools and medical services unlikely to have capacity for increase in population.</p>
Janet Blair [3605]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing site 12 due to impact of increased traffic on Blackford Road, which is already inadequate, has suffered from closures for repairs and has a weight restriction which is not enforced.</p>
Janett Reynolds [4664]			Q15/12	<p>Objects to building of 2,550 new houses in South Shirley area which amounts to 41% of total allocations and is grossly unfair, will have serious impact on already congested roads, will affect local schools and medical services, result in loss of 6 sports and recreational grounds and high density housing will lead to disputes over parking, noise and other social issues through lack of space.</p>
Jen Hickman [3522]			Q15/12	<p>Objection to Site 12.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jennifer Archer [4016]			Q15/12	<p>Road network cannot cope with existing traffic.</p> <p>Cycling is hazardous and allocations are not on established public transport routes.</p> <p>Employment opportunities in Shirley would not be sufficient to meet increased population.</p> <p>Parking is at capacity at local railway stations. More parking will impact on the water table.</p> <p>Will reduce the Green Belt and narrow the gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath. Green Belt does not need to be built on. More convenient locations with better road links are required.</p>
Joanne Hale [4400]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Understand the need for housing.</p> <p>2550 houses in such a small congested area is excessive.</p> <p>Consider highways impact.</p> <p>Already lost part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Loss of countryside, e.g. in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Not a good location to get to HS2.</p> <p>Loss of 'Urbs in rure'.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Allocations 4, 11, 12, 13 will all have a very large impact on the area with respect to transport, schooling and healthcare facilities such as GPs in what is an already congested and high density of dwellings area.</p> <p>Not well served by public transport.</p> <p>Would not benefit from HS2.</p> <p>Development should be more evenly spread across the Borough.</p>
John & Julie Russell [4238]			Q15/12	<p>Object to proposal to locate 41% of proposed houses in South Shirley as inordinate amount compared with elsewhere in Borough, will destroy green field sites, extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion on A34 and surrounding roads especially at peak times, demand for places at oversubscribed schools, demands on already crowded local rail services and inadequate parking, construction will cause extra traffic/noise/disruption, and will degrade the area with loss of character that makes it attractive.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Dancer [4303]			Q15/12	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Recognise urgent need for housing.</p> <p>41% development in Shirley/Dickens Heath is disproportionate.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of Green Belt land; contrary to central government policy.</p> <p>Lots of brownfield land available in Birmingham.</p> <p>Lots of opportunity elsewhere for infilling.</p> <p>DLP not consider impacts on local infrastructure, including roads, parking, congestion, hospitals.</p> <p>3000+ cars will increase air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of trees to absorb pollution.</p> <p>Reducing recreational and public amenity space.</p> <p>Loss of 9 sports pitches.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Junctions 4 to 6 of M42 already at capacity.</p>
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/12	<p>Open countryside with no clear, definitive, robust Green Belt boundaries being identifiable, as required by NPPF.</p> <p>With no clear and firm definitive green belt boundary evident on the allocation plan between Dog Kennel Lane and Cheswick Green it is difficult to assess the level of</p> <p>housing achievable on this site, a site which could lead to coalescence with Cheswick Green.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Robbins [4272]			Q15/12	Object to proposed 41% growth for Shirley South that is disproportionate and unacceptable, more appropriate alternatives yet to be considered including those near infrastructure improvements such as UKC/HS2, area suffers from severe congestion, and housing will compound issue and increase rat running, local rail stations are too small and have inadequate parking, unlikely to meet need for smaller homes, and should look at alternative of smaller sites across Borough.
Julie Betts [3173]			Q15/12	Object to these developments, which will mean the whole of Shirley South being engulfed with further housing instead of lovely countryside, will make existing traffic congestion and noise much worse, will result in loss of recreational green space, and for which there is inadequate school places or opportunities for expansion.
Julie Jones [3659]			Q15/12	Object to housing sites in Shirley as unfair that 41% of new houses are proposed on Green Belt land adjacent to Shirley when other areas are more suitable, the developments will be on top of the huge increase in new homes in recent years and local infrastructure, including roads such as Bills Lane, schools and medical facilities will be unable to cope, the area is overdeveloped and very busy so the adjacent Green Belt is vital in bringing many benefits to the area.
K J Hewitt [4733]			Q15/12	Object to housing proposals for Shirley as infrastructure of area will not allow this intensity of development and needs more consideration, most of new residents will need to use Blackford Road, which is already seriously affected by traffic from Dickens Heath and retail park and has been closed on a number of occasions for repairs due to damage to sewers, and plans are likely to change so that improvements may not end of being delivered.
K Neale [4085]			Q15/12	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair, as will exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed, and contrary to national policy protecting green belt as other options for growth have not been explored or investigated.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kay Wilkes [4000]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 (general South of Shirley) Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Need to exhaust alternatives before building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p>
Kim Cowie [4399]			Q15/12	Possibly agree with Site 12, if Site 13 omitted.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/12	Whilst in a sustainable location there will be impact on Green Belt and coalescence between Shirley and Dickens Heath.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Reference 1007, classified as Category 2. Recognises that development of larger site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Cheswick Green. Less than 50% of site is considered contaminated land/landfill. 10-25% of site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>
Lauren Bosworth [3998]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Detrimental to local community and way of life.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Increase in crime rate in Dickens Heath since new development been finished.</p> <p>HS2 already destroying other parts of local countryside.</p> <p>Council object to new developments in the Green Belt, why treat one house different from over 2000?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Margaret Chadderton [4743]			Q15/12	<p>Unfair that so many houses will be in the Shirley area.</p> <p>Will only exacerbate existing problems with traffic.</p> <p>Pressure on schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Other areas of Solihull should take their fair share.</p>
Margaret Lewis [4611]			Q15/12	<p>Please take into account that all the housing you propose to put in our local community, will have a detrimental impact on our schools and doctors, it will create awfull transport problems along haslucks green rd. Bills lane Burman rd. Tamworth lane and Blackford rd.</p>
Marianne Fogarty [4395]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green belt.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of housing, 41%, of new development in Shirley South area.</p> <p>Traffic increased significantly since last development in Dickens Heath were built out.</p>
Marie Kilgallen [4142]			Q15/12	<p>The proposals for South Shirley will require new schools and medical facilities and will impact on recreation areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Mark Davies [4459]</p>			<p>Q15/12</p>	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>South of Shirley been allocated 2500+ homes; 41% of the Borough's allocation.</p> <p>Inconsistent with the spatial strategy and DLP policies.</p> <p>Fails to take into account impact on local services, infrastructure and the local community.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Lack of evidence that suitable alternatives been explored.</p> <p>Impact on existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools and GPs.</p> <p>Road and rail network at or near capacity. Will be unable to access A34 or M42.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 development.</p>
<p>Matt Stapleton [4281]</p>			<p>Q15/12</p>	<p>Object to concentration of 2500 new homes in South Shirley area as iniquitous and disproportionate and should be more evenly allocated across Borough, would have a huge detrimental effect on already congested roads in area and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michelle Bourke [3952]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>Stratford Road near Audi Garage already very congested.</p> <p>Shirley area already very built up.</p> <p>Very concerned about impact of extra traffic on Shirley.</p>
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/12	<p>Open countryside with no clear, definitive, robust Green Belt boundaries being identifiable, as required by NPPF.</p> <p>With no clear and firm definitive green belt boundary evident on the allocation plan between Dog Kennel Lane and Cheswick Green it is difficult to assess the level of housing achievable on this site, a site which could lead to coalescence with Cheswick Green.</p>
Mr & Mrs Vernon & Phyllis Brookes [3181]			Q15/12	<p>Object to site as the amount of housing in the vicinity has almost doubled already including loss of some green space, and whilst there is a need for housing, locating 41% of the housing proposed in Shirley is much too high, will exacerbate already horrendous traffic, take away Green Belt land and result in loss of an important recreational area on the edge of the countryside.</p>
Mr & Mrs D & L Davies [3260]			Q15/12	<p>Have a number of concerns about the impact of the development on existing road infrastructure and drainage.</p>
Mr & Mrs Simons [4614]			Q15/12	<p>Congestion and Traffic are being given as the main reasons for objecting to development in Shirley.</p>
Mr & Mrs Woollard [4099]			Q15/12	<p>Object to proposals for housing Site 12 as results in loss of green belt land forever, 41% of housing allocation in one area is unfair, negative impact on community through loss of green space and resultant well-being, increased transport problems on already overcrowded roads, overburdening of schools and medical services, and will be poorly located in relation to HS2 interchange compared with areas in east and north of Borough avoiding congested A34 and M42. Proposals should be cancelled or severely scaled back.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr A Jeffs [4708]			Q15/12	Object to housing in Dickens Heath/Shirley as will require vast amounts of expenditure on improving existing infrastructure to prevent an environmental disaster, with traffic congestion on unsuitable roads already from overdevelopment of Dickens Heath and restrictive bridges, flooding affecting land and roads, loss of green space. Developers should be required to build cycle paths on roads and Stratford canal and new parkland as well as improving roads and drainage.
Mr Barrie Stanyer [3641]			Q15/12	Object to housing proposals for South Shirley as 41% of new allocations in area is iniquitous and disproportionate and should be shared more evenly, additional homes would have detrimental effect on already congested roads especially at peak, school start/finish times and weekends, and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport.
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q15/12	Light Hall Farm is a building of historic significance to the area and should be preserved in any development. Extensive site. Whilst not used to same extent by local community as Site 13, it still plays an important function.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q15/12	Objection to Site 12. Disproportionate concentration of housing South of Shirley. Threatens the wellbeing of the existing community through a loss of amenity and a significant strain on the existing infrastructure. Loss of Green Belt. Parcels in this area perform highly against purpose A of Green Belt function. Risk of coalescence and loss of settlements' character.
Mr Mark Howard [3788]			Q15/12	Object to housing site 12 as there will be a significant increase in traffic on busy roads that are extremely congested during peak periods leading to increased pollution and damage to roads already blighted by potholes, whilst the loss of green space and resultant impact on wildlife habitat will have an adverse effect on the quality of our life in Solihull. It would be nice to see more effort being made to uphold the borough's motto: Urbs in Rure, Town in the Country.
Mr Michael Hunter [3086]			Q15/12	We would not object to development of the land north of the Miller and Carter, as there would still be some green belt protecting the village on that side.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Neale [4086]			Q15/12	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair, as will exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed, and contrary to national policy protecting green belt as other options for growth have not been explored or investigated.
Mr Paul Bowkett [4707]			Q15/12	Object to housing sites in and around Shirley as concerned that the proposals do not take account of the impact of additional traffic on already overcrowded roads, and pressures on local and wider medical services and schools.
Mr Peter Seddon [2409]			Q15/12	This development will considerably reduce the open countryside between Shirley and Dickens Heath. This is contrary to the NPPF which seeks to retain individual communities and to resist coalescence of villages. In para 83 the plan talks about "The network of strong and vibrant communities across the Rural Area will have been sustained with a range of local facilities and services that are readily accessible on foot and by bicycle and that are appropriate to the scale and hierarchy of the settlement" whereas the plan seeks to extend many communities and leave only a small strip of dividing land.
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>There is no defensible Green Belt Boundary. It represents a significant extension to Shirley's urban area reducing the green belt gap between the settlements of Shirley, Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath, Majors Green and Whitlock's End.</p> <p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13</p> <p>represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the</p> <p>coalescence of settlements and adversely impact existing communities and infrastructure as well as landscape character and Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Stephen Carter [2941]			Q15/12	<p>Objection to Site 12.</p> <p>Schools already oversubscribed, how to accommodate 2500 new households?</p> <p>Dog Kennel Lane is either a standstill or a race track, exceeding speed limit of 40mph. Particularly congested at rush hour including surrounding roads. Traffic makes crossing roads difficult for pedestrians, especially Tanworth Lane towards Cheswick Green. Traffic on Tanworth Lane already increased since Mount Dairy Farm development.</p> <p>Previous correspondence with Council's Highways team about highway safety concerns.</p> <p>Privacy will be adversely affected.</p>
Mr Steven Rushton [3211]			Q15/12	<p>Development of green belt land south of Dog Kennel Lane will detract from the valued space and distinction between existing settlements of Shirley, Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. It will also add to existing traffic problems in this area, along with current developments at Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green, unless there are major improvements in the road infrastructure. The site also has some flooding, supports protected species (bats, badgers) and being green belt contributes to the feeling of space and proximity of countryside for the borough; I therefore do not believe this site is suitable for 850 new houses.</p>
Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]			Q15/12	<p>Object to site 12 as green belt, the traffic along Dog Kennel Lane is already high especially during peak hours where it can take at least 15 minutes to travel down towards Tanworth Lane.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Reference 1007, classified as Category 2. Recognises that development of larger site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Cheswick Green. Less than 50% of site is considered contaminated land/landfill. 10-25% of site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>
Mrs Carla Hughes [3228]			Q15/12	<p>There is a disproportionate number of homes allocated to the Shirley site without any clear and considered plans made to support and already strained local infrastructure.</p> <p>There is sufficient land to accommodate more property in North Solihull if ultimately the borough needs to maintain the number of homes. I find it difficult to accept the proportion of properties that Solihull needs to accommodate due to lack of space available in Birmingham. The amount of social housing allocation is also a paramount reason for my objection.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>2550 homes is large scale of development proposed for Shirley.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Overflow of vehicles from Shirley station car park onto neighbouring estates.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Health services under pressure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Parkgate development resulted in loss of part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Development in Shirley will not benefit HS2.</p>
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q15/12	<p>I do not have as strong objections to Site 12 (Light Hall Farm), although a beautiful area and a terrible loss if built on, it is better placed than Site 4 & 13 if Shirley is to have it's fair share of housing.</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q15/12	<p>The impact of additional congestion on the local roads from the proposed new housing sites needs to be assessed. The internal roads within Dickens Heath are already experiencing congestion during peak hours in the morning and do not have the capacity to accommodate additional traffic from the proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley. Proposed sites 12 and 11 would also worsen the existing congestion and cause traffic to back up into Dickens Heath.</p>
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q15/12	<p>Far too many to be built on the green belt in the Shirley and Dickens Heath area. Also taking into account Blythe Valley and the houses already being built in Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green, the house numbers account for at least half are those to be built in Solihull.They should be spread out across the borough.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs M A Highfield [3162]		Q15/12	<p>Proportion allocated to Shirley sites too high, in particular site 13 is well utilised by the local community and important to remain as public access to footpaths and open area to wildlife.</p> <p>Not acceptable to use Solihull green belt areas and sports sites to compensate Birmingham shortfall.</p> <p>Proportionate allocation of social housing inappropriate and will alter to detriment the nature of established housing genre.</p> <p>Inadequate provision available for infrastructure to support increased population and necessitates movement for employment in other areas resulting in higher volume of traffic.</p> <p>Suggest moving higher allocations to North Solihull, Catherine de Barnes, Dorrige, Hockley Heath.</p>
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]		Q15/12	<p>Increased housing would not sustain the attractiveness of the area or existing properties;</p> <p>Increased traffic would not assist tackling climate change;</p> <p>Increased traffic would reduce accessibility;</p> <p>Increased population would add pressure on local services;</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt;</p> <p>Increased flooding;</p> <p>New housing in Shirley area will not benefit HS2;</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
MRS REBECCA NICHOLLS [3789]			Q15/12	Object to housing Site 12 as inappropriate location for growth better close to HS2 Interchange and on brownfield land, area has already taken significant development with Dickens Heath, will have significant negative effect on residents, wildlife, trees and greenery, will increase volume, noise and danger of traffic on Haslucks Green Road in area subject to speeding, accidents, road rage incidents, additional people unlikely to walk to station due to poor quality pavements and increased parking, results in loss of countryside and rural walking areas, will increase pressure on overburdened schools and medical services, and will adversely affect property values.
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q15/12	Object to amount of development focussed on South Shirley as traffic congestion already extremely bad at peak times with traffic from Dickens Heath, will be compounded by extra housing on Site 12, Tanworth Lane junction and A34/M42 already suffering gridlock, will create extra pollution increasing health problems such as asthma, poorly located and inconvenient for train travel without using car to get to stations, where parking already oversubscribed, and likely to be a significant flooding risk.
Mrs Shirley Minal [3604]			Q15/12	Object to housing site 12 as will result in urban area being joined up with Cheswick Green, urban area being further from countryside and devalue property.
Ms Rosemary Allen [3351]			Q15/12	site 12 objection Traffic, Heritage, Wildlife, Urban Sprawl are all given as reasons for why the site should not be taken forward.
N T Clayson [4147]			Q15/12	Object to concentration of 2550 houses in close proximity to South Shirley as unfair and should be distributed across Borough, with wider green belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath retained.
Neville & Sue Walker [4022]			Q15/12	Impact on transport infrastructure in Shirley. Will increase existing traffic congestion and queues. Parking at the railway station is impossible in peak periods. The impact on schools and health services will be seriously affected if these proposals go ahead. This is a further loss of Green Belt land in Shirley. These public open spaces are vital for the area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nigel Barney [4583]			Q15/12	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will change character of area.</p> <p>Alternative sites not been explored before release of Green Belt.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 as too far away.</p> <p>High levels of existing congestion on local roads.</p> <p>Public transport not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Schools and doctors oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded and Heartlands a long distance.</p> <p>Houses will not be affordable for young people.</p> <p>Sites 11, 12 and 13 in tight area will be disastrous.</p>
Nigel Collett [4119]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing proposed for South Shirley, as development on this scale will cause the already massively congested roads in the area to become gridlocked, local rail stations do not have capacity for the extra demands with insufficient parking at Whitlocks End, Shirley and Earlswood at present, insufficient local infrastructure with lack of school places and medical facilities, will destroy many local amenities and recreational areas, including several sports fields, and local wildlife, and there are many more suitable alternatives including brownfield sites to the east and north closer the HS2 interchange.</p>
Norman Hodgetts [4711]			Q15/12	<p>Object to building such a large number of houses in one area. No consideration has been given to the effect on the Green Belt which will be eroded and see gaps between settlements close. Also the roads are at saturation point with the A34 at a standstill at times, leading to increased pollution.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Reference 1007, classified as Category 2. Recognises that development of larger site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Cheswick Green. Less than 50% of site is considered contaminated land/landfill. 10-25% of site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>
Paul Balsom [4041]			Q15/12	<p>Any building work would cripple the road network around here which is already busy at peak times down Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road during school run and work rush hour times.</p> <p>Also green belt land was one of the reason we moved here so to see fields carved up for housing and having the potential for being overlooked and also security issues is very worrying. There is also significant wildlife there and this would affect that.</p>
Paul R Kimberley [4722]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing proposals in Shirley due to loss of green belt and recreational countryside, and will exacerbate already ridiculous traffic congestion in Bills Lane and Tanworth Lane.</p>
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q15/12	<p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Impact of increased traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/12	Whilst in a sustainable location there will be impact on Green Belt and coalescence between Shirley and Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.
Phillip Shakles [3440]			Q15/12	<p>The roads aren't much more than lanes in some parts, with narrow footpaths. Pedestrians have to step into the road to pass each other. The roads are heavily used at peak times and there has been several bad accidents in the area.</p> <p>The area is being over developed by property developers who will cram as many houses as they can into the area and Solihull Council who see green fields as £ signs.</p> <p>Will schools, doctors, hospitals and other services & amenities that are stretched now be able to cope? Are there Plans to improve these services and facilities?</p>
R Reed [3682]			Q15/12	Object to housing sites 11, 12 and 13 as a disproportionate number of the Borough's housing requirement are targeted on the South Shirley area, development will destroy valuable green spaces which provide for healthy exercise and mental well being, the areas proposed provide a green buffer between South Shirley and Dickens Heath and development will destroy the distinctiveness of individual communities, development will increase traffic significantly on country roads and loss of wildlife habitats.
R W & J M Harbach [4705]			Q15/12	Object to the unfair distribution of proposed new housing with 41% in South Shirley area, which should be spread evenly across the whole of Solihull to allow amenities, schools and medical services to grow and necessary road improvements, and developments will exacerbate traffic congestion already increased with Dickens Heath development.
Rachel Critcher [4058]			Q15/12	Object to new housing sites in Shirley as there is inadequate infrastructure, with the roads in the area, especially Haslucks Green Road gridlocked for much of the day, medical practices at breaking point with delays in appointments, and schools oversubscribed and children having to travel further from home. Should use brownfield rather than green field sites or ensure infrastructure is right before any development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Raymond Evason [4229]			Q15/12	<p>- shocked, and very worried about the sheer scale of the proposed building of over 2,500 houses between Dickens Heath, and Majors Green</p> <p>- semi rural aspect of the area will be turned into a town</p> <p>- increase in traffic, pollution, and noise</p>
Richard & Ruth Wise [4501]			Q15/12	Object to amount of housing proposed in South Shirley which involves massive overdevelopment that is disproportionate and will result in loss of breathing space and qualities that make Solihull a desirable place to live.
Richard Bailey [4095]			Q15/12	Object to housing Site 12 as overall proposals for South Shirley amounting to 41% of housing allocations are disproportionate and out of step with demands for HS2 development in NE of Borough, threaten to overwhelm current road, transport, schools and medical services infrastructure, being on top of current developments at Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and BVP, will impact on local residential roads that cannot sustain significant increases in commuter traffic and are already rat runs and will require significant increase in local public transport, educational and medical services.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/12	The release of site 12 should extend over to link to the rather ad hoc and long established development at the head of Creynolds Lane and include a feeder road leading over to Dickens Heath.
Richard Cowie [4276]			Q15/12	Object to the concentration of new housing around south Shirley and unfair distribution across the Borough compared with areas such as Meriden and Dorridge, as Dickens Heath contributes to traffic congestion and impacts on wider area especially around Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane at peak times, highway infrastructure inadequate and will need reviewing, and medical services already oversubscribed and will need improvement. Would not object if proposals reduced by removing Site 13 from Plan.
Robert Hopcraft [3653]			Q15/12	Site 12, with Site 11, is a fair and reasonable amount of new homes for this part of Shirley.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Stafford [4398]			Q15/12	<p>Site 12 Objection.</p> <p>41% of new development in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair. Consider impacts on local community.</p> <p>Object to Solihull taking 2000 homes from Birmingham's housing requirement.</p> <p>Four allocations (4,11,12,13) will have detrimental impact on already congested roads.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Should replace sport facilities.</p> <p>Impact on schools, GPs and other local services.</p> <p>Solihull hospital and Heartlands already under pressure.</p> <p>High density housing not in-keeping with surrounding areas.</p>
Robin Hill [4621]			Q15/12	, I can't see how the scheme is supposed to work sustainably without understanding the plan for additional services and roads.
Roger Lock [4112]			Q15/12	Object to housing Site 12 as part of destruction of green belt land around Shirley, as developments at Parkgate, Powergen, the relocation of Shirley library, Sainsbury and KFC have already made it a less pleasant place to live, and further development will exacerbate traffic on already crowded roads in the area, although traffic surveys are mostly done outside peak periods when the problems are worst.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/12	<p>Open countryside with no clear, definitive, robust Green Belt boundaries being identifiable, as required by NPPF.</p> <p>With no clear and firm definitive green belt boundary evident on the allocation plan between Dog Kennel Lane and Cheswick Green it is difficult to assess the level of</p> <p>housing achievable on this site, a site which could lead to coalescence with Cheswick Green.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/12	Open countryside with no clear, definitive, robust Green Belt boundaries being identifiable, as required by NPPF. With no clear and firm definitive green belt boundary evident on the allocation plan between Dog Kennel Lane and Cheswick Green it is difficult to assess the level of housing achievable on this site, a site which could lead to coalescence with Cheswick Green.
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q15/12	Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley. Loss of Green Belt. Added pressure on infrastructure: schools, medical and social support, transport. Reduction in quality of life. Loss of Urbs in Rure character. Development won't benefit HS2.
S Ham [4126]			Q15/12	Whilst the need for more housing is recognised, object to the level of new housing proposed for South Shirley as 41% of Borough total is extremely unfair and should be reviewed, is shocking on top of significant development already allowed at Dickens Heath and elsewhere, local schools and medical services are already at breaking point and extra housing will put more pressure on infrastructure, loss of green belt and local green space accessible without a car, and will exacerbate major transport problems on local roads during peak times.
Sandra & Andrew Campbell [4494]			Q15/12	Object to huge scale of housing growth proposed for 4 sites in South Shirley, which will have negative effect on community, result in loss of green space, and have detrimental impact on local roads, schools and medical services.
Sarah Evans [3893]			Q15/12	Objection to building on Green Belt. Heavily congested area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/12	Object to proposed 41% growth at Shirley South that is disproportionate and unfair, will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, contrary to national guidance protecting green belt, more appropriate alternatives yet to be considered including those near infrastructure improvements such as UKC/HS2, area suffers from severe congestion, and housing will be catastrophic and increase rat running, local rail stations are too small and have inadequate parking, schools and medical facilities at capacity, and unlikely to meet need for smaller homes.
Sheryl Chandler [4179]			Q15/12	Support Shirley Heath Objection as 41% of growth in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair and will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, should not take Birmingham requirement, loss of green belt not justified as other options such as urban area and brownfield not investigated, growth should be focussed on infrastructure improvements such as HS2/NEC, will exacerbate congestion on Stratford Road and surrounding routes, increase rat running, damage to Blackford Road and speeding made worse by Dickens Heath traffic, inadequate transport/school/medical infrastructure, and development unlikely to meet affordable housing need.
Shirley & Peter Hansen [4690]			Q15/12	<p>The present infrastructure is inadequate to support the huge impact of the proposed housing on south west Shirley. GP surgeries and education provision is already over-subscribed.</p> <p>Question where the access points to the sites will be and the highway changes involved. Traffic is already increasing at peak times and can be hazardous for pedestrians. The existing roads cannot cope and this will be exacerbated.</p> <p>The site is Green Belt and will reduce the gap between settlements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q15/12	<p>Proposals account for 2,600 homes at sites 4, 11, 12 and 13. Disproportionate allocation of homes within Shirley/Dickens Heath area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Already 200 homes built in Dickens Heath and consent for 200 in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Likely infrastructure requirements are vague.</p> <p>Aims to satisfy housing need and retain Borough's character are contradictory.</p> <p>Disproportionately high density of 20 homes per ha, and only 14/ha at Site 1 and 16/ha at Site 9.</p>
Simon Heath [3403]			Q15/12	<p>lists several reasons why development should not happen on this site. these include capacity of existing roads, loss of open space and impact of existing infrastructure.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/12	<p>Concentration of 2550 homes in this area is excessive.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/12	<p>Concentration of 2550 homes in this area is excessive.</p>
Solihull Tree Wardens (Mrs Carol Henrick) [3853]			Q15/12	<p>Realise there is a need for affordable housing but the horrors of the intense building already in Dickens heath comes to mind. When building new developments there needs to be plenty of green space for children and adults to enjoy and of course we need to preserve as many of the existing trees as trees are essential to our well being. A mature canopy tree releases enough oxygen to sustain two human beings. Please with thoughtful planning we could provide a healthy environment where people can live.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Tree Wardens (Ms V Just) [2321]			Q15/12	<p>There is no defined boundary on the southern edge of this proposed site. How will the Green Belt between this site and Cheswick Green be protected from further development?</p> <p>Covering the area with housing would increase run-off to Cheswick Green. Very efficient drainage will be needed to protect existing and potential housing.</p> <p>There are many fine trees on this site, such as large mature oaks. These should be preserved for environmental and amenity reasons.</p>
Sonia Woodbridge Oliver [4500]			Q15/12	<p>Object to amount of new housing proposed for South Shirley as area already suffers from growing congestion and concerned that pressures of thousands and new homes on local services, such as schools and medical services not taken into consideration, will result in loss of sports pitches and removal of recreational amenities and have impact on existing residents future.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/12	<p>Object due to the:</p> <p>Contribution it makes to the Green Belt;</p> <p>Heritage assets;</p> <p>Concerns in SHELAA;</p> <p>20% in Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>850 dwellings should be dispersed elsewhere.</p>
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q15/12	<p>oppose the site as it includes a listed building within the heart of the allocation, suitability constraints including contamination, and ca 20% within Flood Zone 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/12	<p>Open countryside with no clear, definitive, robust Green Belt boundaries being identifiable, as required by NPPF.</p> <p>With no clear and firm definitive green belt boundary evident on the allocation plan between Dog Kennel Lane and Cheswick Green it is difficult to assess the level of housing achievable on this site, a site which could lead to coalescence with Cheswick Green.</p>
Sunya A Phillips [4177]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing in Green Belt in South Shirley as green belt should only be used when other land not available, Haslucks Green Road is far too busy to take extra traffic, there are no footpaths in places and developments on this scale are ridiculous.</p>
Susan & Paul Knight [4235]			Q15/12	<p>Objection to Site 12.</p> <p>Proposed development for Shirley South is ca. 30% of the total 6150 dwellings proposed in Solihull by 2033.</p> <p>Unfair distribution in one square mile of 68.8 square miles of the Borough.</p> <p>Added to new proposed care home by Sans Souci, Tanworth Lane.</p> <p>Why such a targeted area?</p> <p>Impact on local community.</p> <p>Negative impact on Green Belt openness.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and open space.</p> <p>Flooding impacts.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q15/12	<p>Support principle of sustainable urban extension at Site 12.</p> <p>Capacity on land ownership for up to 1500 homes.</p> <p>Carried out a number of assessments. No physical constraints. Sustainable location.</p> <p>Vision Document submitted.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Reference 1007, classified as Category 2. Recognises that development of larger site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Cheswick Green. Less than 50% of site is considered contaminated land/landfill. 10-25% of site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/12	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA Score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Accessibility score not refer to whole site.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHELAA Reference 1007, classified as Category 2. Recognises that development of larger site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Cheswick Green. Less than 50% of site is considered contaminated land/landfill. 10-25% of site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>
Tina Ferran [4098]			Q15/12	<p>Object to housing Site 12 as part of overall development of 4 sites in South Shirley as unsuitable for development, will have massive negative impact on community, destroy green space enjoyed by community, add to pressure on already congested roads within locality, and schools and medical services will be unable to cope with population increase.</p>
V Healey Gwilliam [4283]			Q15/12	<p>South Shirley area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.</p>
Valerie Lynes [4054]			Q15/12	<p>Green Belt site.</p> <p>Any development will add to the traffic on these already overcrowded roads.</p>
Viv Smith [4670]			Q15/12	<p>Object as disproportionate amount of housing in Blythe ward and would place excessive burden on small area.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Vivienne & Maurice Hadley [4745]		Q15/12	<p>Overdevelopment in Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Government have reconfirmed their commitment to Green Belt.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion, e.g. Stratford Road.</p> <p>Remember 'Urbs in Rure' motto.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Zoe Murtagh [3083]		Q15/12	<p>Will ruin the character of Dickens Heath village and Shirley.</p> <p>Impact on local wildlife and leisure activities for local people.</p> <p>Flood risk issues.</p> <p>Increased traffic and future highway safety issues.</p> <p>Tythe barn Lane is too narrow.</p> <p>Impact on listed building.</p> <p>Would spoil the gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Farmland will be lost/</p> <p>Future parking issues.</p> <p>Will be a shortfall of playing pitches in the area.</p> <p>Could the Tidbury Green sites accommodate more development?</p> <p>Schools and doctors are at capacity.</p> <p>Devalue property.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/13 Land South of Shirley			
A & V Blake [4304]		Q15/13	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Should be fairer distribution of housing.</p> <p>Recent development in Cheswick Green and Dickens Heath already added to congestion.</p> <p>Proposed development of 2550 houses will increase strain on road infrastructure, including air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of green space for community benefit and health.</p> <p>Loss of green corridor to canal and countryside.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Retain Green Belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p>
A J Edgeworth [4106]		Q15/13	<p>Object to proposals for 2,500 new houses in South Shirley as area already suffers from loss of green belt and extra congestion from Dickens Heath, will result in additional pollution from vehicles when we should be reducing harm to health, road infrastructure in area will be unable to cope with extra traffic, significant development is already taking place in Earlswood area, and there must be brownfield and green field sites elsewhere that can take a share.</p>
Adam Hughes [4534]		Q15/13	<p>Object to housing on Site 13 as insufficient infrastructure to support huge increase in road users, will exacerbate severe congestion on A34 and local residential roads, results in loss of existing local amenities with no proposals for replacement, area lacks employment for additional residents and schools and medical facilities inadequate, and will damage environment through impact on wildlife, air quality and water table.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Adam Welch [4417]		Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p> <p>Recent developments e.g. Parkgate have resulted in loss of green space.</p> <p>Road infrastructure unable to cope with 600 houses.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at Shirley and Whitlocks End train station.</p> <p>Schools and doctor surgeries oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital downgraded, more will need to travel to Heartlands.</p> <p>2550 new homes in this area is too much.</p> <p>Less populated areas in Borough, e.g. Knowle, Dorridge, Hockley Heath, Hampton-in-Arden should be considered.</p> <p>Council should ensure Birmingham have used all of brownfield sites before any overspill is allocated to Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Adrian Cox [4295]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Central Government targets are set on housebuilding which results in erosion of Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Roads around Dog Kennel Lane and Blackford Road are already over contested (sic) by traffic accessing Dickens Heath village.</p> <p>Complete disregard of speed bumps on Blackford Road; hazardous to children.</p> <p>Local doctor surgeries are overrun.</p> <p>When Dickens Heath was built it was agreed there should be a Green Belt buffer to keep Shirley and Dickens Heath separate.</p> <p>Green Belt should be protected; plenty of other sites which can be redeveloped.</p>
Alex Thompson [4616]			Q15/13	<p>object to development in the area as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed sites are very well used natural environment, that provides a much welcomed break from the urban environment - Shirley area is already subject to a huge amount of congestion which affects the whole of the Stratford Road from the M42 junction and all arterial routes - extremely concerned about the impact on local roads which are already very congested - a large number of sports clubs and facilities currently in allocation 4 <p>would impact on the physical and mental well being of the residents in the local community</p>
Alison Foreshew [3323]			Q15/13	<p>objection to the inclusion of site as it is a well used space by local families and walkers for both leisure and pleasure</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alison Robbins [4062]			Q15/13	Object to disproportionate and unfair housing levels in Shirley South and particularly Site 13 which is green belt, where development is contrary to Government policy, unrelated to major infrastructure improvements such as HS2, whilst local rail stations are unfit for purpose with inadequate parking, will exacerbate major congestion affecting all roads in area including traffic from Dickens Heath, schools and medical practices are already at capacity requiring more green field land for expansion, loss of amenity and wildlife habitat prone to flooding. Understand that numerous other options have not been explored and question why these are considered unsuitable.
Amanda & Stuart Tonks [4267]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of highly valued and regularly utilised local recreational green space and wildlife area and consequent adverse impact on quality of life, possibility of access via Shotteswell Road which is a quiet residential road, increased volume of traffic exacerbating congestion on Stretton Road especially at peak times and increasing risk to children walking or cycling to school, on top of traffic from Dickens Heath, and use of green belt land before development of the many viable brownfield sites in Solihull.
Amanda Carroll [3442]			Q15/13	<p>Will result in loss of Green Belt and narrowing of the gap between Dickens Heath and Shirley.</p> <p>The site is a well used for public recreation in an area with low levels of convenient open space.</p> <p>It would be wrong to build on the area of public amenity land and its access corridor that is currently fenced off and request that this area is retained for the benefit of existing and future local residents.</p> <p>The new homes would add to existing traffic congestion and increase pollution. Also doctors and schools are filled to capacity and services would be over stretched.</p>
Amy & Glenn Hodesdon & Cross [4691]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as much loved area with varied wildlife currently used for recreation, will exacerbate traffic problems, infrastructure inadequate and local schools have insufficient capacity to take more children.
Andrea Hopcraft [3651]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as deeply concerned about the impact that building 600 houses on allocation 13 and other allocated areas will have on local neighbourhood, wildlife, and local traffic. Additional housing will make already unbearable peak time traffic on Tanworth Lane intolerable. Level of growth proposed too great for Shirley and should be absorbed elsewhere around the Borough.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew Beadsworth [4063]			Q15/13	Object to housing development in Shirley and specifically Site 13, as area is taking an unfair proportion compared with elsewhere in Borough, will exacerbate congestion on already busy roads, public transport, infrastructure, schools and medical facilities will be adversely affected, health and well being will be impacted with loss of green space for leisure and recreation on top of loss of land at Shirley Park, will increase urban sprawl towards Dickens Heath, whilst development of brownfield sites or more equitable spread across Borough is less considered.
Andrew Robinson [3140]			Q15/13	<p>The area is the only public area for walkers and dog walkers in the area between Tanworth Lane and Dickens Heath. The proposal goes right up to the boundary of the massive Christmas tree plantation and airstrip. Rather than ruin the area for all the local people, why not compulsorily purchase the tree plantation.</p> <p>There will need to be substantial improvements to the road network to cope with, probably, 1,000 cars and related vehicles arising from the new dwellings. Tanworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane and Blackford Road are already overcrowded in rush hours with constant queues.</p>
Andy & Natasha Maidment [4073]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as the surrounding roads are already heavily congested and the additional development will result in gridlock, rail services and park and ride are at capacity during peak hours and will not cope with additional passengers, will result in loss of green belt land, recreational and social facility and sports club grounds, and increase anti social behaviour and crime rates. Required housing should be accommodated on other sites especially brownfield before using this green belt land.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Andy & Rachel Bennett [4580]		Q15/13	<p>Agree housing is needed.</p> <p>2550 homes is disproportionate south of Shirley.</p> <p>Contrary to DLP spatial strategy and policies.</p> <p>Fails to take account of infrastructure impacts.</p> <p>Health services under pressure.</p> <p>Existing high levels of congestion.</p> <p>Resident views not considered.</p> <p>Visual impact not been assessed.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Partial flooding on site.</p> <p>Urbanisation.</p> <p>Would not serve HS2 as too far.</p> <p>Impact on local community.</p> <p>Sans Souci should be retained for educational use.</p> <p>Government has made repeated commitments to Green Belt, e.g. Housing White Paper.</p>
Solihull MBC			<p>Reconsider brownfield sites.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Angela Adams [3099]		Q15/13	<p>More traffic will be a major problem, plus more noise and constant traffic, with cars cutting through for a short cut to the Stratford Rd and other area's.</p> <p>More children on Baxters Green /Road riding through on there bikes and causing trouble, cutting through to the School and causing noise, litter and more hassle for residents.</p> <p>It is a nice peaceful area and having a new housing estate will create more traffic, noise, more children/people hanging around, using it as a cut through and spoil the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Ann Parker [4362]		Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Development will change character from semi-rural location to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Government states that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances after all alternatives examined.</p> <p>Numerous other options.</p> <p>Development should be close to HS2.</p> <p>Heavy congestion already, affects Stratford Road from M42 and all arterial routes.</p> <p>New development will compound congestion and traffic.</p> <p>Local railway stations are not fit for purpose; inadequate parking.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Doctor surgeries overstretched. Trip to Heartlands is a nightmare.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and wildlife.</p> <p>Green space safeguarded for local residents by Layca.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Scholes [4618]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very special circumstances for building on green belt has not been proved by SMBC in the DLP - proven that contact with nature promotes health and well being in all of us - inability of infrastructure to cope with new development
Barry & Jenny Jennings [4300]			Q15/13	<p>Site 4, 11, 12 and 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath and Shirley would merge into one huge suburb, which wasn't the vision for Dickens Heath Village.</p> <p>Considerable development already threatening gaps between Dickens Heath, Wythall and Earlswood.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development increased traffic on Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Haslucks Green Road.</p> <p>Roads could not cope with more traffic.</p> <p>Need to keep green spaces for wellbeing.</p> <p>Look for brownfield sites.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Barry Jackson [3957]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure would be too much.</p> <p>Traffic in area has steadily increased over the years; gridlock during peak times; not mentioned any improvements to make roads safer.</p> <p>New houses around Dickens Heath putting massive strain on local services, doctors, schools and transport.</p> <p>Must be better alternatives than this site in Green Belt; an increasingly developed area.</p>
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>There is no defensible Green Belt Boundary. It represents a significant extension to Shirley's urban area reducing the green belt gap between the settlements of Shirley, Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath, Majors Green and Whitlock's End.</p> <p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the coalescence of settlements and have a significant and potentially unacceptable adverse impact on the existing communities and infrastructure as well as the Green Belt and landscape.</p>
Bethan Griffiths [4481]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of fields and recreational area to the local community. Instead of development a community park linking Shirley and Dickens Heath should be provided.</p>
Bev Ellis [4253]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of recreational facilities for residents and children at a time when there is recognition of the need to encourage greater activity for health and well-being and to discourage crime, loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of local area of natural beauty for walking, exacerbate traffic on roads that are barely coping now, schools and medical services are oversubscribed and cannot take extra strain.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Bradley Healey Gwilliam [4286]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as would result in loss of only direct countryside accessible for South Shirley residents, a valuable natural green space and recreational facility between urban areas, and an important habitat for diverse wildlife which should be verified by independent ecological survey, area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.
Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]			Q15/13	Objection to Site 13. Concerns about coalescence with settlements such as Majors Green close to Bromsgrove/Solihull boundary; and undermining Green Belt functions contrary to NPPF.
C A Frost [4006]			Q15/13	Already a massive problem with traffic congestion in the local area. If you add a further concern about the capacity of the local NHS system and the underfunding of schools in the area, then the proposal to build over 2500 new homes seems to be totally absurd. Whilst I appreciate the national requirement for new homes, it is wrong to blindly pursue the delivery of numbers and ignore the quality of life of existing and new residents. Hope that a more moderate approach can be found which will avoid turning Shirley into a new town on the edge of Solihull.
Carol Bird [3991]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Inappropriate for area. Cause far too much congestion. Already a huge problem with traffic and very busy. Could result in a dangerous walk home from school for many children.
Carol Edgeworth [4101]			Q15/13	Whilst new housing is very much needed, object to 2550 homes in 4 sites so close together as local schools, medical services and roads will be unable to cope and the green belt will be a concrete jungle when there are brownfield sites that should be used first.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Carolyn Locke [4096]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as part of overall 41% of housing allocations in South Shirley as unfair and should be spread more fairly across Borough, will add to already congested roads causing higher levels of pollution implicated in various chronic conditions, increase pressure on struggling medical services, require significant investment in new schools and impact on catchments, increased number of residents travelling long distances to Waste & Recycling Centre, impact on natural environment, wildlife and flooding, on top of developments already taking place will undermine attractiveness, health and well-being of the area.
Cath Proctor [3267]			Q15/13	Wish to retain public access/corridor to the canal.
Catherine Lawrence [4356]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Only received notice from the Council on 10th February.</p> <p>Traffic already impossible in local area, e.g. Dog Kennel Lane at peak times.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>planning to widen all the roads in this area?</p> <p>Are pedestrian crossings going to be put in?</p> <p>How is the sewage system going to cope?</p> <p>What about drainage?</p> <p>Why is this area being targeted with so many homes?</p> <p>A development of this size will spoil the local area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Celia Scottow [3148]			Q15/13	<p>This area is used by many residents in this area of Shirley and is a direct benefit to the local community.</p> <p>I am very concerned that once again South Shirley will be losing more of its pleasant characteristics for the benefit of other areas of Solihull.</p>
Charlotte Gilbert [4436]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Support.</p> <p>Writing against petition to stop Site 13.</p> <p>As a young professional working in the Solihull area, I have had to move away as there is housing shortage and housing costs are too expensive in neighbouring areas.</p> <p>Other childhood friends share this view.</p>
Charlotte Murray [4071]			Q15/13	<p>Object to such a large development on a well used green space at housing Site 13 as will result in loss of green space, and Shirley requires improved infrastructure in the form of more schools, medical practices and other services before new development is considered.</p>
Chris Carney [4196]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detrimental effect on the local countryside and abundant wildlife - Green Belt should only be amended in exceptional circumstances when all other avenues have been explored. - disproportionate percentage (41%) of the total build required being sited in one area

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Isaacs [4450]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>2500 houses in Shirley area is disproportionate.</p> <p>Agree some housing should be here, but not to this degree.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues will be exacerbated, e.g. Stratford Road congestion.</p> <p>Of the sites, Site 13 is untouchable. Widely used for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Consider golf courses for development.</p>
Chris Ready [3684]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing site 13, on top of development of Dickens Heath which has continually grown and adds to the already horrendous levels of traffic on Tanworth Lane and surrounding roads during peak hours, further development will not be sustainable within any proposed infrastructure. There are Green Belt sites around Dorridge/Knowle and other areas where development could be located, without discriminating further against South Shirley or worsening local air pollution. Retaining this green space within walking distance is vital as a respite from traffic and for physical and mental wellbeing.</p>
Christina Lawlor [4252]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of countryside and urban sprawl contrary to Council motto, leading to coalescence with Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green, loss of natural green space/green corridor and impact on recreation and well-being, and increased housing and density will have huge detrimental impact on infrastructure, schools and medical services. If some building is essential, should ensure that a green space/wildlife corridor of at least 2 fields width is retained from Tanworth Lane to Bills Lane with any hedges and trees retained</p>
Christine Carey [3263]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to the site 13 as there is an abundance of wildlife present.</p>
Christine Stajka [3707]			Q15/13	<p>objecting to the overall number of housing being proposed in and around Shirley (including DH) as it lead to loss of green/open space, increase congestion on roads as well as impacting on schools, and medical facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Christine Street [4315]			Q15/13	Preferable to Site 4 in Dickens Heath, but only if suitable infrastructure was provided to prevent exacerbating traffic etc issues in Dickens Heath village.
Christine Taylor [3593]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Christine Waters [4329]			Q15/13	Objection to Site 13. Parts of Site are used for recreation by local community. Nowhere else to go for walks. Would undermine existing infrastructure.
Christopher Mansbridge [3603]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as roads, schools and medical facilities will be unable to cope. Should be retained as open space for recreation.
Christopher Taylor [4473]			Q15/13	Object to scale of growth proposed for South Shirley on top of recent supermarket and retail park developments which is unfair, involves loss of so much green belt land in one area when other areas unaffected, will exacerbate traffic congestion on A34 and local roads, there is inadequate public transport to carry increased population or parking provision at local stations and inadequate provision for school places and is clearly not in best interests of local residents, and to loss of recreational/amenity area for Site 13 and the consequent impact on quality of life.
Claire Hodgskin [4104]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 on a beautiful piece of green belt land as development will exacerbate already unsustainable levels of traffic with gridlock on Stratford Road and route to Solihull, insufficient school places or medical facilities to cope with additional people, and loss of land used for local recreational purposes accessible by foot and cycle with consequent health benefits.
Claire K [3152]			Q15/13	site 13 objection

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHLAA Site Ref. 41, includes much larger area than land proposed. Category 2 for development. Less than 10% of site within a LWS. Less than 50% affected by heritage assets. Grade 4 agricultural land.</p> <p>States that development would undermine existing Christmas tree orchard business.</p> <p>Recognises that developing entire site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15/13	<p>I cannot support the proposals for this land. This is incredibly important to a vast number of residents in the area.</p> <p>There is a significant amount of wildlife and it is a buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>The area is well used by the community, helps to foster a community spirit and contributes to health and well being.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15/13	<p>Petition objecting to Site 13.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Allen [2632]			Q15/13	Impact on traffic Congestion and air quality on A34 and on surrounding local roads. Impact on Green Belt which provide a buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath. Loss of well used green space that many people walk over every day and that they value for the maintenance of health and wellbeing of the whole community. Impact on biodiversity and ecology of the area which is much valued by everyone. Flooding issues including surface water and impact on neighbouring properties.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/13	I cannot support the proposals for this land. This is incredibly important to a vast number of residents in the area. There is a significant amount of wildlife in the area and it operates as a buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath. If this site were to be developed, then the greenbelt between the two would be little more than a belt. This is very well utilized by the community and it is land that helps to foster a community, by being land that they are able to meet one another whilst walking over. It also plays a significant role in both the health and wellbeing of a great number of residents in the area.
Councillor T Hodgson [2532]			Q15/13	Site 13 massively expands the urban area of Shirley into the Green Belt.
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/13	Contrary to Green Belt policy and Council policy to protect 'urbs in rure' character, unsustainable location dependent on car travel, would harm attractive open countryside, remove opportunities for quiet recreation, loss of playing fields/sports grounds and drainage issues and impact on flood risk.
Cpt D A Benton [4097]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as part of horrendous proposals for 2550 houses in South Shirley, which will exacerbate traffic already overloaded by Dickens Heath development, local shops, medical services, schools and parking infrastructure will be inadequate to support additional population, developments will result in loss of open space, countryside and peace and fresh air. Only benefit is extra employment and rates income, Council should make case to Government that enough development already and find more suitable areas.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
D Wilkinson [4001]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection - together with allocations 4, 11 & 12 there is an over-allocation of proposed houses in a small area of the borough, on mainly on precious green space.</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with this extra demand to the local area. Will exacerbate existing traffic problems, increase pollution and impact on community infrastructure such as doctors and schools.</p> <p>This scheme adds little value to the HS2 access plans and will make the M42 unbearable and more like London's M25.</p> <p>Request that the plans be considerably scaled back to a sensible build programme.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Dan Sullivan [3958]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Would remove vitally important green space to the local community.</p> <p>Public amenity fields and corridor to the bridleway and Bills Lane are an established recreation facility. Regularly used and enjoyed.</p> <p>Important to health and wellbeing. Green areas alleviate depression.</p> <p>Must be safeguarded.</p> <p>Loss of ancient trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>2550 new homes will add to existing congestion at Stretton Rd, Tanworth Lane, Dickens Heath Rd, Dog Kennel Lane.</p> <p>Services and infrastructure insufficient.</p> <p>Retain more Green Belt to reduce coalescence between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Understand need for housing, but consider local community.</p>
<p>Darren Maskell [4076]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will have detrimental effect on local community in many ways, notably educational and healthcare facilities which are already stretched and will need expanding, and local rail services which are at capacity during peak times.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
David Paddock [3988]		Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Need to exhaust alternatives before building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Very popular recreation and amenity area.</p> <p>Important for local wildlife.</p> <p>Boggy areas and risk of flooding.</p> <p>Houses won't be affordable.</p> <p>Is self-build in the Plan?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Paddock [3988]			Q15/13	<p>In addendum to my previous communication, I have been in contact with many local residents in our group of 730 people, and many would be keen to see allocation 13 set aside as a country park with a green corridor linking Dickens Heath and Majors Green.</p> <p>This could be managed by the local community and could be of benefit to the local community.</p>
David Parkinson [4562]			Q15/13	<p>Object to proposals for an additional 2550 houses in Shirley area and to housing Site 13 in particular as will have detrimental impact on area through loss of green area/countryside away from busy roads used by adults and children to enjoy wildlife, compounded by impact of Parkgate development on Shirley Park, highway infrastructure is already struggling to cope with current traffic levels especially during peak times, lack of school places to meet expected demand never mind growth which will lead to larger classes and poorer education, medical and police services at capacity, and nursing home proposal will add to chaos.</p>
David Smith [4043]			Q15/13	<p>The needs and requirements of existing residents must be taken into consideration regarding health, quality of life and the effect on local infrastructure.</p> <p>A mass programme such as proposed on the Green Belt surrounding south Shirley will have a massive destructive effect on all the residents living within a huge radius.</p> <p>Additional cars will add to existing problematic congestion.</p> <p>Additional school and nursery places and health facilities will be required.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt between South Shirley and Dickens Heath that will see the 2 areas merging without open spaces.</p> <p>Loss of an important area of recreation for existing residents.</p>
Debbie Stokes [4255]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing in South Shirley and particularly Site 13 as concentration of 41% of new housing in one small area is unfair, 2,500 plus houses will exacerbate severe traffic congestion on A34, Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road, the impact will have a severe detrimental affect on local schools, medical services and transport, and loss of recreational facilities used by many local children.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Disproportionate allocation in Blythe Ward; 45% of new allocations.</p> <p>Should be more medium and smaller Green Belt releases, spread across the Borough.</p> <p>High scoring Green Belt parcels should not be released for development.</p> <p>Need exceptional circumstances to change Green Belt boundaries, housing not sufficient.</p> <p>Significant harm to village character and rural setting.</p> <p>Greater than 800m walking distance from village centre.</p> <p>Increased traffic and parking unacceptable.</p> <p>Negative ecological impact.</p> <p>90% of survey respondents objected to both sites being removed from Green Belt.</p> <p>Sites 13 conflicts with the original masterplan and vision for Dickens Heath village.</p>
Don Alcott [4021]		Q15/13	600 houses =600 cars, plus school places. I do not think the infrastructure is geared up for this.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Donna Bunce-Burke [3438]			Q15/13	<p>There are more places to build without using Green Belt.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on roads that are already full and put a strain on the schools which are up to maximum over subscribed!</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Need space away from traffic, houses and people. The area is a vital community amenity and vital to the identity of local settlements.</p> <p>Open spaces are needed for many reasons.</p>
Dr Milla Shah [4201]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic and congestion on local road network - concerned about safety of pedestrians and non-car users - inadequate level of green space being designated in the DLP - health and well being of Shirley residents will be negatively impacted - lack of planning and consideration for the required level of infrastructure to both support the new development and to deal with existing pressures.
Dylan Steele [4332]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of open space.</p> <p>Loss of rural character.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Earlswood & Forshaw Heath Residents Association (Jennifer Buckley) [4439]			Q15/13	<p>Object to Site 4.</p> <p>Contrary to Government manifesto 2015 on protecting Green Belt and countryside.</p> <p>No evidence of cross-boundary consultation or discussion as prescribed by the Localism Act.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure and quality of life of residents in Earlswood & Forshaw Heath not been taken into account.</p> <p>Developments by SMBC in last 20 years had dramatic impact on rural parish and none for the better.</p> <p>No recompense to Stratford District Council for impacts of these developments, e.g. traffic on roads.</p> <p>SDC should be compensated.</p>
Edward Fraser [4138]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as totally unacceptable as will deplete the green belt with its intrinsic benefits, cause major traffic problems and exacerbate existing unacceptable delays, overload medical services and impact on local schools. Whilst it is recognised that housing is required, Shirley has more than its fair share and is not the place for growth associated with HS2.</p>
Elizabeth Padgett [4610]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic is already dire - Green belt land and wildlife are more important to people than houses which they cannot afford - Traffic pollution is not good for anyone's health or safety
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q15/13	<p>Object to amount of land proposed for development in Shirley, as too much on green belt, the area south of Stratford Road is already congested and will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic, there are insufficient transport connections such as railway links, and loss of green areas will reduce Shirley's image from the lovely 'town in the country' it always was.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Elizabeth Yates [3274]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 on grounds of loss of wildlife habitat, inadequate road, transport, school and medical facilities, loss of remaining open spaces and trees that have escaped the growth that has taken place already in Shirley over the last 40 years.
Emily Matthews [4010]			Q15/13	<p>I do not agree with the proposed plans to build on the site name Allocation 13. This is due to traffic concerns in Shirley, particularly the Stratford Road, and concerns about access to local facilities such as doctors surgery and schools.</p> <p>I also think that any housing plans proposed should be for Brownfield sites not Green Belt.</p>
Emily Rose Walker [4080]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as land is green belt, there are other areas available before green belt is used, and loss of recreational facility.
Emma Durant [3942]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Road safety issues near schools. Proposed development would be adjacent to a single carriageway.</p> <p>Serious congestion concerns caused by increased usage of the surrounding roads and insufficient infrastructure to deal with the increased volume.</p> <p>Reduction of amenity to existing residents for medical and educational services (doctors, schools etc)</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and ancient woodland.</p> <p>Sufficient brownfield land nearer to the M42, would be more suitable.</p> <p>Has a lower impact alternative been considered?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Esme Thompson [4393]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Minimal green space left in Shirley. Obesity levels on the rise; removal of this area poses risk to people's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Consider community impact.</p>
Evan Seibert [3222]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
F Beesley [4044]			Q15/13	<p>The area is already over populated and extra building would create more problems than it solves.</p> <p>Road traffic and local services would be greatly over used. Traffic congestion and extra strain on local services should be the start of any discussion.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Gemma Welch [4413]		Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p> <p>Recent developments e.g. Parkgate have resulted in loss of green space.</p> <p>Road infrastructure unable to cope with 600 houses.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at Shirley and Whitlocks End train station.</p> <p>Schools and doctor surgeries oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital downgraded, more will need to travel to Heartlands.</p> <p>2550 new homes in this area is too much.</p> <p>Less populated areas in Borough, e.g. Knowle, Dorridge, Hockley Heath, Hampton-in-Arden should be considered.</p> <p>Council should ensure Birmingham have used all of brownfield sites before any overspill is allocated to Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Geoff Hickman [3515]		Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Have used footpaths and fields for walking at Site 13 for 40 years.</p> <p>Important area of open countryside providing for health and wellbeing of local community.</p> <p>Important for wildlife.</p> <p>Green buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Quality Green Belt.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development badly impacted traffic in the area due to insufficient road infrastructure.</p> <p>Continuous stream of traffic between Dickens Heath, Dog Kennel Lane and junction 4 on Stratford Road to M42.</p> <p>Better to build closer to M6, M40, Birmingham International and proposed HS2 station.</p> <p>Need joined up thinking about road infrastructure with adjacent counties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Geraldine Evans [4363]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Suffered greatly with development of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Beautiful piece of land.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of green space and enjoyment for local people.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing congestion.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>
Gill Lyons [3333]			Q15/13	<p>objecting on grounds of impact on the local infrastructure</p>
Gina Ready [3393]			Q15/13	<p>Traffic congestion in the area is already at a high level.</p> <p>The area is the only respite for families to get fresh air within walking distance.</p> <p>Other parts of the Borough have green belt sites so why south Shirley?</p> <p>Open space is important for physical and mental well being.</p> <p>We hear that builders, counsellors and relevant landowners between them have already made up their minds to do this and this is shameful.</p> <p>Yes, new housing will need to be built but why concentrate it on South Shirley once again?</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Glyn Jones [4354]		Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green space for residents' enjoyment, recreation, health and wildlife.</p> <p>Unfair for Solihull to be expected to take on Birmingham's overspill.</p> <p>Many brownfield sites in Birmingham that could be used, e.g. Tyseley and Digbeth.</p> <p>Birmingham should fill their housing quota.</p> <p>Seems more logical to consider housing areas with good access to the motorway network and the proposed HS2 route.</p> <p>South Shirley has lack of road infrastructure, social and health provision.</p> <p>No longer any A&E at Solihull hospital.</p> <p>New developments should be close to major health care centres.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion.</p>
Graham Roberts [4108]		Q15/13	<p>Object to concentration of housing around Shirley/Cheswick Green/BVP, instead of sharing across Borough, which will create problems of lack of medical services, overloaded roads not fit for increasing traffic, and result in loss of green belt contrary to Government policy.</p>
Greg Doust [3756]		Q15/13	<p>Objecting as it would lead to increased pressure on local road, schools and doctors. A loss of green space for recreational uses and habitat for local wildlife.</p>
Gurmeash Kaur [4015]		Q15/13	<p>Not happy with the housing plans in Shirley, especially around the Green Belt areas. I feel the green areas should be preserved. Furthermore, this housing expansion will have a detrimental impact on schooling and GP surgeries, where problems with waiting lists exist.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Harry March [4537]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as land used for walking and recreation, would destroy semi-rural character and varied bird and wildlife.
Harry Street [3905]			Q15/13	Preferable to Site 4 in Dickens Heath, but only if suitable infrastructure was provided to prevent exacerbating traffic etc issues in Dickens Heath village.
HC, JR, CJ, J, N Easton, O'Brien, Shaw [4307]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and nature rich habitats.</p> <p>Transport issues, congestion and highways safety along Bills Lane.</p> <p>1,500 homes means 2000 more cars. Cause disruption and chaos on already busy roads.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Well loved and well used space by Shirley residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heidi Williams [4382]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Existing traffic and road safety issues on busy Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Road etc. Especially for children walking to school.</p> <p>Local park been reduced and not suitable for walking a dog off the lead.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Loss of character.</p> <p>Coalescence with Dickens Heath and Majors green.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools, GPs and hospitals.</p> <p>Detrimental impact on quality of life of existing community.</p>
Helen Polhill [4375]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>600 houses not needed in this area.</p> <p>Should not build on green fields.</p>
Helen Williams [3175]			Q15/13	<p>We kindly request that Housing Site 13 South of Shirley be retained for public use. This public amenity area is well used amongst the local community and is especially important for an area that has such a low provision of open space and parkland. Please reconsider other areas which are more logical infill sites and not used by the public.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/13	<p>Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.</p>
Holly Davis [3141]			Q15/13	<p>Disappointed that the land is now being turned into a housing estate removing this land from not only myself but also many dog walkers.</p> <p>I'm interested in hearing how 600 new houses are being built yet no new schools to accommodate this amount of people moving into the area. The removal of the new doctors surgery is also a concern.</p> <p>This has been a poorly planned decision and that the fields in south Shirley should remain and the plan be moved to a more appropriate area.</p>
Hopcraft Ray [4018]			Q15/13	<p>Local roads are already congested. Development will exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Impact on already over-subscribed schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Site 13 is an area for recreation and provides a defined border between Shirley and the surrounding villages. This should remain intact.</p>
Howard Maine [4172]			Q15/13	<p>Object to development of green belt to provide 2,250 additional houses around South Shirley as will have detrimental impact on transport problems, schools and already stretched hospitals, and exacerbate already frightening volume of traffic on A34 and surrounding local roads.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Iain Baker [3139]			Q15/13	<p>Whilst realising the council have obligations to provide additional housing the size and concentration of this proposal is totally inappropriate.</p> <p>Erosion of valuable green belt at a time when we are encouraged to live more healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>Will lose football fields.</p> <p>Will result in Dickens Heath and Shirley joining up and losing their different characteristics.</p> <p>The roads in the vicinity are gridlocked at peak times.</p> <p>The doctors surgery in Tanworth Lane is already over capacity.</p> <p>Schools are full and at the beginning and end of the day the traffic in the area is dangerous for the school pupils.</p>
J D Green [3195]			Q15/13	objection site 13
J Hall [4109]			Q15/13	Object to the level of housing proposed for the Shirley area, as the densities are too high, the roads and lanes will not be able to cope with the amount of traffic generated, concern that there will be insufficient schools and medical services, and loss of green fields for enjoyment.
Jack Street [3906]			Q15/13	Preferable to Site 4 in Dickens Heath, but only if suitable infrastructure was provided to prevent exacerbating traffic etc issues in Dickens Heath village.
Jacqueline Edinburgh [3768]			Q15/13	<p>objecting as the development will result in a loss of open space/countryside.</p> <p>it will also increase pressure on existing roads and social infrastructure (hospitals, maternity, schools)</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Jacqueline Harris [4320]		Q15/13	<p>41% of development in area around Shirley is disproportionate.</p> <p>Should be spread more fairly across Borough.</p> <p>Loss of green space for community benefit, health and visual amenity.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and green corridor.</p> <p>Heavy congestion on Stratford Road, M42 and surrounding roads will get worse.</p> <p>Poor public transport links.</p> <p>More pollution.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at railway stations.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Local schools, nurseries, doctor surgeries and hospital already unable to cope. Will need new school and surgery.</p> <p>Feels Shirley is forgotten part of Solihull.</p> <p>Look for options with better transport links and more direct access to M42 and A34.</p>
Jacquie Knott [4158]		Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as additional residents will need new school places.</p>
James Griffiths [4482]		Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of fields and recreational area to the local community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
James McCarthy [4023]			Q15/13	<p>Development will exacerbate existing congestion. Roads in the local area are not equipped to take the extra strain.</p> <p>Local schools and doctors are currently fully subscribed.</p> <p>The Green Belt area is a key part of the local community and provides an area for recreation. It also acts a buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath and offers crucial social and more importantly health benefits to local residents.</p> <p>The planned development will vastly alter the look and feel of the local area, and directly impact on current residents as the local landscape changes.</p> <p>Impact on local wildlife.</p>
Jane & Alan Horton [4443]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Development will join Dickens Heath, Majors Green, Tidbury Green and Shirley.</p> <p>Will be one giant housing estate.</p> <p>Traffic volume on Haslucks Green Road is major hazard.</p>
Jane Galvin [3257]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to housing on this site. pressure on existing infrastructure and services will make the new settlements unsustainable.</p>
Jane Mills [4134]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing in South Shirley as over 2,500 houses or 41% of proposed allocations is unfair and will have negative affect on local community through loss of precious green belt, increased traffic on all local roads, Shirley station car park is currently inadequate let alone for a huge increase in users, increased noise, pollution and rat running on local roads across Shirley, construction traffic will be intrusive and unwelcome, and local schools and medical services unlikely to have capacity for increase in population.</p>
Janet & Malcolm Barnes [3703]			Q15/13	<p>traffic congestion, and impact on school and doctors cited as reasons for objecting to the site.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Janet Bird [3617]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 due to loss of highly valued recreational facility.
Janet Blair [3605]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 due to impact of increased traffic on Blackford Road, which is already inadequate, has suffered from closures for repairs and has a weight restriction which is not enforced.
Janett Reynolds [4664]			Q15/13	Objects to building of 2,550 new houses in South Shirley area which amounts to 41% of total allocations and is grossly unfair, will have serious impact on already congested roads, will affect local schools and medical services, result in loss of 6 sports and recreational grounds and high density housing will lead to disputes over parking, noise and other social issues through lack of space, and to Site 13 in particular as loss of green belt/recreation area will impact on health and well-being of local community, and development will exacerbate problems of flooding.
Janis Hartles [4568]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of green land away from roads used by adults and children for recreation, loss of wildlife habitats, increase in traffic exacerbating already high volume of congestion which will create gridlock, increase in pollution, and impact on schools and medical services already at capacity.
Jean Goodman [3176]			Q15/13	We kindly request that Housing Site 13 South of Shirley be retained for public use. This public amenity area is well used amongst the local community and is especially important for an area that has such a low provision of open space and parkland. Please reconsider other areas which are more logical infill sites and not used by the public.
Jean Gibbs [3405]			Q15/13	While I understand the need for extra housing, the area south of Shirley has already been developed some years ago. Development would result in a need for other schools so it would not stop at the extra housing. Also there would probably be a need for another doctors surgery to cope with the extra residents. We do not want a green "corridor", we want fields to walk through unrestricted by roofs etc. Then there is the wildlife to consider. Shirley park has already lost trees and some of the land to the Parkgate development.
Jeanette Atkins [4366]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of green space. Impact on wildlife. Bats live in local houses.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Jen Hickman [3522]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Have used footpaths and fields for walking at Site 13 for 40 years.</p> <p>Important area of open countryside providing for health and wellbeing of local community.</p> <p>Important for wildlife.</p> <p>Green buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Quality Green Belt.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development badly impacted traffic in the area due to insufficient road infrastructure.</p> <p>Continuous stream of traffic between Dickens Heath, Dog Kennel Lane and junction 4 on Stratford Road to M42.</p> <p>Better to build closer to M6, M40, Birmingham International and proposed HS2 station.</p> <p>Need joined up thinking about road infrastructure with adjacent counties.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jennifer Archer [4016]			Q15/13	<p>Road network cannot cope with existing traffic.</p> <p>Cycling is hazardous and allocations are not on established public transport routes.</p> <p>Employment opportunities in Shirley would not be sufficient to meet increased population.</p> <p>Parking is at capacity at local railway stations. More parking will impact on the water table.</p> <p>Will reduce the Green Belt gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath. Green Belt does not need to be built on. More convenient locations with better road links are required.</p> <p>Will impact on an area used for recreation which makes an important contribution to health and well being.</p> <p>Access is flawed.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>
Jenny Painter [4327]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Understand need to provide more homes.</p> <p>South Shirley already lost a significant proportion of its green areas to residential development.</p> <p>Parkgate has improved area. Feels semi-rural and cosmopolitan.</p> <p>Shame to ruin what has become a much sought after location to live and work in.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Joanne Hale [4400]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Understand the need for housing.</p> <p>2550 houses in such a small congested area is excessive.</p> <p>Consider highways impact.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Impact on walking and recreation.</p> <p>Already lost part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Loss of countryside, e.g. in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Not a good location to get to HS2.</p> <p>Loss of 'Urbs in rure'.</p>
<p>Joanne Liddiard-McGann [3407]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Object to loss of public amenity area which is an asset to local people. Recreational spaces are already limited in the area.</p> <p>The area was originally designated as an area of public amenity.</p> <p>Would narrow the Green Belt between Dickens Heath and Shirley.</p> <p>Additional development would result in more traffic in an area where congestion is already an issue.</p> <p>Impact on schools places and healthcare provision.</p> <p>Wrong to build on the area of public amenity land and its access corridor. The area should be retained for the benefit of existing and future local residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Allocations 4, 11, 12, 13 will all have a very large impact on the area with respect to transport, schooling and healthcare facilities such as GPs in what is an already congested and high density of dwellings area.</p> <p>Reduce buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath</p> <p>Not well served by public transport.</p> <p>Would not benefit from HS2.</p> <p>Loss of accessible green space for recreation and community benefit.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of distinct community identity.</p> <p>Development should be more evenly spread across the Borough.</p>
John & Christine Thorp [4477]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of green footpaths in a semi rural area which are used daily by many local residents to help keep fit and maintain well-being when there are no other similar amenities, loss of green belt gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath, loss of wildlife, increased use of cars, traffic, air pollution and litter, increased pressure on schools and medical services already at capacity and on roads with poor surfaces, and any affordable housing element will not meet needs of local young people or encourage them to remain in area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John & Jennifer Fearn [4714]			Q15/13	<p>There should be no secondary vehicular access via Woodlands/Badger Estates.</p> <p>The established open space on Council owned land, adjoining Woodloes Road is regularly used by local residents.</p> <p>Exercising safely away from traffic, particularly walking is invaluable.</p> <p>South Shirley needs a large new park/country park to provide access to open space equally with Monkspath, Hillfield, Central Solihull, Knowle and Dorridge.</p> <p>This site provides valuable recreational space with space for some housing.</p>
John & Julie Russell [4238]			Q15/13	<p>Object to proposal to locate 41% of proposed houses in South Shirley as inordinate amount compared with elsewhere in Borough, will destroy green field sites, extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion on A34 and surrounding roads especially at peak times, demand for places at oversubscribed schools, demands on already crowded local rail services and inadequate parking, construction will cause extra traffic/noise/disruption, will degrade the area with loss of character that makes it attractive, and to Site 13 in particular as will result in loss of recreation, amenity and wildlife area with many trees.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John & Linda Cawley [4449]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Appreciate need for new housing.</p> <p>Dickens Heath not worked.</p> <p>Local amenities under pressure.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure will not be able to cope, e.g. schools, hospitals, doctor surgeries, drainage sewers.</p> <p>Massive increase in traffic.</p> <p>Associated noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Planning gain from development needs to be shared.</p> <p>Affordable housing is important for younger generation.</p> <p>Need to adhere to 1947 Planning Act.</p>
John A MacDonald [4723]			Q15/13	<p>Loss of public amenity land which is also Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
John Dancer [4303]		Q15/13	<p>Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Recognise urgent need for housing.</p> <p>41% development in Shirley/Dickens Heath is disproportionate.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of Green Belt land; contrary to central government policy.</p> <p>Lots of brownfield land available in Birmingham.</p> <p>Lots of opportunity elsewhere for infilling.</p> <p>DLP not consider impacts on local infrastructure, including roads, parking, congestion, hospitals.</p> <p>3000+ cars will increase air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of trees to absorb pollution.</p> <p>Reducing recreational and public amenity space.</p> <p>Loss of 9 sports pitches.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Junctions 4 to 6 of M42 already at capacity.</p>
John Grendon [4602]		Q15/13	<p>fully support this allocation with the proviso that sports facilities should be retained as the amateur clubs are much appreciated locally</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Keaney [4039]			Q15/13	<p>Traffic congestion will increase. Question what studies the Council have commissioned to monitor and reduce traffic impact.</p> <p>Should re-use brownfield sites and take opportunity to make urban dwelling more attractive.</p> <p>Parking at local stations is at capacity. What provisions are in place to meet needs of extra commuters. Would make sense to propose a development next to the HS2 terminal.</p> <p>Additional pressure on already stretched public services.</p> <p>Some of the surrounding area is prone to flooding and there have been accidents as a result of wet conditions.</p> <p>Impact of Brexit could leave the development unfinished as funding dries up.</p>
John Rawlins [4232]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection as this will lead to a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of Greenbelt land, - loss of amenity land for local people, - loss of rich local wildlife, and minimal evidence of consideration for expanding local infrastructure to cope with the additional population. - lack of infrastructure and congestion on the roads
John Robbins [4272]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as part of proposed 41% growth that is disproportionate and unacceptable, will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, contrary to national guidance protecting green belt, more appropriate alternatives yet to be considered including those near infrastructure improvements such as UKC/HS2, area suffers from severe congestion, and housing will compound issue and increase rat running, local rail stations are too small and have inadequate parking, loss of popular recreational and amenity area and wildlife habitats, unlikely to meet need for smaller homes, and should look at alternative of smaller sites across Borough.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Scotow [3147]			Q15/13	<p>This area is used by many residents in this area of Shirley and is a direct benefit to the local community.</p> <p>I am very concerned that once again South Shirley will be losing more of its pleasant characteristics for the benefit of other areas of Solihull.</p>
Jonathan Asbury [3171]			Q15/13	<p>This is a public amenity area that myself and others have enjoyed for many years. There are established colonies of Butterflies on these fields. Also grasshoppers, Roesel's Bush Cricket as well as a Badger sett on the boundary etc.</p> <p>If this area has to be developed, I hope that wildlife will be catered for within the project.</p> <p>People have to have somewhere to live, but do we have to be packed in so tightly, more vehicles means more pollution leading to health issues. Although not proven, the increase in dementia has been connected with exhaust fumes.</p>
Joseph & Anna Green [4713]			Q15/13	<p>The proposed allocation at site 13 does not appear to have been through out very well. Green space is being eroded at a great pace with little thought being given to the impact on residents' health and quality of life. There appears to be little thought for the impact new houses will have on the roads, schools, doctors and dentists. Where are all the people going to find these services? The impact on local roads will be awful with roads already being used as rat-runs.</p>
Julia Shelton [3766]			Q15/13	<p>negative impact on our community such as increased traffic problems, loss of green space and impact upon schools and services such as doctors etc.</p>
Julian Cook [4463]			Q15/13	<p>The proposed development at Sites 4 and 13 will exacerbate the traffic congestion on Haslucks Green Road, already causing gridlock in peak times following the Asda development and with the Powergen redevelopment to come, as occupiers will use Asda and/or route to Solihull/Birmingham so the road infrastructure is inadequate to support this level of development, and will remove green belt further from Shirley.</p>
Julie Betts [3173]			Q15/13	<p>Object to these developments, which will mean the whole of Shirley South being engulfed with further housing instead of lovely countryside, will make existing traffic congestion and noise much worse, will result in loss of recreational green space, and for which there is inadequate school places or opportunities for expansion.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julie Jones [3659]			Q15/13	Object to housing sites in Shirley as unfair that 41% of new houses are proposed on Green Belt land adjacent to Shirley when other areas are more suitable, the developments will be on top of the huge increase in new homes in recent years and local infrastructure, including roads such as Bills Lane, schools and medical facilities will be unable to cope, the area is overdeveloped and very busy so the adjacent Green Belt is vital in bringing many benefits to the area.
Julie Lomas [3179]			Q15/13	We kindly request that Housing Site 13 South of Shirley be retained for public use. This public amenity area is well used amongst the local community and is especially important for an area that has such a low provision of open space and parkland. Please reconsider other areas which are more logical infill sites and not used by the public.
Julie Trevis [4377]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Infrastructure will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Disruption would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Well-used by locals for recreation and children's play.</p>
K G & H E Bushell & Cooke [4752]			Q15/13	<p>Appreciate there is a need for housing.</p> <p>Object to this site as:</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p> <p>Infrastructure could not cope: existing heavy congestion on roads, impact on doctors and schools.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Loss of privacy for residents on Woodlands estate.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
K J Hewitt [4733]			Q15/13	Object to housing proposals for Shirley as infrastructure of area will not allow this intensity of development and needs more consideration, most of new residents will need to use Blackford Road, which is already seriously affected by traffic from Dickens Heath and retail park and has been closed on a number of occasions for repairs due to damage to sewers, and plans are likely to change so that improvements may not end of being delivered.
K Neale [4085]			Q15/13	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair and particularly Site 13, as will result in loss of recreational facility and wildlife area, exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed, and contrary to national policy protecting green belt as other options for growth have not been explored or investigated.
Karen Spriggs [3963]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Negative impact on local community to lose this green space. Regularly used.</p> <p>Recognise housing shortage, but extending existing built up area will harm community health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Unfair to put 41% of new housing next to Shirley.</p> <p>Supporting infrastructure will have added negative effect in terms of traffic, schools and doctors.</p> <p>Burden of central government targets needs to be fairly shared across Solihull Borough, including the more affluent areas.</p>
Karen Swan [3249]			Q15/13	Concerned that development will impact negatively on the local wildlife and lead to the loss of green space.
Kate Edwards [3285]			Q15/13	<p>object to the level of housing being proposed for Shirely, since this will lead to a loss of green space, destruction of the local wildlife, and deterioration of air quality.</p> <p>it will also add to the pressure on existing infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Katherine Parkinson [3358]			Q15/13	site 13 objection as it will lead to a loss of green space for local residents and wildlife. existing pressure on road and health care.
Katie Brown [3159]			Q15/13	We love walking along side those fields towards the canal from our home on Woodlands Lane, it's one of the reasons we love living here. It is massively beneficial to health to walk in the country side and we currently have this on our doorstep. Please do not take this away from us.
Kay Agostinho [3266]			Q15/13	objection to the large scale of development in Shirley and environs.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Kay Wilkes [4000]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>DLP states housing should support new infrastructure; but HS2 not stopping anywhere near proposed developments.</p> <p>Need to exhaust alternatives before building on Green Belt.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Very popular recreation and amenity area.</p> <p>Important for local wildlife.</p> <p>Boggy areas and risk of flooding.</p> <p>Houses won't be affordable.</p> <p>Is self-build in the Plan?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kelly Maskell [3954]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Existing high levels of traffic in area. Safety concerns for children on foot on way to Lighthall School.</p> <p>Increased housing will exacerbate traffic volume and have highway safety implications.</p>
Kim Cowie [4399]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Accept requirement for new housing.</p> <p>Object to 2,550 homes in close proximity in this area. Unfair distribution of housing across the Borough.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues, especially Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane junctions.</p> <p>Loss of Green belt.</p> <p>Loss of well-used green space, for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Need for more opportunities to exercise.</p> <p>Shirley Park too far.</p> <p>Agree with TRW site and Blythe Valley and possibly Dog Kennel lane.</p> <p>Consider more housing going towards HS2 hub.</p> <p>Impact on highway infrastructure, medical facilities, doctors surgeries, Solihull hospitals.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kiri Monksfield [4386]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Extra traffic from developments will add to existing congestion.</p> <p>Any through roads would cause major disruption to residents.</p> <p>Schools and hospital already overstretched.</p> <p>Pointless to put houses on other side of Borough to HS2. Consider building on the NEC.</p> <p>Consider smaller developments in pockets of land or brownfield sites, rather than Green Belt land.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/13	<p>Whilst in a sustainable location there will be impact on Green Belt and coalescence between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
L M Mallender [4292]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of view of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of access to green space for exercise for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of dog walking places.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Plans don't seem to account for impact of required extra educational and medical facilities or extra traffic implications to the already local busy roads with access to the A34 and M42.</p> <p>Not an ideal location.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHLAA Site Ref. 41, includes much larger area than land proposed. Category 2 for development. Less than 10% of site within a LWS. Less than 50% affected by heritage assets. Grade 4 agricultural land.</p> <p>States that development would undermine existing Christmas tree orchard business.</p> <p>Recognises that developing entire site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p>
Laura Buckley [3174]			Q15/13	<p>We kindly request that Housing Site 13 South of Shirley be retained for public use. This public amenity area is well used amongst the local community and is especially important for an area that has such a low provision of open space and parkland. Please reconsider other areas which are more logical infill sites and not used by the public.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Laura Townsend [4216]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Objection on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of green belt in unacceptable - inappropriate for 41% of allocation is Shirley south - congestion already present on existing roads, which is only to increase - impact on schools and medical facilities, - local rail stations and associated parking are inadequate for amount of housing proposed-
<p>Lauren Bosworth [3998]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection. Detrimental to local community and way of life.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Increase in crime rate in Dickens Heath since new development been finished.</p> <p>HS2 already destroying other parts of local countryside.</p> <p>Council object to new developments in the Green Belt, why treat one house different from over 2000?</p>
<p>Laurie Allen [4338]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Support Site 13.</p> <p>Increased cost of housing in this area, sought after location.</p> <p>Majority of objectors are living in relatively new houses.</p> <p>New development has been tasteful, does not feel like a concrete jungle.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
LAYCA - Lighthall Area Community Centre (John Shaw) [4678]			Q15/13	<p>Specific concern regarding the need to maintain the public amenity area and ensure measures are put in place to reduce any adverse impact on the existing residential estates.</p> <p>Additional pressure on already congested roads.</p> <p>Request that if site 13 is to go forward the existing public amenity space is retained and enhanced as a recreation facility; no secondary vehicle access onto the Woodlands and Badgers Estates; retention of the widest possible gap between site 13 and Dickens Heath; provision of affordable housing for families with local links.</p>
Lee Durant [3495]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure inadequate.</p> <p>Development will add to traffic congestion on Stratford Road.</p>
Lee Garfield [4567]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as local medical, school, emergency services and highway infrastructure already at capacity and increased provision essential, will impact detrimentally on local residents through loss of green belt, wildlife habitats and sports/recreational facilities, and should not be seeking to cram maximum number of houses into area most of which will be unaffordable by first time buyers or young families.</p>
Lesley Nightingale [4480]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as green belt has already been significantly eroded through creation of Dickens Heath, will result in loss of semi rural gaps between settlements, will put massive pressure on schools and medical services already in high demand, will add further traffic and pedestrians to already congested area that suffers frequent accidents with dangerous roads and junctions especially around Whitlocks End station, will result in loss of wildlife habitats and increased risk of flooding, loss of recreational areas essential for health and well-being, and there are brownfield sites, such as NEC that should be developed instead.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Moore [3488]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Three fields used by local dog walkers and walkers for access to countryside.</p> <p>Local infrastructure already stretched.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>
Lisa Howe [3357]			Q15/13	site 13 objection principally on the grounds that infrastructure is deficient
Lisa Turrell [3177]			Q15/13	We kindly request that Housing Site 13 South of Shirley be retained for public use. This public amenity area is well used amongst the local community and is especially important for an area that has such a low provision of open space and parkland. Please reconsider other areas which are more logical infill sites and not used by the public.
Liz Blakey [4688]			Q15/13	Desecration of countryside.
Liz Frampton [4197]			Q15/13	<p>Negative impact on existing residents health and wellbeing from the proposed developments. concerns cited include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - queues of traffic, on the school run or on the Stratford road and junction 4 of the M42 - trying to get a doctor, dentist, hospital appointment. - hoping your child will get into a school in this catchment, or into brownies or any other activity.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lorraine Saunders [4045]			Q15/13	<p>Loss of Green Belt. Not convinced that alternative options have been explored.</p> <p>The amount of development proposed for Shirley is disproportionate. It will completely change the character of the area from a semi-rural location to an urban sprawl.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion in the area will be exacerbated and will increase rat run traffic.</p> <p>Local rail stations are not fit for purpose and have inadequate parking.</p> <p>The area is important for recreation, wildlife and ecology.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Housing contracts should go to smaller companies using innovative methods, and promote self build and housing associations. Is this in the plan?</p>
Lucy Bower [3765]			Q15/13	objection to developing greenbelt/open space for housing as this would lead to a los of recreation space. it will also increase traffic and congestion on local roads.
Luke Farmer [3221]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Lynette Donohoe [3439]			Q15/13	<p>Additional residents would need access to already overstretched resources - doctors, dentists, school places, emergency services and hospitals.</p> <p>Solihull Council are being led by greed and are being short sighted about the impact of these new homes on the existing residents. Solihull is special thanks to the fact it has green spaces and woodland. It was always known as Urbs in Rure, the town in the country. If you start building on all of these green spaces then we will become another faceless town of new builds.</p>
Lynn Mullard [4401]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mairead, Kelvin & Harry James [3986]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Unfair to propose 41% of housing in this neighbourhood.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in Dorridge should be used.</p> <p>Housing White Paper states use Green Belt land as last resort.</p> <p>Public open space is valuable amenity to local residents for walking, keepign healthy and wildlife. No access to large parks in Shirley.</p> <p>Will impact on schools, doctor surgeries, traffic and pollution.</p>
Malcolm Edgington [3885]			Q15/13	<p>traffic congestion, loss of Christmas trees (increasing air pollution), lack of schools and doctors as well as inadequate services at Solihull hospital. Parking at Whitlocks and Shirley stations is insufficient, and there is increased on-street parking.</p>
Malcolm Lyons [3334]			Q15/13	<p>objection to the site on the grounds that it is well used and any new development will have an adverse impact on the infrastructure (physical and social) in Shirely</p>
Marcus Ham [4269]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as land is only direct access to countryside for thousands of people on adjoining estates and development would result in loss of valuable community recreation and amenity land and green space, area has already taken significant growth with Dickens Heath and infill developments which have been accepted but Site 13 is of significant local amenity value and for well-being and quality of life, and loss of natural environment and diverse wildlife habitats.</p>
Margaret & Michael Ereaut [4716]			Q15/13	<p>Object to building on public amenity land. Building on Green Belt is criminal. The Green Belt is sacred and irreplaceable.</p> <p>Air and noise pollution in Shirley is already very bad, especially in the vicinity of this site.</p> <p>Need to build the right types of housing in the right locations.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Margaret Chadderton [4743]			Q15/13	Unfair that so many houses will be in the Shirley area. Will only exacerbate existing problems with traffic. Pressure on schools and medical facilities. Other areas of Solihull should take their fair share.
Margaret Foreshew [3324]			Q15/13	objection to the inclusion of site as it is a well used space by local families and walkers for both leisure and pleasure
Margaret Lewis [4611]			Q15/13	Please take into account that all the housing you propose to put in our local community, will have a detrimental impact on our schools and doctors, it will create awfull transport problems along haslucks green rd. Bills lane Burman rd. Tamworth lane and Blackford rd.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Maria Williams [4365]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Pleased local residents have been consulted.</p> <p>Understand need for more affordable housing.</p> <p>Strong local feeling against development.</p> <p>Loss of public amenity area for recreation, health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Building houses in Shirley does not maximise benefit of HS2 whilst protecting our environment.</p> <p>Insufficient open space and parkland in Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Housing White Paper says Green Belt should only be changed in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>41% of housing in area is disproportionate.</p> <p>Further strain on local infrastructure. Increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Not a place we would like Solihull to 'grow and develop to be'.</p>
<p>Marianne Fogarty [4395]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green belt.</p> <p>Disproportionate amount of housing, 41%, of new development in Shirley South area.</p> <p>Traffic increased significantly since last development in Dickens Heath were built out.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Marie Gray [3269]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Marie Kilgallen [4142]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as will replace semi-rural area with urban sprawl, no justification for deleting green belt as other options across Borough not fully considered such as sites around Airport, close to HS2 or dispersed across Borough, will exacerbate traffic on A34 and surrounding roads, develop on an area popular for recreation and amenity and of environmental importance, and together with other proposals for South Shirley will require new schools and medical facilities.
Marike & Matthew Downes [3337]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Mark Cadwallader [4312]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Understand need to find housing sites.</p> <p>Loss of green space and opportunities for recreation and sport. Impact on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Erosion of gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Shirley already heavily built up area with little green space.</p> <p>Add to existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Increase in CO2.</p> <p>Services won't be able to cope.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Mark Davies [4459]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>South of Shirley been allocated 2500+ homes; 41% of the Borough's allocation.</p> <p>Inconsistent with the spatial strategy and DLP policies.</p> <p>Fails to take into account impact on local services, infrastructure and the local community.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Lack of evidence that suitable alternatives been explored.</p> <p>Impact on existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools and GPs.</p> <p>Road and rail network at or near capacity.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 development.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation, children's play and health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p>
<p>Mark Gibbs [3475]</p>			<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Area is used by many people from local community for recreation and relaxation all year round.</p> <p>Mental and physical health benefits.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Hathaway [3330]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Over last 10 years traffic worsened due to Dickens Heath development.</p> <p>More congestion.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Lower quality of life in area.</p>
Mark Taft [3595]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing on site 13 due to loss of established Green Belt land, site too large and would be better replaced by smaller infill sites, impact on already congested roads within the Bills Lane area and beyond, loss of mitigating affect of fields and trees on flooding, density too high to protect important trees, which should be protected by TPOs, and additional planting, loss of wildlife and biodiversity and need for provision for wildlife corridors, impact of loss of countryside on health and well-being, community cohesion, recreation and fitness and lack of compensation/mitigation.</p>
Mark Thompson [3446]			Q15/13	<p>The sheer volume of new development around south Shirley is far too high.</p> <p>Local roads struggle to cope with congestion and development will exacerbate this and lead to more pollution and accidents.</p> <p>Pressure on local services including GPs and schools.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Access to open space improves physical and mental health and well being.</p> <p>The first 2 fields that face the housing on the woodlands estate should be left alone in their natural state.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Martin & Debbie Doyle [4412]		Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of green space for recreation. Loss of wildlife. Unfair allocation in this part of Borough. Will join up Dickens Heath with Shirley. Impact on local character. Increase in air pollution, further exacerbate transport issues, put strain on existing services. Should development not be closer to HS2 to prevent additional congestion on M42.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Martin & Sharon Rabbitte [4435]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>40% of all new houses being proposed in Shirley area. Should be more evenly spread across the Borough. Object to high density housing.</p> <p>Increase in traffic congestion.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Will result in urban sprawl and connecting Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Drainage issues</p> <p>Loss of green space and green corridors for recreation.</p> <p>Impact on community wellbeing and reduction in quality of life.</p>
Martin Painter [4522]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as South Shirley has already lost a significant percentage of its green areas to development with more in pipeline, and would result in loss of semi-rural environment undermining improvements to area.</p>
Martin Rowland [3149]			Q15/13	<p>To remove such a vast amount of green space would be detrimental to the local environment, as well as depriving residents of access to these spaces. An increased population would also negatively impact on local resources such as roads (with the accompanying pollution), public transport, schools, healthcare, and council services.</p>
Martyn Hanson [4718]			Q15/13	<p>The open land is vital recreation area for residents and its benefit cannot be underestimated in terms of physical and mental health and well being.</p>
Mary Davis [3297]			Q15/13	<p>development of this site will lead to mass overcrowding, removal of amenity space for the local community and suggest that alternative sites be sought in Dorridge</p>
Mary Webster [4601]			Q15/13	<p>- live in Dickens Heath and at one time it was a village but, there are so many houses/apartments now it's more like a town. We only have one school, a small Tesco store, no post office. I just find it ludicrous that there are even more houses going up.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Matt Ellis [4259]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of green belt, green space for recreation and walking and sports facilities, wildlife habitats, and will result in area becoming overcrowded with increased traffic and fewer green areas.
Matt Nightingale [4549]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as the roads are already congested and dangerous around Majors Green and natural habitat will be lost forever.
Matt Stapleton [4281]			Q15/13	Object to concentration of 2500 new homes in South Shirley area as iniquitous and disproportionate and should be more evenly allocated across Borough, would have a huge detrimental effect on already congested roads in area and put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport, and specifically to Site 13 due to loss of valued recreational area, impact on health of local people, loss of wildlife habitats, loss of trees with consequent impact on air quality and carbon emissions, loss of semi-rural gap between urban area and Dickens Heath and creation of urban sprawl.
Melvyn Oxland [4120]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as a resident of 36 years.
Michael Murray [3146]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Michael Bird [4161]			Q15/13	Whilst the need for further housing is recognised, object to housing on Christmas tree farm as the Shirley area has experienced enough development already, and additional housing will put greater stress on transport and medical services and other infrastructure in and around area.
Michael Corfield [3728]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13, as it provides an area of natural green space that is a valuable resource to current residents, and is extensively used by all ages. Since the reduction in size of Shirley Park, resources such as this have become much more valuable. Increasing the number of houses should not be at the expense of the quality of life.
Michael Pugh [4004]			Q15/13	I object to the proposal to extend the Badgers estate into the green belt - which the latest white paper indicates a presumption against encroaching. At times it can take a whole minute before I can cross Bills Lane due to the volume of traffic - another 600 houses will make this even more difficult.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michelle Kingston [4328]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Mike & Becky Ford [4198]			Q15/13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - significant detrimental effect on the semi-rural feel of the area. It would also be loss of sports facilities and good quality agricultural land - local road network is not able to cope with the additional houses and traffic - congestion on the local
Mike Stott [3178]			Q15/13	<p>We kindly request that Housing Site 13 South of Shirley be retained for public use. This public amenity area is well used amongst the local community and is especially important for an area that has such a low provision of open space and parkland. Please reconsider other areas which are more logical infill sites and not used by the public.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Emma Maybury [3416]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13</p> <p>We need these green spaces protected for generations to come, not built on</p> <p>We were guaranteed by the Council that the land would never be built on</p> <p>We do not need more houses, we need the green spaces, schools, GP surgeries and better roads</p> <p>On a floodplain</p> <p>Sewer stream running through it</p> <p>Is land saturated?</p> <p>Countless wildlife</p> <p>Strain on schools, doctors, roads, car parks</p> <p>Very little publicity</p>
Miss Hayley Marie Beck [4569]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of green belt land and beautiful green space used by adults and children for recreation and benefits of better life, loss on wildlife habitats, impact on local economy through overstretching of schools and medical services, and impact on road infrastructure which would cause major congestion and gridlock.</p>
Miss Nicola Jefferies [3705]			Q15/13	<p>site 13 objection due to the loss of open space and impact that it has on the users of the fields, the impact on infrastructure.</p>
miss Stephanie Archer [3793]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing site 13 as the open space is one of the most used in the area by all ages, and concerned that several drainage pipes have had to be replaced close to site 13 due to poor workmanship when the developments were built, so including the proposed housing site will put more pressure on areas that were not designed to take that much foul and surface water.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
miss susan turner [2965]			Q15/13	<p>objecting to the site (and the other 3 sites in the area as they) would lead to an increase in the congestion on the roads, impact negatively on the quality of residents lives and put pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p>it would also not be accessible or contribute towards HS2.</p>
Miss Tessa Hartles [4404]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of countryside view.</p> <p>Additional pollution.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion.</p> <p>Devalue our homes.</p>
Mr & Mrs Abbotts [4492]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will increase traffic on already overcrowded roads around Whitlocks End station which are dangerous for children and pedestrians, result in loss of green belt and wildlife habitats, increase pressure on already oversubscribed schools and medical practices leading to degradation of services, and loss of pitches will impact sports facilities for schools and clubs.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Tony & Jacky Barnes [3145]			Q15/13	<p>The open space is a valuable community amenity.</p> <p>We understand the need for additional housing but feel those proposed are excessive and will be of severe detriment to the existing area, residents and local wildlife and potentially a drain on the local services (bus services, Doctors Surgery emergency services).</p> <p>Impact of additional traffic.</p> <p>Flood risk.</p> <p>At least, retain the amenity area between Woodloes Road and Baxters Green as this is of great benefit to all local residents and for any potential new residents when any new housing is completed.</p>
Mr & Mrs Vernon & Phyllis Brookes [3181]			Q15/13	<p>Object to site as the amount of housing in the vicinity has almost doubled already including loss of some green space, and whilst there is a need for housing, locating 41% of the housing proposed in Shirley is much too high, will exacerbate already horrendous traffic, take away Green Belt land and an important recreational bridle path on the edge of the countryside.</p>
Mr & Mrs Bakewell [4726]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will exacerbate already intolerable increase in traffic and pollution associated with Dickens Heath.</p>
Mr & Mrs D & L Davies [3260]			Q15/13	<p>site 13 objection</p>
Mr & Mrs D & L Davies [3260]			Q15/13	<p>Have a number of concerns that the development will impact negatively on the existing infrastructure (roads, etc)</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs M J & J R Whittingham [4221]			Q15/13	site 13 objection on the basis: - will lead to a loss of recreation fields - traffic on bills lane and surrounding roads is gridlocked - allocations in Shirley are heavily weighted and each area in the borough should share fairly - pressure should be put on Birmingham Council to use all of its brownfield land.
Mr & Mrs Martin & Claire Calkeld [3217]			Q15/13	Objection to site 13 for the loss of fields in the area and impact on transport infrastructure
Mr & Mrs Richards [4026]			Q15/13	The area is an important public amenity, well used by the local community. Impact on wildlife Increased traffic. Impact on local services and facilities.
Mr & Mrs Simons [4614]			Q15/13	Congestion and Traffic are being given as the main reasons for objecting to development in Shirley.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Wells [4461]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play. No other green spaces within 0.5 mile of Bills Lane.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Detrimental to visual amenity.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing congestion on local roads.</p> <p>Schools, doctors and hospitals oversubscribed.</p> <p>41% of new development within close proximity; not enough other areas have been considered or proposed.</p> <p>Overcrowding.</p>
Mr & Mrs Woollard [4099]			Q15/13	<p>Object to proposals for housing Site 13 as results in loss of green belt land forever, 41% of housing allocation in one area is unfair, negative impact on community through loss of green space and resultant well-being, increased transport problems on already overcrowded roads, overburdening of schools and medical services, and will be poorly located in relation to HS2 interchange compared with areas in east and north of Borough avoiding congested A34 and M42. Proposals should be cancelled or severely scaled back and Site 13 in particular scrapped.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr A Jeffs [4708]			Q15/13	Object to housing in Dickens Heath/Shirley as will require vast amounts of expenditure on improving existing infrastructure to prevent an environmental disaster, with traffic congestion on unsuitable roads already from overdevelopment of Dickens Heath and restrictive bridges, flooding affecting land and roads, loss of green space. Developers should be required to build cycle paths on roads and Stratford canal and new parkland as well as improving roads and drainage.
Mr Alex Lukeman [3387]			Q15/13	<p>Object to the loss of available public amenity land adjacent to Woodloes Road, Baxters Green and the Badgers Estate.</p> <p>This is a valuable breathing space both well used and a buffer between this part of South Shirley and the ever developing Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Road infrastructure will need detailed consideration as it is already under pressure.</p> <p>Funding for public transport schemes is unlikely to be forthcoming given tight public expenditure controls.</p>
Mr Barrie Stanyer [3641]			Q15/13	Object to housing proposals for South Shirley as 41% of new allocations in area is iniquitous and disproportionate and should be shared more evenly, and particularly Site 13 as additional homes would have detrimental effect on already congested roads especially at peak, school start/finish times and weekends, put intolerable strain on local schools, medical services and transport, loss of recreational facility for health and well-being, loss of wildlife, removal of trees and impact on air quality, pollution and carbon footprint, loss of gap between urban area and Dickens Heath and destroy semi-rural feeling with urban sprawl.
Mr Chris Gibbs [3313]			Q15/13	The proposed housing on site 13 (South of Shirley) will deprive the local community of the only area in Shirley where it is still safe for dogs to be exercised off-lead on public land, as well as affecting a much appreciated wildlife area. Combined traffic impact from sites 4,12 and 13 (which all have high green belt scores) will make A34 Stratford Road between Marshall Lake Road and M42, already extremely congested, nightmarish. Coming so soon after the halving of Shirley park for development, it feels as if Solihull's motto should be changed from "Urbs in Rure" to simply "Urbs".

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Everitt [4441]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Retain and enhance existing amenity fields and Green Corridor to the bridleway, with access to Bills Lane, the Canal and countryside beyond.</p> <p>No secondary vehicle access roads via the Woodlands or Badgers Residential Estates.</p> <p>Seek a faire distribution of housing across the Borough (not 2550 in South of Shirley area).</p> <p>Should retain a wider Green Belt buffer between South Shirley and built area of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure motto.</p>
Mr D Gregory [3253]			Q15/13	<p>Do not consider that housing should be delivered in Shirley as the area has already seen significant development in recent history, leading to increased traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Support delivery of affordable housing, but do not state whether level in DLP is the right one or not.</p>
mr david moore [3419]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Green space valuable to local people for recreation.</p> <p>Given by the Layca community association.</p> <p>Lots of wildlife.</p> <p>Stratford Rd to M42, and roads around Tanworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane etc congested at peak hours.</p> <p>Local services: schools, hospital, doctors, emergency services are stretched.</p> <p>Should remain Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q15/13	<p>Loss of open space and widely used community asset.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Impact on residents' health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of trees which capture pollution and improve air quality.</p> <p>Loss of separation between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Loss of semi-rural character.</p> <p>Will increase flood risk in area.</p>
Mr G E Leighton [3320]			Q15/13	object o 41% of housing allocated in Shirley
Mr Graham Beck [3287]			Q15/13	object on the basis that the site 1) is used by the local residents to walk, dog-walk, 2) will increase congestion on the road network, with particular local roads badly affected,
Mr J Davies [2104]			Q15/13	<p>This green space is much-used by residents. It is the only land of its type in the area, and provides recreational space for children, dog walkers, walkers, cyclists and nature-lovers. The space was set aside specifically for residents when the area was built.</p> <p>Doctors, schools and road systems are already overloaded and would be unlikely to cope with additional development.</p> <p>Shirley residents feel "dumped-on" when there are no plans for the Catherine-de-Barnes, Knowle or Dorridge areas where space is more readily available. This is unfair seeing as there are already developments in Aqueduct Road/Solihull Lodge and the Powergen site.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Jeffrey Barlow [3138]			Q15/13	<p>Will be an eyesore if it goes ahead. We have a great view at the moment which we have had for 40 years. The house prices will fall in this area which we are not happy about.</p> <p>The infrastructure is at breaking point (schools and health services).</p> <p>Increased traffic and congestion.</p>
Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]			Q15/13	that Constituents views are taken into account
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Disproportionate concentration of housing South of Shirley.</p> <p>Threatens the wellbeing of the existing community through a loss of amenity and a significant strain on the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Parcels in this area perform highly against purpose A of Green Belt function.</p> <p>Risk of coalescence and loss of settlements' character.</p>
Mr Mark Howard [3788]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 12 as there will be a significant increase in traffic on busy roads that are extremely congested during peak periods leading to increased pollution and damage to roads already blighted by potholes, whilst the loss of green space and resultant impact on wildlife habitat will have an adverse effect on the quality of our life in Solihull. It would be nice to see more effort being made to uphold the borough's motto: Urbs in Rure, Town in the Country.
Mr Martin Holloway [4170]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of limited green space left between Shirley and the ever expanding Dickens Heath, and should consider alternative sites such as in Sheldon and Chelmsley Wood where more affordable housing could be provided.
Mr Martin Mynott [3811]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as destroys open land/public rights of way enjoyed by many - true countryside on our doorstep, which must be preserved and not replaced by narrow corridor of sterile parkland, existing residential roads (Blackford Road and Tanworth Lane) not suitable for extra traffic, and Blackford Road is already regularly closed due to sewer collapse - the already heavy traffic must be a factor.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Max Archer [3858]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as area should remain green belt, the infrastructure in and around Shirley cannot cope at present and no proposals to make changes to manage thousands of extra cars on already congested roads with increased pollution, medical services downgraded and remote, poorly located for public transport especially commuting to London, impact on water table will increase localised flooding, and area used for recreation and walking away from roads and vehicle fumes to benefit of health and wellbeing.
Mr Michael Hunter [3086]			Q15/13	We would not object to development of the land north of the Miller and Carter, as there would still be some green belt protecting the village on that side.
Mr Neale [4086]			Q15/13	Object to level of growth in Shirley South at 41% of new housing allocations which is disproportionate and unfair and particularly Site 13, as will result in loss of recreational facility and wildlife area, exacerbate congestion that affects A34 and surrounding roads including route to Solihull from Dickens Heath and causes use of side roads as rat runs, local infrastructure is inadequate with schools over subscribed, and contrary to national policy protecting green belt as other options for growth have not been explored or investigated.
Mr Neill Jongman [3118]			Q15/13	- site 13 objection as it is a popular recreation area is an asset to the area and is important for health, fitness and wellbeing. - will create traffic on surrounding roads
Mr Paul Bowkett [4707]			Q15/13	Object to housing sites in and around Shirley as concerned that the proposals do not take account of the impact of additional traffic on already overcrowded roads, and pressures on local and wider medical services and schools.
Mr Peter Seddon [2409]			Q15/13	This development will considerably reduce the open countryside between Shirley and Dickens Heath. This is contrary to the NPPF which seeks to retain individual communities and to resist coalescence of villages.
Mr Pravin Gadhia [3599]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 due to impact on environment and increase in traffic. Should be retained as open space.
Mr R N Moll [3610]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as insufficient infrastructure, roads, schools and medical facilities to cope with additional residents, it is already difficult to move off Baxters Green estate in peak times. There must be more land available that does not adjoin built up areas.
Mr Robert Anderson [3302]			Q15/13	oppose development on basis of what was said at the time that DH was in planning. Specifically that the fields would be retained as GB

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Robert Anderson [3302]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Mr Robert Wardle [3455]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of only Green Belt land left in Shirley.</p> <p>Lots of retail development in past 30 years.</p> <p>Will add to congestion on Stratford Road, Dog Kennel Lane and Bills Lane.</p> <p>Local services stretched.</p>
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>There is no defensible Green Belt Boundary. It represents a significant extension to Shirley's urban area reducing the green belt gap between the settlements of Shirley, Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath, Majors Green and Whitlock's End.</p> <p>The proposed scale of development on sites 4, 11, 12 and 13</p> <p>represents an over-concentration of growth in a small area which will cause the</p> <p>coalescence of settlements and adversely impact existing communities and infrastructure as well as landscape character and Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Stephen Carter [2941]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Schools already oversubscribed, how to accommodate 2500 new households?</p> <p>Dog Kennel Lane is either a standstill or a race track, exceeding speed limit of 40mph. Particularly congested at rush hour including surrounding roads. Traffic makes crossing roads difficult for pedestrians, especially Tanworth Lane towards Cheswick Green. Traffic on Tanworth Lane already increased since Mount Dairy Farm development.</p> <p>Previous correspondence with Council's Highways team about highway safety concerns.</p> <p>Privacy will be adversely affected.</p>
Mr Stuart Jenkins [3459]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of amenity and recreational land, and impact on wildlife habitats.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Unreasonable that 41% of housing proposal is located in Shirley area.</p> <p>Should be spread more evenly across the Borough.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2.</p> <p>Smaller developments of ca. 100 houses ensure variety and diversity.</p> <p>Lack of robust investigation of brownfield sites.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green space and amenity areas.</p> <p>Road infrastructure cannot cope with existing high volumes of traffic and congestion.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing parking issues, e.g. at railway stations.</p> <p>Increased flood risk.</p>
Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]			Q15/13	<p>Object to site 13 as green belt, Stretton Road onto Shotteswell Road is not able to cope with more traffic as it is too narrow for constant car travel, and the fields at South Shirley are also used by many dog walkers and provide public walking routes.</p>
Mrs Margaret Guest [3690]			Q15/13	<p>Significant reservations about housing on site 13, how close new development will be to existing properties, whether the existing amenity area and trees will be retained, loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of playing fields, the type, height and tenure of the proposed housing, insufficient schools and medical facilities for the new residents, unsuitability of existing roads for current levels of traffic, without additional traffic from development, the location of the access roads and whether it will have access through existing residential areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHLAA Site Ref. 41, includes much larger area than land proposed. Category 2 for development. Less than 10% of site within a LWS. Less than 50% affected by heritage assets. Grade 4 agricultural land.</p> <p>States that development would undermine existing Christmas tree orchard business.</p> <p>Recognises that developing entire site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p>
Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13, as increasing the urban sprawl onto what was supposed to be green belt land, so Shirley almost meets Dickens Heath seems to contradict everything Solihull is supposed to stand for.
Mrs Ashley Wilson [3255]			Q15/13	objection to the development of housing on site 13.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs C A Preece [4744]			Q15/13	<p>Disproportionate number of new homes proposed in Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Loss of green open space for recreation.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt; more development will result in urban sprawl and coalescence.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Will create significant traffic problems.</p> <p>Significant investment will be required for additional schools and medical centres.</p>
Mrs C Clarke [3258]			Q15/13	<p>Object to the level of development identified for Shirley per se.</p>
Mrs Carla Hughes [3228]			Q15/13	<p>There is a disproportionate number of homes allocated to the Shirley site without any clear and considered plans made to support and already strained local infrastructure.</p> <p>There is sufficient land to accommodate more property in North Solihull if ultimately the borough needs to maintain the number of homes. I find it difficult to accept the proportion of properties that Solihull needs to accommodate due to lack of space available in Birmingham. The amount if social housing allocation is also a paramount reason for my objection.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>2550 homes is large scale of development proposed for Shirley.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Overflow of vehicles from Shirley station car park onto neighbouring estates.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Health services under pressure.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Parkgate development resulted in loss of part of Shirley Park.</p> <p>Development in Shirley will not benefit HS2.</p>
Mrs Dawn Fearn [3689]		Q15/13	<p>Significant reservations about housing on site 13, how close new development will be to existing properties, whether the existing amenity area and trees will be retained, loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of playing fields, the type, height and tenure of the proposed housing, insufficient schools and medical facilities for the new residents, unsuitability of existing roads for current levels of traffic, without additional traffic from development, the location of the access roads and whether it will have access through existing residential areas.</p>
Mrs E Thompson O'Dowd [4557]		Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of well used natural green countryside area which was major attraction for moving to Shirley, thousands more houses will compound already severe congestion on A34 and other arterial routes, and could lead to decrease in quality of education as extra families stretch resources.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth March [4709]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of an extensively used recreation area which encourages people to take exercise, developments such as Dickens Heath are insensitive to area, will exacerbate already extreme levels of congestion on roads made worse by Dickens Heath especially at peak times, no confidence that adequate infrastructure will be provided as previous developments not provided for, loss of green belt areas will make Shirley a less pleasant place to live and undermine Urbs in Rure quality, and there are brownfield sites more suitable for development.
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q15/13	<p>Flooding issues and impact on surrounding land.</p> <p>The road system in Shirley (and the wider impact on Solihull) would not cope with the amount of homes proposed in such a small area.</p> <p>Sites 4 and 13, have no real bus services and local train stations are overcrowded. The proposed increase number of residents, will not be able to use the trains and will therefore increase car use.</p> <p>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt and nature.</p> <p>Impact on health and well being from loss of community space.</p>
Mrs J A Leighton [3321]			Q15/13	Object to level of housing proposed in Shirley.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Campbell [4322]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Existing congestion at peak hours.</p> <p>Constant stream of traffic from Dickens Heath to Tanworth Lane.</p> <p>Roads cannot cope with additional traffic.</p> <p>More pollution.</p> <p>Already overstretched health care system. Why A&E is flooded.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and health benefits.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure.</p>
Mrs J M Warder [3234]			Q15/13	assumed to be site 13 by location of home address, but could equally be applied to the other two sites in Shirley
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q15/13	<p>The proposed housing sites at the west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley should not be included due to the following reasons: loss of open countryside around the rural village of Dickens Heath; loss of the rural character of Dickens Heath; significant adverse impacts on the natural environment due to loss of ancient woodlands at Little Tyburn and Birch Leasow Coppice; significant negative impacts on the local biodiversity due to loss of hedgerows, mature native trees and ponds, and also potential for loss of habitats that support legally protected species including great crested newts, badger setts and bat roosts.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Joanna Holloway [3491]			Q15/13	<p>Object because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shirley is already a busy place - increase pressure on services (doctors) - traffic and congestion on high street and other local roads -
Mrs Judy Hill [3463]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of only direct access to countryside.</p> <p>Loss of areas for children's play and recreation.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Already lost a lot.</p> <p>Will increase strain on local services, schools, doctors.</p> <p>Already congested roads.</p> <p>Reduction in quality of life.</p> <p>41% of development is disproportionate. Should share more fairly.</p> <p>Loss of tranquility.</p>
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q15/13	<p>Far too many to be built on the green belt in the Shirley and Dickens Heath area. Also taking into account Blythe Valley and the houses already being built in Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green, the house numbers account for at least half are those to be built in Solihull. They should be spread out across the borough.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Lianda Roach [4673]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as will result in loss of recreational paths and area, trees and wildlife, and area should be conserved for its wildlife habitats.
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as reduces gaps between settlements contrary to the objectives of Challenge E, increasing urban sprawl and merging communities with consequent loss of identity, will impact on an area of biodiversity and habitat of value, an important area for local wildlife and valuable amenity space in Shirley that brings health and wellbeing benefits to the local residents and the area, inadequate infrastructure which cannot be mitigated, increase in pollution, and there would be significant effects on the water table in the area, both in terms of run-off and drainage.
Mrs Lion [4350]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Over 40% of new development planned in this area. Disproportionate.</p> <p>Already suffering from massive increase in traffic and transport.</p> <p>Doctor surgery on Stratford Road is overstretched.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Hard to see benefits of HS2 to Shirley community. Will be difficult to access new station.</p> <p>Congestion on A34 and M42.</p> <p>Keep local community informed. Don't want a repeat of Shirley Park.</p>
Mrs M Hughes [3268]			Q15/13	Agrees with the housing required, but would like to see it not built in an indiscriminate manner.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs M A Highfield [3162]		Q15/13	<p>Proportion allocated to Shirley sites too high, in particular site 13 is well utilised by the local community and important to remain as public access to footpaths and open area to wildlife.</p> <p>Not acceptable to use Solihull green belt areas and sports sites to compensate Birmingham shortfall.</p> <p>Proportionate allocation of social housing inappropriate and will alter to detriment the nature of established housing genre.</p> <p>Inadequate provision available for infrastructure to support increased population and necessitates movement for employment in other areas resulting in higher volume of traffic.</p> <p>Suggest moving higher allocations to North Solihull, Catherine de Barnes, Dorridge, Hockley Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs M Stewart [4298]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Understand need for extra housing, but traffic is horrendous morning and evening.</p> <p>Fields and bridlepath used for walking and getting to Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Dickens Heath traffic already causing traffic jams from Bills Lane to Shakespeare Drive and Tamworth Lane.</p> <p>Emergency vehicles can't get through Shirley as too congested.</p> <p>Need to build homes where they can widen roads.</p> <p>Not possible to accommodate all these houses and people.</p> <p>Parts of Earlswood have more space.</p> <p>Build some in Knowle and Dorridge they have bigger roads.</p>
Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing site 13 as moved to Shirley over 60 years ago because it was on the edge of Green Belt land, love the open fields which I have been walking on for over 60 years, forming a major part of life talking to old and new friends, which is very important to my health and welfare especially as I become less mobile.</p>
Mrs P J Roberts [4224]			Q15/13	<p>site 13 objection:</p> <p>- traffic and congestion</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]			Q15/13	<p>Increased housing would not sustain the attractiveness of the area or existing properties;</p> <p>Increased traffic would not assist tackling climate change;</p> <p>Increased traffic would reduce accessibility;</p> <p>Increased population would add pressure on local services;</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt;</p> <p>Increased flooding;</p> <p>New housing in Shirley area will not benefit HS2;</p>
Mrs patricia clayton [3792]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing site 13 as should retain the Green Belt between South Shirley and Dickens Heath and the field alongside Woodloes Road is a popular amenity.</p>
MRS REBECCA NICHOLLS [3789]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as inappropriate location for growth better close to HS2 Interchange and on brownfield land, area has already taken significant development with Dickens Heath, will have significant negative effect on residents, wildlife, trees and greenery, will increase volume, noise and danger of traffic on Haslucks Green Road in area subject to speeding, accidents, road rage incidents, additional people unlikely to walk to station due to poor quality pavements and increased parking, results in loss of countryside and rural walking areas, will increase pressure on overburdened schools and medical services, and will adversely affect property values.</p>
Mrs Rebecca Reade [3449]			Q15/13	<p>I strongly oppose the plans to build on allocation 13, woodlands area.</p> <p>This is a beautiful part of our town and used by many people as a recreation area, not to mention the amount of wildlife that reside there too.</p> <p>New homes would cause immense stress on the local area roads, schools and amenities. We moved to the area last year and were unable to get our son into the local school we chose due to over subscription. In a heavily populated area already, I do not think adding more homes is the best answer.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Ruth Neal [4301]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Dickens Heath growing at tremendous rate, no longer a village.</p> <p>Roads around Tidbury Green and Earlswood are in a bad state. Will only get worse.</p>
Mrs S Snook [4719]			Q15/13	<p>Object to the loss of public open space that is used by the community for recreation.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Increase traffic.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of the area.</p>
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q15/13	<p>objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - impact on health and wellbeing of existing community - loss of green/open/recreational space - increased pressure on infrastructure - future flood risk - taking so much habitat away in one go will decimate the eco system

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q15/13	Object to amount of development focussed on South Shirley as traffic congestion already extremely bad at peak times with traffic from Dickens Heath, will be compounded by extra housing on Site 13, Tanworth Lane junction and A34/M42 already suffering gridlock, will create extra pollution increasing health problems such as asthma, poorly located and inconvenient for train travel without using car to get to stations, where parking already oversubscribed, likely to be significant flooding risk as fields boggy and drainage overflows on roads, and will result in loss of recreational/amenity/wildlife area providing intrinsic benefits to local people which must be protected.
Mrs Shirley Minal [3604]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 as will result in urban area being joined up with Dickens Heath, urban area being further from countryside and devalue property.
Mrs Suzanne Sturdy [3487]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Fields have lots of wildlife.</p> <p>Lots of dog walkers use site.</p> <p>Keep our beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [3301]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - negative impact on the health and well being of the local population - unfair amount of housing allocated to Shirley - The plans to build 41% of houses in South Shirley will effect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * A loss of natural environment * An increase in traffic and pollution. * Policing * Schools * Open space for all to enjoy * Doctors surgeries
Mrs T Hughes [3209]			Q15/13	<p>Object to the allocation for site 13 - impact on quality of life, loss of local open space and increase in traffic.</p>
Mrs W Murphy [3474]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Lived on Bills Lane since 1993 and seen a large increase in traffic, mainly due to building out of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Pressure on traffic will increase from further homes being built at Dickens Heath, Wythall and Tidbury Green. Insufficient capacity for 600 further homes.</p> <p>Concerned about loss of open space.</p>
Ms C Morerwa [4710]			Q15/13	<p>Do not have concerns about our beautiful local area. I am happy to live here and wish all the best for the future.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Louise Taylor [3443]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Roads will not cope with extra traffic.</p> <p>Not enough school places.</p> <p>Doctors overstretched.</p> <p>Houses won't be affordable but overpriced like Dickens Heath.</p>
Ms Mary Gilligan [3547]			Q15/13	<p>Object to the size of the build.</p> <p>The population in Shirley will be left with virtually no green belt - the Council have already built in our park - how is this taking our well being into consideration?</p> <p>The infrastructure is already at capacity thanks to the Dickens Heath development, how much more do you expect Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Road etc. to take?</p> <p>Both Shirley and Whitlock's End railway stations car parks are packed to capacity</p> <p>How do you propose stopping even more landlords from buying property which ends up empty like so many existing properties in Dickens Heath?</p>
N T Clayson [4147]			Q15/13	<p>Object to concentration of 2550 houses in close proximity to South Shirley as unfair and should be distributed across Borough, with wider green belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath, the existing amenity fields and the green corridor to the bridleway, with access to Bills Lane, the canal and the countryside beyond retained, and no secondary vehicular access roads via Woodlands or Badgers estates.</p>
Neil Jones [4667]			Q15/13	<p>Object to site 13.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Neville & Sue Walker [4022]			Q15/13	<p>Impact on transport infrastructure in Shirley. Will increase existing traffic congestion and queues.</p> <p>Parking at the railway station is impossible in peak periods.</p> <p>The impact on schools and health services will be seriously affected if these proposals go ahead.</p> <p>This is a further loss of Green Belt land in Shirley. These public open spaces are vital for the area.</p>
Nicola Burton [4130]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as although there is a housing problem this is not the answer and will change Shirley's character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, roads which are already racetracks will be unable to cope, medical services will be oversubscribed, rail facilities/services are not fit for the increased numbers that will need to use them, loss of green belt, wildlife and recreational area for children.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Nigel Barney [4583]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will change character of area.</p> <p>Alternative sites not been explored before release of Green Belt.</p> <p>Will not benefit HS2 as too far away.</p> <p>High levels of existing congestion on local roads.</p> <p>Public transport not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Schools and doctors oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded and Heartlands a long distance.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of flood storage.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and community benefit.</p> <p>Houses will not be affordable for young people.</p> <p>Sites 11, 12 and 13 in tight area will be disastrous.</p>
<p>Nigel Collett [4119]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Object to housing proposed for South Shirley, as development on this scale will cause the already massively congested roads in the area to become gridlocked, local rail stations do not have capacity for the extra demands with insufficient parking at Whitlocks End, Shirley and Earlswood at present, insufficient local infrastructure with lack of school places and medical facilities, will destroy many local amenities and recreational areas, including several sports fields, and local wildlife, and there are many more suitable alternatives including brownfield sites to the east and north closer the HS2 interchange.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Norman Hodgetts [4711]			Q15/13	Object to building such a large number of houses in one area. No consideration has been given to the effect on the Green Belt which will be eroded and see gaps between settlements close. Also the roads are at saturation point with the A34 at a standstill at times, leading to increased pollution.
Olivia Childs [3536]			Q15/13	<p>I disagree with the allocation of housing at site 13 - South of Shirley (between Whitlocks End Farm and Dickens Heath Road).</p> <p>I believe this area should stay as it is. The roads would suffer and the area could flood as knock on effect.</p> <p>Please reconsider this allocation.</p>
P & D E Cooper [4457]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Impact on congested road network.</p> <p>Inadequate parking provision at nearby railway stations.</p> <p>Insufficient school places.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctor surgeries.</p> <p>Pressure on existing busy supermarkets.</p> <p>High concentration of development in Shirley area, which should be spread across the Borough.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHLAA Site Ref. 41, includes much larger area than land proposed. Category 2 for development. Less than 10% of site within a LWS. Less than 50% affected by heritage assets. Grade 4 agricultural land.</p> <p>States that development would undermine existing Christmas tree orchard business.</p> <p>Recognises that developing entire site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p>
Pamela & Roger Davis [3472]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13</p> <p>This area will have little parkland and open space if building goes ahead.</p> <p>Ask steps taken to retain and enhance existing amenity fields and green corridor to the bridleway, with access to Bills Lane, the canal and countryside.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Pamela Deakin [4406]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of Green Belt Loss of green space for recreation and children's play. Loss of wildlife. Existing congestion on busy roads. Local amenities will not be able to cope. Oversubscribed schools and doctors.
Pamela Hunt [4704]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of recreational area and wildlife habitats which should be preserved, and infrastructure in area is already failing, with schools and medical services oversubscribed.
Patricia Harfield [4767]			Q15/13	Retain 'Green Corridor' from Bills Lane to Sans Souci. Retain trees. Loss of open space for recreation and children's play. Loss of wildlife. Existing infrastructure inadequate; high levels of congestion.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Patrick McLarnon [3452]			Q15/13	<p>Objection Site 13</p> <p>As a family we enjoy walking along this area</p> <p>Local resources already at breaking point</p> <p>Traffic is beyond ridiculous at rush hour</p> <p>Addition of 600 houses will push the area to breaking point.</p> <p>Only real green area and will have a major impact on local wildlife and greenery</p>
Paul Balsom [4041]			Q15/13	<p>Any building work would cripple the road network around here which is already busy at peak times down Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road during school run and work rush hour times.</p> <p>Also green belt land was one of the reason we moved here so to see fields carved up for housing and having the potential for being overlooked and also security issues is very worrying. There is also significant wildlife there and this would affect that.</p>
Paul Brunn [4077]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as area has lost many acres of green belt land in recent years, being close to the countryside is a joy, there are surely other options for development and the area is already under strain with congestion on roads, for school places and medical facilities.</p>
Paul Haver [3395]			Q15/13	<p>The site is part of an established recreation facility that has been in use for many years.</p> <p>The site is Green Belt and must be retained to prevent Dickens Heath from joining up with Shirley.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul J Dufrane [4410]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Understand need for new housing.</p> <p>41% of new housing on Green Belt area south of Shirley.</p> <p>Should develop more suitable sites, including brownfield.</p> <p>Object to high density housing here.</p> <p>Road network cannot support this number of homes.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation, exercise and health & wellbeing.</p> <p>Will impact on community spirit in area.</p> <p>Not unused waste land.</p>
Paul R Kimberley [4722]			Q15/13	Object to housing proposals in Shirley due to loss of green belt and recreational countryside, and will exacerbate already ridiculous traffic congestion in Bills Lane and Tanworth Lane.
Paul Smith [3236]			Q15/13	Object to housing development in Shirely, citing that development would lead to additional pressures on existing infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q15/13	<p>Unfair for 41% of new housing to be located south of Shirley.</p> <p>Will completely change semi-rural character to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Will close gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of flood storage.</p> <p>Loss of amenity and open space. Well used community asset.</p> <p>Impact of increased traffic.</p>
Paula Fantham [4135]			Q15/13	Object to housing on Site 13.
Paula Price [4498]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as road network inadequate to cope with existing traffic and Haslucks Green Road suffers from speeding traffic and frequent accidents and additional housing will increase volume of traffic significantly putting safety of local residents at risk, Whitlocks End park and ride already full and public transport inadequate, area has taken significant growth in Dickens Heath and Shirley, increased pollution and health risks, loss of sports pitches used by active clubs and parkland/recreational areas and unclear these will be replaced adequately.
Pauline Daniels [3674]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 due to loss of Green Belt and the public amenity recreation fields provided by the Layca Community Association. Shirley has become so commercialised with car showrooms, too many supermarkets and out of town shopping with inadequate parking for employees, which cause the area to be totally gridlocked during peak times and high pollution levels. Loss of greenspace and wildlife habitat at Shirley Park and Green Belt including an unnecessary MSA, whilst Powergen has remained undeveloped. Family housing should be freed up by building elderly persons retirement properties, which would avoid building on greenfield land.
Pauline Dyer [4513]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as will exacerbate amount of traffic in an area already struggling at peak times and will result in loss of green and pleasant land used for amenity purposes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Pauline Meredith [3201]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Concerned about loss of wildlife.
Pauline Meredith [3201]			Q15/13	objecting to the allocation of site 13 in the DLP and a number of questions.
Pauline White [4195]			Q15/13	- main reasons is the increased traffic that will come with the developments - also concerned about the impact on the schools and medical provision - increased demand and impact on train stations at whitlocks end and Shirley
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/13	Whilst in a sustainable location there will be impact on Green Belt and coalescence between Shirley and Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.
Pete Rosie [4042]			Q15/13	The attraction that led me to purchase my home in this area over 30 years ago was to get away from congested estates like the one proposed and it's fair to say in doing so myself and many just like me have paid a premium house price for the privilege. For projects of this size I'm sure we would suffer many years of disruption in the most inconvenient of places. Shirley has regenerated enough for the time being!
Peter & Elaine King [3262]			Q15/13	site 13 - additional comments on wildlife
Peter & Elaine King [3262]			Q15/13	site 13 objection

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Holmes [4371]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and visual amenity.</p> <p>Disproportionate to put 41% of new housing in Shirley South area.</p> <p>Impact on local community.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p>
Philip Furze [3142]			Q15/13	<p>I have been informed that Solihull council is planning to build new housing estates within the fields adjacent to my property, and I would like to appeal against this. If the proposed housing estates are built I believe that local properties (my own included) would depreciate in value. While this is a major concern to me and my family, there is also the fact that these fields are an area of natural beauty, that many locals (again including me and my family) use to exercise, take dogs out and have a relaxing walk.</p>
Phillip Shakles [3440]			Q15/13	<p>The roads aren't much more than lanes in some parts, with narrow footpaths. Pedestrians have to step into the road to pass each other. The roads are heavily used at peak times and there has been several bad accidents in the area.</p> <p>The area is being over developed by property developers who will cram as many houses as they can into the area and Solihull Council who see green fields as £ signs.</p> <p>Will schools, doctors, hospitals and other services & amenities that are stretched now be able to cope? Are there Plans to improve these services and facilities?</p>
R Maull [3606]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing site 13 due to concern that access from Bills Lane, which already suffers from heavy traffic as a bypass for Haslucks Green Road, to get to the retail park, and during school start and finish times, will make existing residential area intolerable and undermine safety.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
R Reed [3682]			Q15/13	Object to housing sites 11, 12 and 13 as a disproportionate number of the Borough's housing requirement are targeted on the South Shirley area, development will destroy valuable green spaces which provide for healthy exercise and mental well being, the areas proposed, especially site 13, provide a green buffer between South Shirley and Dickens Heath and development will destroy the distinctiveness of individual communities, development will increase traffic significantly on country roads and loss of wildlife habitats.
R Thompson [4290]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Green fields will be replaced by houses and roads. Fields are irreplaceable.</p> <p>Loss of drainage capacity of open land from hard surfaces, leading to local flooding.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Not benefit from the "trees breathing oxygen" as posted by Woods Farm Christmas Trees.</p> <p>Lose view of sun over green fields.</p> <p>No longer 'Urbs in Rure'.</p>
R W & J M Harbach [4705]			Q15/13	Object to the unfair distribution of proposed new housing with 41% in South Shirley area, which should be spread evenly across the whole of Solihull to allow amenities, schools and medical services to grow and necessary road improvements, and to site 13 in particular as will develop valued recreational area, exacerbate traffic congestion already increased with Dickens Heath development and which has led to massive increase in traffic using Bills Lane.
Rachel Critcher [4058]			Q15/13	Object to new housing sites in Shirley and specifically Site 13 as there is inadequate infrastructure, with the roads in the area, especially Haslucks Green Road gridlocked for much of the day, medical practices at breaking point with delays in appointments, and schools oversubscribed and children having to travel further from home. Should use brownfield rather than green field sites or ensure infrastructure is right before any development.
Rachel Williams [4535]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as unfair, loss of fields will cause eyesore, will cause huge disruption and pollution.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ragni Gilbert [4613]			Q15/13	I fully support Allocation 13
Raymond Evason [4229]			Q15/13	- shocked, and very worried about the sheer scale of the proposed building of over 2,500 houses between Dickens Heath, and Majors Green - semi rural aspect of the area will be turned into a town - increase in traffic, pollution, and noise
Raymond Wong [3450]			Q15/13	Object to the proposed 600 homes at allocation 13. I do not believe that we have the necessary infrastructure in place to support such a huge increase in population. On top of that I do not feel that current beautiful piece of land should be used for housing. The land should continue in its present state and be open to the public.
Rebecca Frampton [4028]			Q15/13	Loss of valuable public space, which helps to maintain the health and well being of the community. Will result in further congestion on the roads. Impact on local schools and doctors surgeries. Impact on wildlife.
Rebecca Rowland [3127]			Q15/13	Beautiful green land around a built up estate, somewhere to go for family walks, to escape the noise of traffic and car fumes. You wish to add to the world's pollution and destroy habitats for our wildlife. Why? There is insufficient infrastructure to meet the needs of a burgeoning population, which will make access all the more difficult. We need housing, but not at the cost of reduced quality of life. Find somewhere else. This decision will likely affect the local house prices in a negative way.
Richard & Ruth Wise [4501]			Q15/13	Object to amount of housing proposed in South Shirley which involves massive overdevelopment that is disproportionate and will result in loss of breathing space and qualities that make Solihull a desirable place to live.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Bailey [4095]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as overall proposals for South Shirley amounting to 41% of housing allocations are disproportionate and out of step with demands for HS2 development in NE of Borough, threaten to overwhelm current road, transport, schools and medical services infrastructure, being on top of current developments at Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and BVP, will impact on local residential roads that cannot sustain significant increases in commuter traffic and are already rat runs and will require significant increase in local public transport, educational and medical services.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/13	Relocate Light Hall school to site 13 to include some playing fields and a formal park as well as some housing. Similar to the approach proposed for Arden Academy in Knowle. Use the existing school site for residential development.
Richard Cowie [4276]			Q15/13	Object to the concentration of new housing around south Shirley and unfair distribution across the Borough compared with areas such as Meriden and Dorridge, as Dickens Heath contributes to traffic congestion and impacts on wider area especially around Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane at peak times, highway infrastructure inadequate and will need reviewing, medical services already oversubscribed and will need improvement, and loss of accessible green space well used by local residents with alternatives too far to walk to.
Robert Hopcraft [3653]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 due to loss of Green Belt and associated health, recreation and natural habitat benefits, taken together with Sites 11 and 12 is too much, unnecessary and unwarranted, will exacerbate existing traffic congestion on Tanworth Lane with attendant tailbacks, will impact on local amenities and services, and there are other areas around Solihull that can accommodate more and a fairer share of new homes.
Robert Street [3904]			Q15/13	Preferable to Site 4 in Dickens Heath, but only if suitable infrastructure was provided to prevent exacerbating traffic etc issues in Dickens Heath village.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Robert & Doreen Warnock [4445]</p>		<p>Q15/13</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Understand Government have set targets.</p> <p>Excessive amount of development in one area.</p> <p>Will schools and doctor surgeries be expanded or new ones built to meet increased demand?</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded, will be inadequate to meet new demand.</p> <p>Local roads only 'B' class.</p> <p>Existing congestion. What measures are planned to ease traffic flow?</p> <p>Many prime building plots been allocated for 'Senior living'. Could have gone for family homes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Stafford [4398]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>41% of new development in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair. Consider impacts on local community.</p> <p>Object to Solihull taking 2000 homes from Birmingham's housing requirement.</p> <p>Four allocations (4,11,12,13) will have detrimental impact on already congested roads.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of open space for exercise, recreation, dog walking. Detrimental to health and wellbeing. Government trying to promote healthy living through exercise.</p> <p>Impact on schools, GPs and other local services.</p> <p>Solihull hospital and Heartlands already under pressure.</p> <p>High density housing not in-keeping with surrounding areas.</p>
Robin Hill [4621]			Q15/13	<p>Allocation 13 is the exact opposite and I oppose its use for housing. It is a valuable green space for recreation, nature and acting as a buffer between Dickens Heath and Shirley. Unless the previously planned 'Shirley Relief Road' is reinstated it is difficult to see it offering any improvement in the already busy traffic in the area. This allocation in particular would cause Shirley and Dickens Heath to merge into a mass of over-corded small local roads and housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Roger & Valerie Godwin [3496]		Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>41% of additional housing in 1 square mile of Shirley South.</p> <p>Already major house building projects in area.</p> <p>Gridlock on Stratford Road and feeder roads.</p> <p>Poor road network.</p> <p>Bills Lane is not a road, traffic problems all times of day.</p> <p>Major impact on schools, doctor surgeries, local hospital, roads, parking.</p> <p>Shirley station cannot accommodate additional parking so people park on local roads.</p> <p>Impact on environment and additional pollution.</p> <p>Impact on quality of life.</p> <p>Existing lack of amenities, including reducing Shirley Park and loss of trees for development.</p> <p>Impact on Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Roger Buckley [3161]			Q15/13	<p>The site is one of the few areas remaining where countryside can be enjoyed within the Solihull district to the west of the M42.</p> <p>The fields are well used by the community and it is important to preserve an area of land which is available for the existing community.</p> <p>The fields are also home to much wildlife.</p> <p>Please preserve this area, not just to preserve the quality of life of the current people living in Shirley but also for the future generations. We need to preserve this remnant of countryside for the benefit of all.</p>
Roger Lock [4112]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as part of destruction of green belt land around Shirley, as developments at Parkgate, Powergen, the relocation of Shirley library, Sainsbury and KFC have already made it a less pleasant place to live, and further development will exacerbate traffic on already crowded roads in the area, although traffic surveys are mostly done outside peak periods when the problems are worst.</p>
Roy Stiles [3286]			Q15/13	<p>site 13 objection</p>
Russ Townhill [4430]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>
Russell Trevis [3172]			Q15/13	<p>Object due to loss of informal recreational land used by walkers and dog walkers,</p> <p>loss of Green Belt land, inadequate infrastructure of Shirley to cope with the extra houses as the A34 is already congested, there are not enough schools in the area and the 2 schools in our catchment are oversubscribed, and there will be major issues for medical facilities in Shirley.</p> <p>Where are you proposing to re site all the football fields you are planning on destroying?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q15/13	<p>Disproportionate number of homes south of Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Added pressure on infrastructure: schools, medical and social support, transport.</p> <p>Reduction in quality of life.</p> <p>Loss of amenity land.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of Urbs in Rure character.</p> <p>Development won't benefit HS2.</p>
Ruth Amor [4270]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of valued recreation and community amenity area, proportion of housing growth in such a small area which has already taken massive development at Dickens Heath, impact of additional housing on local schools, medical services and transport, loss of well used recreation ground, loss of diverse wildlife habitats, unsuitability as low lying boggy and subject to flooding, already significant congestion affecting A34 and surrounding roads, including Blackford Road which has structural issues, and a massive loss of conservation and recreational area used by many children.</p>
Ruth Walmsley [3294]			Q15/13	<p>objection to site 13 on the basis that it will lead to increasing pressure on existing infrastructure.</p>
S A Neale [4721]			Q15/13	<p>Object. The area will be overdeveloped with plans for Dickens Heath and Dog Kennel Lane in the pipeline.</p> <p>Impact on local roads which are already congested. Impact on local services and impact on the environment and local wildlife.</p> <p>The land is Green Belt and also used for recreation which is important for health and well being. Impact on mature trees.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
S Ham [4126]			Q15/13	Whilst the need for more housing is recognised, object to the level of new housing proposed for South Shirley as 41% of Borough total is extremely unfair and should be reviewed, is shocking on top of significant development already allowed at Dickens Heath and elsewhere, local schools and medical services are already at breaking point and extra housing will put more pressure on infrastructure, loss of green belt and local green space accessible without a car especially the open fields on Site 13, and will exacerbate major transport problems on local roads during peak times.
S Volz [3276]			Q15/13	would like to have the open space retained and if development is to take place on this site, then would want to have 'green corridor' to the canal from existing residential area.
Sally Bull [3939]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of wildlife and endangered species. Little green space for Shirley residents and this area is very important to health and wellbeing of community.
Sally Hobday [4434]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of green space for recreation. Added to loss of Shirley Park as part of Parkgate schmee. Impact on local community.
Sally Wadhams [3356]			Q15/13	concerned about the loss of open space and impact on flora&fauna; increased traffic and pressure on local school provision.
Sandra & Andrew Campbell [4494]			Q15/13	Object to huge scale of housing growth proposed for 4 sites in South Shirley, which will have negative effect on community, result in loss of green space, and have detrimental impact on local roads, schools and medical services.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Downing [3587]			Q15/13	Objection to Site 13. Loss of wildlife Loss of open space. Loss of countryside character.
Sarah Allen [3316]			Q15/13	object on grounds that development will negatively impact on local community through a loss of local green area
Sarah Evans [3893]			Q15/13	Objection to building on Green Belt. Heavily congested area.
Sarah McGrath [4389]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of wildlife. Impact on local community. Loss of green space for recreation, children's play. Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools and GPs. If some land must be used for housing, suggest that part of it is kept for park or nature reserve. Ensure new schools and surgeries are built to meet increased demand, even before houses built.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Walshaw [4310]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>More cars</p> <p>Overcrowded schools</p> <p>Drs surgeries unable to cope</p> <p>Loss of greenbelt</p> <p>Loss of playing fields</p> <p>Loss of nature</p> <p>There are probably many more reasons against but I can't see a reason to support the building of so many houses.</p>
Sharn Hartles [4081]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as area has been used for recreational purposes for many years and has wildlife habitats, it provides a safe place for children to play away from busy roads.</p>
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as part of proposed 41% growth that is disproportionate and unfair, will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, contrary to national guidance protecting green belt, more appropriate alternatives yet to be considered including those near infrastructure improvements such as UKC/HS2, area suffers from severe congestion, and housing will be catastrophic and increase rat running, local rail stations are too small and have inadequate parking, schools and medical facilities at capacity, loss of popular recreational and amenity area under stewardship, wildlife habitats, flood risk, unlikely to meet need for smaller homes.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Sheryl Chandler [4179]		Q15/13	Support Shirley Heath Objection as 41% of growth in Shirley South is disproportionate and unfair and will change character from semi-rural to urban sprawl, should not take Birmingham requirement, loss of green belt not justified as other options such as urban area and brownfield not investigated, growth should be focussed on infrastructure improvements such as HS2/NEC, will exacerbate congestion on Stratford Road and surrounding routes, increase rat running, damage to Blackford Road and speeding made worse by Dickens Heath traffic, inadequate transport/school/medical infrastructure, loss of recreational/amenity and wildlife area, impact on flooding, development unlikely to meet affordable housing need.
Shirley & Peter Hansen [4690]		Q15/13	<p>The present infrastructure is inadequate to support the huge impact of the proposed housing on south west Shirley. GP surgeries and education provision is already over-subscribed.</p> <p>Question where the access points to the sites will be and the highway changes involved. Traffic is already increasing at peak times and can be hazardous for pedestrians. The existing roads cannot cope and this will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Site 13 is an isolated pocket of land only access through narrow residential roads.</p> <p>The site is Green Belt and will reduce the gap between settlements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q15/13	<p>Proposals account for 2,600 homes at sites 4, 11, 12 and 13. Disproportionate allocation of homes within Shirley/Dickens Heath area.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Already 200 homes built in Dickens Heath and consent for 200 in Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Gross imbalance of housing in this area compared to Dorridge, East of Solihull/Monkspath and west of Dorridge/Knowle.</p> <p>Likely infrastructure requirements are vague.</p> <p>Aims to satisfy housing need and retain Borough's character are contradictory.</p> <p>Densities are inconsistent.</p> <p>Propose only one of sites 4,12,13 are taken forward.</p>
Simon Heath [3403]			Q15/13	<p>Lists several reasons why development should not happen on this site. these include capacity of existing roads, loss of open space and impact of existing infrastructure.</p>
Simon Rogers [4011]			Q15/13	<p>The road network will not cope and will exacerbate existing congestion.</p> <p>The rail network will not cope with additional passengers.</p> <p>Impact on local schools.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/13	<p>2550 homes is excessive in the area.</p> <p>Seek to retain and Enhance existing open space and a green Corridor to the Bridleway, Canal, Bills Lane and the wider Countryside for health and well-being benefit of existing and future residents.</p> <p>Should be no secondary vehicular access to Woodlands and Badgers Estate.</p> <p>Affordable housing for local needs in Dickens Heath.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>2550 homes is excessive in the area.</p> <p>Seek to retain and Enhance existing open space and a green Corridor to the Bridleway, Canal, Bills Lane and the wider Countryside for health and well-being benefit of existing and future residents.</p> <p>Should be no secondary vehicular access to Woodlands and Badgers Estate.</p> <p>Affordable housing for local needs in Dickens Heath.</p>
Solihull Tree Wardens (Mrs Carol Henrick) [3853]			Q15/13	<p>Realise there is a need for affordable housing but the horrors of the intense building already in Dickens heath comes to mind. When building new developments there needs to be plenty of green space for children and adults to enjoy and of course we need to preserve as many of the existing trees as trees are essential to our well being. A mature canopy tree releases enough oxygen to sustain two human beings. Please with thoughtful planning we could provide a healthy environment where people can live.</p>
Sonia Woodbridge Oliver [4500]			Q15/13	<p>Object to amount of new housing proposed for South Shirley as area already suffers from growing congestion and concerned that pressures of thousands and new homes on local services, such as schools and medical services not taken into consideration, will result in loss of sports pitches and removal of recreational amenities and have impact on existing residents future.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stephanie James [3497]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Wonderful area, full of nature. Enjoyed by many locals.</p> <p>Lots of development already in South Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Feel the decision has already been made by the Council.</p> <p>Impact on local roads, schools and healthcare.</p>
Steve Brown [3160]			Q15/13	<p>This is a beautiful area of countryside enjoyed by most people who live in the existing estate. It provides a safe place to residents to walk away from traffic and to meet and chat with neighbours. It is also full of wildlife in particular a wide variety of birds most noticeable at dawn and dusk.</p> <p>We love to walk and run through this area to get to the canals and it is a big part of the reason we bought our house on woodlands lane. Please do not take this away.</p>
Steve Dyer [3361]			Q15/13	concerned about the increase in traffic on the local roads. Also concerned about the loss of countryside and the impact on environment from the new housing.
Stuart Wilson [3256]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
Stuart Wilson [3256]			Q15/13	site 13 objection.
Sue Hillitt [3199]			Q15/13	<p>Do not agree that Shirley site should be taking 41% of the housing as it would lead to higher levels of traffic and congestion in the surrounding roads (Bills Lane, A34).</p> <p>have suggested that Dorridge could be a place to look to build.</p>
Sunya A Phillips [4177]			Q15/13	Object to housing in Green Belt in South Shirley as green belt should only be used when other land not available, Haslucks Green Road is far too busy to take extra traffic, there are no footpaths in places and developments on this scale are ridiculous.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Susan Roberts [3451]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13</p> <p>Extra traffic on already busy roads and at junctions</p> <p>Inadequate doctor facilities</p> <p>Ever decreasing green belt between Dickens Heath and Shirley South</p>
Susan & Paul Knight [4235]			Q15/13	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Proposed development for Shirley South is ca. 30% of the total 6150 dwellings proposed in Solihull by 2033.</p> <p>Unfair distribution in one square mile of 68.8 square miles of the Borough.</p> <p>Added to new proposed care home by Sans Souci, Tanworth Lane.</p> <p>Why such a targeted area?</p> <p>Impact on local community.</p> <p>Negative impact on Green Belt openness.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and open space.</p> <p>Flooding impacts.</p>
Susan Bliss [3098]			Q15/13	<p>This beautiful piece of countryside is used and enjoyed by local residents and had been a cherished place to walk since the Stretton Road Estate was built many years ago.</p> <p>Unlike the park, it is an unspoilt, not manmade green space and the council should be protecting it not building on it. There are not many natural green spaces like this left in Shirley.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Susan Cook [4486]			Q15/13	The proposed development at Sites 4 and 13 will exacerbate the traffic congestion on Haslucks Green Road, already causing gridlock in peak times following the Asda development and with the Powergen redevelopment to come, as occupiers will use Asda and/or route to Solihull/Birmingham so the road infrastructure is inadequate to support this level of development, and will remove green belt further from Shirley.
Suzanne Murphy [3196]			Q15/13	site 13 objection
T Williams [4293]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Land is well loved and well used by many locals for recreation and dogwalking.</p> <p>Place to take children to play.</p> <p>Building in this area will create more traffic, pollution, fill up schools and stretch struggling medical centres.</p> <p>Object to development and detrimental impact on Shirley area and residents with regards to school standards, house prices and overpopulation.</p>
Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection & attached photo.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and community benefit.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Propose site as a community managed nature reserve. Would be fantastic for community relations and help bees and butterflies if convert fields to wildflower meadows.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]			Q15/13	<p>Realise houses need to be built in the area, but the site needs to be saved.</p> <p>The fields are used by people to enjoy the benefits of the countryside on the doorstep and are the last bit of common land left to the people of Shirley and act as a parkland. The fields also contain wildlife (monk jack deer, wild fowl, owls, herons and various amphibious creatures).</p> <p>Prone to flooding.</p> <p>Detrimental effect on the already heavy traffic.</p> <p>Site 13 to remain as green corridor.</p>
Terry Hughes [3143]			Q15/13	<p>Fields act as a floodplain. Promised that no further housing would be built on them.</p> <p>This part of Shirley is impacted by Dickens Heath and proposed development there.</p>
TG Autos sarah Guest [3447]			Q15/13	<p>The road systems (tanworth lane, dog kennel lane, dickens heath road & stratford road) can not cope with traffic as it stands already & is often grid locked in rush hour, the impact any further housing / traffic would have i cannot imagine. this area of fields is also home to a lot of wild life i.e deer, ducks, woodpecker, cuckoo, pheasant, etc. its also some of the only green space left for dog walking / recreation, plus a bridle path runs along side it which i use on my horse regularly.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHLAA Site Ref. 41, includes much larger area than land proposed. Category 2 for development. Less than 10% of site within a LWS. Less than 50% affected by heritage assets. Grade 4 agricultural land.</p> <p>States that development would undermine existing Christmas tree orchard business.</p> <p>Recognises that developing entire site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/13	<p>Review of evidence:</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt in significant location (GBA score 6 out of 12).</p> <p>Adverse impact on sensitive landscape character.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Impact on community facilities.</p> <p>Impact on existing communities and cohesion.</p> <p>SHLAA Site Ref. 41, includes much larger area than land proposed. Category 2 for development. Less than 10% of site within a LWS. Less than 50% affected by heritage assets. Grade 4 agricultural land.</p> <p>States that development would undermine existing Christmas tree orchard business.</p> <p>Recognises that developing entire site would result in coalescence of Shirley with Dickens Heath.</p>
Tina Ferran [4098]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as part of overall development of 4 sites in South Shirley as unsuitable for development, will have massive negative impact on community, destroy green space enjoyed by community, add to pressure on already congested roads within locality, and schools and medical services will be unable to cope with population increase.</p>
V Healey Gwilliam [4283]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as would result in loss of only direct countryside accessible for South Shirley residents, a valuable natural green space and recreational facility between urban areas, and an important habitat for diverse wildlife which should be verified by independent ecological survey, area has taken significant growth already including Dickens Heath and unreasonable for it to take 41% of the Borough's housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Valerie Bennett [4600]			Q15/13	Objecting to the site for the following reasons: - loss of green space/recreation for local population - increase in traffic on local roads - in ability if existing infrastructure to expand to cope with new demands
Valerie Lynes [4054]			Q15/13	Green Belt site. Any development will add to the traffic on these already overcrowded roads.
Vicky Exall [3248]			Q15/13	Objection to housing development at this site, impact on roads and need for higher level of parking in any new developments.
Victor & Christine Callow [3619]			Q15/13	Object to housing site 13 due to loss of well used and safe recreational footpath from Woodloes Road to Bills Lane, would exacerbate traffic and pollution in an already busy area, is unnecessary and too much given proposals for sites 11 and 12, and need for upgrading of road, traffic management and schools infrastructure.
Victoria Lynch [4353]			Q15/13	Site 13 Objection. Loss of Green Belt. Loss of wildlife. Impact on schools, doctors and traffic. Detrimental effect on our community.
Viv Smith [4670]			Q15/13	Object as disproportionate amount of housing in Blythe ward and will place excessive burden on small area, will reduce key gaps between urban area and Dickens Heath, and access to the countryside and recreational opportunities.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Vivienne & Maurice Hadley [4745]			Q15/13	<p>Overdevelopment in Shirley.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Government have reconfirmed their commitment to Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Important to protect amenity fields.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion, e.g. Stratford Road.</p> <p>Remember 'Urbs in Rure' motto.</p>
Wayne Taylor [4387]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of well-used green space.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of countryside.</p> <p>Loss of character.</p> <p>Suggest Site 13 is turned into a community park.</p>
Wendy Sharrard [4257]			Q15/13	<p>Object to housing Site 13 as will result in loss of green space used for recreation and for use by future generations when the nearest park is more than a mile away, local medical facilities are already struggling to meet demand, and will exacerbate traffic congestion on local roads.</p>
Wendy Sharrard [4331]			Q15/13	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Harm to local community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Yvonne Oxland [4114]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 as this is green belt and should be retained as a recreational and amenity area now and for future generations.
Zoe Murtagh [3083]			Q15/13	<p>Will ruin the character of Dickens Heath village and Shirley.</p> <p>Impact on local wildlife and leisure activities for local people.</p> <p>Flood risk issues.</p> <p>Increased traffic and future highway safety issues.</p> <p>Tythe barn Lane is too narrow.</p> <p>Would spoil the gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Farmland will be lost/</p> <p>Future parking issues.</p> <p>Will be a shortfall of playing pitches in the area.</p> <p>Could the Tidbury Green sites accommodate more development?</p> <p>Schools and doctors are at capacity.</p> <p>Devalue property.</p>
Zowie Vale [4279]			Q15/13	Object to housing Site 13 due to loss of last bit of green belt land in area, impact on wildlife, flora and fauna, impact on quality of life of local residents, and massive impact on local services which are already at stretching point.
Question 15/14 Arran Way, Smith's Wood				
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/14	Yes if its done sensitively. Arran way deserves well planned homes . not high density modern slums

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q15/14	support the allocation, but would wish to retain the park.
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q15/14	Site 14 - Arran Way I would support providing homes in this location, which is a good example of the kind of area they should be provided.
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q15/14	Support provision of new homes in this location, but would not support loss of new playground opened at Mull Croft in 2014. An error? If built on, then compensatory open space needs to be provided elsewhere.
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15/14	Using general boundaries is unhelpful, rather than the area to be developed. Arran Way includes areas of land with existing planning permission (so it is unclear whether there is a double counting of supply) and a recently built childrens playground. Propose that these and similar sites should either be designated as mixed use or the relevant areas of concern removed from the areas included within the site boundaries.
Question 15/15 Jenson House, Auckland Drive, Smith's Wood				
Big Local Group (Dave Dixon) [4732]			Q15/15	The field is important to the local community. It is used by a range of sports clubs to ensure young people stay active. It is an amenity for local children who would otherwise have to navigate a main road to reach other play areas. It would be detrimental to the Big Local Project - a key flagship community programme for the Borough. Concern about the loss of this important local amenity, particularly the social impact for local children having less opportunity to play and be involved in regular exercise. Request amending the plan to enable the field to be retained.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cars FC (Stacey Lanchester) [4735]			Q15/15	<p>Bosworth Field is used by the Cars FC to run football skills sessions for local children. If the plans go ahead the organisation would have to fold as there would be nowhere to move to and the chance would be lost to develop a local football team.</p> <p>The field is pivotal to the community and used to get children into groups and activities to keep them active.</p> <p>Request reviewing the plans to develop the field for housing and keep it for the community.</p>
Chelmsley Wood Colts FC (Craig Blaxland) [4728]			Q15/15	<p>Disappointed at the decision to use Bosworth Field for housing. The land is key to all the summer activities and pre-season activities. It provides a focal point for the community and allows the development of local players.</p>
Colebridge Trust (Alan Crawford) [4730]			Q15/15	<p>The area was selected for Big Local funding due in part to lack of local amenities in the area. To take away the asset would be a very discouraging message to send to local people.</p> <p>It would take away the opportunity to promote sport and physical activity in the area.</p> <p>Question whether a health impact assessment has been done.</p> <p>Could the site be developed in a different way with investment to provide changing facilities and an improved local facility.</p>
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/15	<p>Yes to building on brownfield but not the open space /sports ground. why does Chelmsley wood have to lose all its open space</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q15/15	<p>shortage of school places and planned new housing may require the land for expansion of the school.</p> <p>Auckland House and the green space are valuable community assets, contributing to the local wellbeing and health.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor D Evans [2240]			Q15/15	<p>I think the use of green space to build houses on is wrong.</p> <p>We have lost enough green space in the north of the borough.</p> <p>Enough is enough.</p>
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q15/15	<p>Site 15 - Jensen House / Auckland Drive</p> <p>The proposals for this site include the loss of a valuable community facility in Auckland Hall (essential to delivery of other core objectives); yet more loss of green space in an area that has suffered far more than its fair share of such already; and the loss of a potential school site which, given the amount of development in this area in recent years and the fact that schools are now full, will very likely be needed in the future.</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q15/15	<p>Residents petition including 97 (CHECK) signatures.</p> <p>Densely populated area with 1,500 properties.</p> <p>Since loss of local school, pupils have to travel out of area.</p> <p>Limited recreational facilities in the area.</p> <p>Big Local were given lottery funding to make a difference in community. Bosworth Field only place in area to hold events.</p> <p>Loss of open space for sports, children's play and recreation. Younger children do not feel safe at Lanchester Park.</p> <p>Existing parking issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q15/15	<p>Already densely populated area and more housing will put untold pressure on roads and facilities.</p> <p>Jensen House may need to re-opened as a school, shortage of places in NSRA.</p> <p>Auckland Hall a critical community asset.</p> <p>Green space and sports pitches used regularly.</p> <p>686 signature petition.</p> <p>Important for physical and mental health and well-being locally.</p> <p>Contrary to SMBC's Health and Wellbeing Strategy and Council's Strategic Plan.</p>
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15/15	<p>Concern about inadequate education places. This is the only site large enough for a new school. This site should not be allocated for housing but reserved for possible future educational use.</p> <p>Parts of the site are used for sports by several clubs and by the community for various uses.</p> <p>The housing could be on the built up part of site (unless required for education).</p> <p>Auckland Hall should be removed from the allocation and improved outside the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The sports field should be removed from the allocation and protected and designated as an area for sport and recreation.</p>
Mr Savio Dsouza [3022]			Q15/15	<p>Jensen House, Auckland Drive Smiths Wood. I object to the plan to build new houses there. My reasons are: There is a shortage of school spaces, parking spaces and open spaces for kids to play. At the old bosworth fields, kids have activities during summer/spring/autumn. People walk their dogs there too .Building new houses would be the wrong thing to do as the field is surrounded by more than a thousand homes as it is. There are different species of birds that come to feed there too.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Safe & Sound in Area 13 (Paul Gwilliam) [4737]			Q15/15	<p>Concern that the field, which is accessible to local residents will be lost. There is nowhere else for local football clubs to train or where Big Local can organise Fun Days, or for residents to have recreational use in a safe environment.</p> <p>Question whether a health impact assessment has been undertaken.</p>
Solihull Moors Football Club (Mike Turl) [4725]			Q15/15	<p>Concern at plans to develop Jensen House. The area is used for organised activities for young people across North Solihull including football and multi-sports opportunities. SolihullMoors Football Club is keen to find a permanent base in North Solihull and has identified Bosworth Field as a facility to potentially invest in to maximise its use as a local asset.</p> <p>Adjustments are needed to enable the field to be retained for community use.</p>
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q15/15	<p>Sport England are aware that work is currently underway on the completion of an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strateg(PPS).</p> <p>The PPS should be used to determine whether or not the playing fields proposed for allocation is surplus to sporting requirements by demonstrating that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment.</p> <p>If this cannot be demonstrated then the playing field or formal recreation land would need to be replaced with equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality.</p> <p>In the absence of evidence to justify the loss of sporting facilities, Sport England object.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Cars Area (Aimee Mallinson) [4203]			Q15/15	<p>Online petition (567 online signatures).</p> <p>Densely populated area with 1,500 properties.</p> <p>Since loss of local school, pupils have to travel out of area.</p> <p>Limited recreational facilities in the area.</p> <p>Loss of open space for sports, children's play and recreation.</p> <p>Existing parking issues.</p>
Question 15/16 East of Solihull				
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q15/16	<p>The 2012 SHLAA and SLP Inspector considered the site to be unsuitable.</p> <p>Site 16 conflicts with challenges C and E and objectives of Policy P7. Public transport is vital for the health and well being of the elderly community in the rural settlements.</p> <p>Would impact on traffic congestion and road improvements would detract from the rural character of the area.</p> <p>Local facilities will need to be provided but there is no firm commitment. No development should proceed unless facilities are put in place.</p> <p>The site includes listed buildings and there would be loss of sports pitches and impact on wildlife.</p>
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/16	<p>Major road works would be needed to prevent gridlock back onto Damson park way , hampton lane and the warwick road junction to the M42. proposed high growth at the A45 corridor from JLR / HS2 will have a massive impact on this whole road network between A45 and A41 & M42</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q15/16	<p>Whilst I recognise that there will be a number of residents in the area who appreciate this site as greenbelt, it also is located ideally for both access to the town centre, the airport, HS2 and JLR. I am concerned that a junior football club will be affected by this development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/16	site is ideally located to town centre, JLR, HS2. but valued as greenbelt by local residents. Nevertheless, should consider density and increasing to higher density could mean fewer sites needed (esp in Shirley)
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/16	Contrary to Green Belt policy and Council policy to protect 'urbs in rure' character, unsustainable location dependent on car travel, would harm attractive open countryside, remove opportunities for quiet recreation, loss of playing fields/sports grounds and drainage issues and impact on flood risk.
David Reynolds [4659]			Q15/16	Object to housing Site 16 as green belt land currently used for farming, Hampton Lane is already over capacity and cannot take more traffic, Field Lane is narrow and cars cannot pass safely, so access will be problem, will put huge pressure on roads schools, medical and other services, topography will dominate landscape/result in overlooking of properties in Hampton Lane and density likely to mean small rear gardens, must be brownfield land that is more suitable or land further east towards M42 which would affect fewer properties, and contrary to Solihull's motto.
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q15/16	Disagree with the East of Solihull development of 650 units as on green belt.
Frances Cook [4696]			Q15/16	Object to housing Site 16 as development of this scale would seriously damage the rural aspects of this area and the approach to Solihull from the motorway which is such an attractive feature, the loss of open green spaces and trees would increase pollution levels from road traffic and from the airport, and there is only poor public transport available, so development will need new and regular services provided.
Gill Jennings [3877]			Q15/16	traffic congestion, pressure on roads, loss of agricultural and sporting fields, changing the character of the local area along field lane, lack of schools, medical and leisure options are all provided as reasons for objecting the development.
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q15/16	Object to inclusion of housing site 16 as contrary to SHLAA assessment (reference 247) undertaken in 2012 which concluded that site should not be considered for development unless there are no suitable alternatives, it adjoins a busy commuter road subject to significant delays, lacks local infrastructure in absence of shops, surgery or schools, would bring urban area to within one field or 400m of Catherine de Barnes, and would result in loss of agricultural land and playing fields.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q15/16	Object to inclusion of housing site 16 as contrary to SHLAA assessment (reference 247) undertaken in 2012 which concluded that site should not be considered for development unless there are no suitable alternatives, it adjoins a busy commuter road subject to significant delays, lacks local infrastructure in absence of shops, surgery or schools, would bring urban area to within one field or 400m of Catherine de Barnes, and would result in loss of agricultural land and playing fields.
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/16	Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.
Jaswinder Loi [4107]			Q15/16	Object to housing Site 16 as will destroy the tranquil setting and views of green fields from Pinfold Road, will have detrimental effect on property value, will exacerbate already long queues resulting in gridlock and delays around Damson Parkway/Hampton Lane/ Yew Tree Lane, will put safety of children who play outside in road at risk, proposal for new school will not address shortfall in faith schools with long waiting lists where siblings may not get a place due to increased demand, and loss of wildlife.
John & Sue McMahon [3408]			Q15/16	<p>Objection to the inclusion of site 16 for a host of reasons. These include: loss of prime agricultural land, presence of a listed building, impact on health and wellbeing due to loss of recreational facilities.</p> <p>The site is within the Meriden Gap which is already under pressure and will reduce the gap between Catherine-de-Barnes and Solihull.</p> <p>Even with upgrading of Lugtrout and Field Lane the traffic increase will be considerable and will cause hold-ups on surrounding local roads.</p> <p>The size of the development will not be sensitive to local character and fail to enhance the area, contrary to Policy P19.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
John Elks [3389]		Q15/16	<p>Accept there is a need to provide houses but the development will reduce the gap between Catherine-de-Barnes and Solihull.</p> <p>Area is within the Meriden Gap and is Green Belt.</p> <p>Proposed road up-grading is illogical and will increase traffic cause congestion up to the lights on Solihull bypass.</p> <p>The speed limit is not adhered to traffic causes noise and pollution.</p> <p>The requirements for local facilities has not been addressed.</p> <p>Will change the character of the rural area.</p> <p>Potential loss of agricultural land and listed buildings.</p> <p>Green Belt policies have applied to existing homeowners who want to build on their own land.</p>
Jonathan Franklin [3200]		Q15/16	<p>Do not agree that this site should be considered for development as it reduces the gap between Solihull and CdeBarnes. Any improvements to the roads ie upgrading, will lead to a loss of the areas character.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julian Crook [4311]			Q15/16	<p>Objection to Site 16.</p> <p>Loss of open space for sport and recreation.</p> <p>Loss of views from properties on Lugtrout Lane.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt. Erosion of Meriden Gap. Supported by SLP Inspector's Report 2013.</p> <p>Damson Parkway meant to set Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impact on historical buildings and landscape.</p> <p>Contrary to policies P7, P8, P16, P17, P18 and P19.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
June Tyler [4215]			Q15/16	<p>site 16 objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic/congestion on Damson Parkway - concern over loss of playing pitches - a need for schools and doctors surgeries.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
K Sunner [4351]		Q15/16	<p>Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Excessive in size for the locality. Contravenes Policy P19.</p> <p>Schools and local surgeries oversubscribed.</p> <p>No guarantee that schools, public transport and health services will be increased.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land.</p> <p>Erode Green Belt gap between Solihull and Catherine de Barnes.</p> <p>Potential loss of listed building at Field Farm.</p> <p>Lugtrout Lane and Field Lane will need to be upgraded; will lose rural character.</p> <p>Loss of accessible recreational sports facilities. Already limited in area.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing traffic issues in area.</p> <p>Can meet housing need without using this site.</p>
Ken James [3669]		Q15/16	<p>Object to housing site 16 as would erode separation from Catherine de Barnes, breaches the Local Plan objective to protect key gaps, is in the recognised Meriden Gap which should be protected, there is no guarantee that required improvements in schools, public transport and local health infrastructure will be provided, will require significant highway upgrading which will not resolve congestion issues with continuing expansion of JLR, will change the character of the rural area, is insensitive to local character and involves loss of sports facilities contrary to policy P19 and health and well being, and effects Field Farm listed building.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/16	Main concern relating to this site relates to coalescence between Solihull and Catherine-de-Barnes.
Lorna Whitaker [4373]			Q15/16	<p>Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Lugtrout Lane and Field Lane are ancient rural areas.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of sports fields.</p> <p>Land Rover expansion has already resulted in loss of ancient trees.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of 'Urbs in Rure' character.</p>
M J Ferguson [4207]			Q15/16	<p>objection on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - surrounding roads will prove to be absolutely unable to cope and unfit for the increase in traffic - land is used as an "overflow" car park for the Spire hospital - upgrading of Lugtrout Lane and Field Lane will completely change the character of the area - Prime agricultural land will be lost - loss/erosion of the Meriden gap
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q15/16	<p>Already emailed comments.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q15/16	<p>the existing road infrastructure causes is congested and this will only increase with the development on this site.</p> <p>Also site contains sports pitches - which will be needed with the new housing.</p>
Mr & Mrs G P & M P Troth [3398]			Q15/16	<p>A number of reasons put forward in objecting to this site. These are pressure on road, schools and health facilities.</p> <p>Also concerned about the closing of the Green Belt between CdBarnes and urban area; loss of playing fields, farmland and listed buildings.</p>
mr andrew edwards [2957]			Q15/16	<p>Object to housing Site 16 as will destroy rural feel of area, encroach on critically important green belt, threaten the identity of Catherine de Barnes as a separate settlement, contradicts the findings of the SHLAA 2012 which rejected development of this site and which remain relevant, fails to guarantee additional school, health and transport infrastructure, and contravenes Council objectives on many fronts and the Government's White Paper directive against building on green belt land.</p>
Mr Cliff Dobson [3740]			Q15/16	<p>Proposed Mitigation:</p> <p>If approved, development should be restricted at the periphery. Provide significant buffer strips of undeveloped and landscaped to retain open aspect to minimise impact on existing dwellings.</p> <p>Section 106s should ensure additional infrastructure e.g cycle, pedestrian and vehicle routes, school, medical centre and encourage use of public transport.</p> <p>Field Lane is not a suitable access road for development, and widening would result in permanent loss of rural byway and ancient hedgerow. Could close road to traffic and access from Hampton Lane or Lugtrout Lane.</p> <p>Existing Green Belt constraint on existing properties should also be removed so can redevelop.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q15/16	<p>Despite loss of Green Belt, site is ideally located for access to town centre, Airport, HS2 and JLR.</p> <p>Low densities comparable to Catherine-de-Barnes, rather than higher densities at Damson Parkway, would be a waste of land.</p> <p>Higher densities would take pressure off land elsewhere in Borough, e.g. Shirley.</p> <p>May be worthwhile exploring viability of immediately adjacent land also in process.</p>
Mr Giles Cook [3867]			Q15/16	<p>Serious concerned about the proposal to allow a large housing development on site 16 which should be excluded as it is Green Belt land and its green belt status was defended by your own reports in 2012, building on these fields would seriously erode the Meriden Gap, Hampton Lane, Damson Parkway and Lugtrout Lane suffer from severe daily congestion at peak times and even if nearby roads are improved, these junctions could not cope with the additional traffic created by this number of houses.</p>
Mr Graham Roderick [3521]			Q15/16	<p>objecting to this site for several reasons, which include a loss of green field and agricultural land, loss of sporting/recreational facilities.</p> <p>also impact on road infrastructure will not be sufficiently addressed through the identified infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>concerned about convalesce between settlements.</p>
mr john florence [3553]			Q15/16	<p>Whilst need to provide for new houses, object to housing Site 16 as unsuitable due to loss of green belt, loss of historic hedgerows and trees along Field Lane/Lugtrout Lane, widening lanes will make traffic problems worse, access to site should be from Damson Parkway, and local schools and medical services oversubscribed so will not cope with increased population.</p>
Mr Mark Roberts [2967]			Q15/16	<p>16 - East of Solihull (between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton Lane). As a Solihull resident and as someone who works in Solihull, I totally object the proposal of 650 new homes. This number is far too large for the supporting roads into and around Solihull. I am more than willing to take time to show the necessary decision makers how the roads already struggle to cope during peak hours. Also I think it is a terrible decision to build on one of the few green belt sites in the heart of the town.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr Robert Spencer [3745]		Q15/16	<p>Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Appreciate need to increase number of homes.</p> <p>Loss of rural land.</p> <p>Solihull will lose its town in countryside appearance and more urbanised.</p> <p>Will lose key gap between urban areas and rural settlements.</p> <p>Local facilities already under pressure; seems no provision to increase these.</p> <p>Exacerbate already severe traffic problems caused by increased development at JLR.</p> <p>Upgrading Field Lane and Lugtrout Lane will cause loss of their rural nature.</p> <p>Potential loss of listed building at Field Farm.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land.</p> <p>Destruction of natural heritage.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife on and close to site.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q15/16	<p>The plan mentions 650 houses on the fields above Hampton lane and Pinfold Road. Taking the space available this would mean any houses built would be small, tightly crammed in and right up the rear gardens of existing houses. Given the established high quality housing on Hampton Road and Pinfold Road this would seem to be an wholly inappropriate development and would have a very detrimental visual, noise and environmental effect on owners of the existing houses as the current field is overlooked and provides a lovely view.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Concern that potentially hedgerows and trees will be removed.</p>
Mr W A Wood [3664]			Q15/16	<p>Object to housing site 16 due to the effect such a large high density development in the Green Belt will have on local environment, it will exacerbate traffic congestion and delays on Solihull Bypass, Hampton Lane and Yew Tree Lane especially during peak times, at JLR shift changes and town centre opening and closing times, additional residents cannot be added to schools and medical facilities which are already under great strain, and impact on existing unreliable foul sewage treatment facility prone to flooding.</p>
Mrs C Spelman MP [2073]			Q15/16	<p>Chairman of Parish Council has pointed out the proposed route for new junction off M42 will come very close to Catherine de Barnes village.</p> <p>Should wait to see how village is to be affected by new motorway exit road; likely it will require other changes to be made to east side of Catherine de Barnes.</p> <p>Could should look to protect the west side of Catherine de Barnes so that communities of Solihull and Catherine de Barnes do not coalesce</p>
Mrs Sheila Pittaway [4111]			Q15/16	<p>Believes that this site is subject to a deed/covenant (for sports use) from previous applications and questions whether the land therefore should be deleted from the plan. I would hope so.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/16	<p>Main concern relating to this site relates to coalescence between Solihull and Catherine-de-Barnes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Raj Loi [3132]			Q15/16	Object to Site 16 as will destroy tranquil setting/green outlook, detrimentally affect value of property, exacerbate traffic congestion/gridlock on Damson Parkway/Hampton Lane/Yew Tree Lane, make Pinfold Road less safe for children to play in, exacerbate shortage of faith schools/places and additional demand may lead to siblings being unable to attend same school, and lead to loss of wildlife and habitats.
Reverend G Michael Pearson [3589]			Q15/16	<p>Objection to Site 16.</p> <p>Avoid building on greenfield sites.</p> <p>Prefer land with low value and use.</p>
Russell Hogg [3235]			Q15/16	Objecting to the level/scale of housing being proposed for the site and feel that it is better suited for a lower level of housing, without quantifying what that level should be.
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q15/16	<p>Sport England are aware that work is currently underway on the completion of an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strateg(PPS).</p> <p>The PPS should be used to determine whether or not the playing fields proposed for allocation is surplus to sporting requirements by demonstrating that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment.</p> <p>If this cannot be demonstrated then the playing field or formal recreation land would need to be replaced with equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality.</p> <p>In the absence of evidence to justify the loss of sporting facilities, Sport England object.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Susan & Michael Avery [4542]		Q15/16	<p>Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Recognise housing shortage.</p> <p>Will have the Green Belt distance between Solihull and Catherine de Barnes.</p> <p>Contrary to Challenge E. Impact on Meriden Gap.</p> <p>Upgrading local roads will not resolve ongoing traffic issues or accommodate 650 homes. Contrary to Policy P8.</p> <p>Schools and GPs oversubscribed.</p> <p>Bus services do not comply with Policy P7.</p> <p>Seek guarantee that increased school places, health services and public transport will be provided.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities not accord with Challenge J.</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land.</p> <p>Potential loss of listed buildings at Field Farm.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/16	<p>Support allocation.</p> <p>Will meet the objectives of Growth Option G.</p> <p>Will meet national policy requirements to deliver sustainable development on available, suitable, viable and achievable land.</p> <p>Represents a logical sustainable eastwards expansion of Solihull.</p> <p>Town Centre has benefitted from number of improvements in recent years, allocation will help to secure its continued success.</p> <p>No known legal or physical constraints.</p> <p>Site was rejected as LWS in 2002.</p> <p>Part of site owned by Client (SHELAA 15), at former Pinfold Nursery Site, could be developed in first five years of plan period.</p> <p>Keen to be involved in concept masterplan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/16	<p>Agree with findings in Green Belt Assessment, Accessibility Study, Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Broadly agree with SHELAA except for erroneous reference to a LWS on-site.</p> <p>Disagree with statements in SA referring to LWS and potential loss of heritage asset.</p> <p>Size of the site would enable protection and enhancement of the setting of the Grade II Listed building within the site, adjacent to Field Lane, and the Grade II Listed building outside the site boundary.</p> <p>Site has clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Ecology is a 'soft constraint' according to SHLAA 2012, evidence that 6 LWS were lost beneath the Dickens Heath settlement.</p>
Tracey & Spencer Clark [3441]			Q15/16	<p>Woodland behind Pinfold Road should be retained as it provides a habitat for wildlife and provides privacy and security for residents of Pinfold Road.</p> <p>Concern that increased housing would further exacerbate the traffic issues on the surrounding roads.</p>
Trevor Desmond [4720]			Q15/16	<p>Object to housing Site 16 as contrary to green belt policy to protect gaps between settlements as will erode distance to Catherine de Barnes by 50%, area under pressure from large developments by Airport, NEC, JLR, new M42 junction, will exacerbate traffic congestion which with JLR will lead to gridlock, upgrading of Lugtrout Lane/Field Lane will destroy character, schools, public transport and local health services oversubscribed/inadequate, would result in loss of sports facilities contrary to local plan objective J and prime farmland, and size of development insensitive to area contrary to Policy P19.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Robert Gardner	GVA (Robert Gardner) [3700]	Q15/16	<p>Support for Site 16.</p> <p>Topography means it is obscured from viewpoints in surrounding area.</p> <p>Highly sustainable location; easy walking and cycling distance to Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Site in several ownerships.</p> <p>UKLD fully engaged with landowners and will promote as one comprehensive development.</p> <p>Progressing further technical work.</p> <p>Developable in early part of plan period.</p>
Question 15/17 Moat Lane/Vulcan Road				
Colin Davis [3352]			Q15/17	If the council depot and light industry move out where will they be relocated . will more green belt be taken elsewhere . Lode lane is a congested traffic corridor . the site would have to be carefully designed to avoid all the social and parking problems that wharf lane next door has experienced
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/17	<p>Concern about ability to bring forward current employment sites at this location within the Plan period and the potential conflict with the employment policy P3 on retention of employment land.</p> <p>Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option.</p>
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/17	<p>Concern about ability to bring forward current employment sites at this location within the Plan period and the potential conflict with the employment policy P3 on retention of employment land.</p> <p>Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option.</p>
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q15/17	Area 17 and 18 should not be included as they are already established areas and the infrastructure will have an adverse effect on the existing area

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Renewal Christian Centre [457]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/17	site 17 - Family church Centre and car park to be removed from allocated site plan
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/17	Appreciate that the Moat Lane depot might be a sensible site on its own if it were to be relocated, but the remainder of the allocation site is comprised mainly of relatively inexpensive buildings and yards which are necessary for so many business units. The Rural East around Balsall Common, Shirley and Dickens Heath need to be part of a balanced business site portfolio. Site 17 should not be developed for housing but left for employment use as these are lacking. Any housing numbers that it might provide should be distributed to small and medium sized sites.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/17	Concern about ability to bring forward current employment sites at this location within the Plan period and the potential conflict with the employment policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/17	Concern about ability to bring forward current employment sites at this location within the Plan period and the potential conflict with the employment policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/17	Concern about ability to bring forward current employment sites at this location within the Plan period and the potential conflict with the employment policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/18 Sharmans Cross Road			
A Naik [3995]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic - area already gridlocked at peak times. Been number of accidents at Streetsbrook Road/Sharmans Cross Road junction.</p> <p>Oversubscribed medical practice - At Northbrook need to book 3 weeks in advance.</p>
A P Saunders [4031]		Q15/18	<p>Increased traffic in an area that is already very busy at certain times of the day. This can lead to problems when keeping appointments at the medical centre and the high volume of traffic is a danger to pedestrians and cyclists, especially children walking and cycling to school.</p> <p>The character of the whole area will be put at risk with the inevitable felling of many mature trees, shrubs etc.</p> <p>The increase in population - most of the schools in the area are already over subscribed, as is the medical centre.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alan La Touche [4339]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility.</p> <p>Land deemed to be for sport use only in 2013.</p> <p>Developer has overcharged for grounds and prevented use of land for sport.</p> <p>Not well maintained.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of green space and trees will harm local character.</p> <p>Increased traffic will exacerbate existing congestion and parking issues.</p> <p>Alternative roads are not suitable for volume of traffic.</p>
Alex Edwards [4638]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of sporting facilities and impact this will have on the local community - increase in traffic and associated risk to pedestrians, esp young children - increased pressure/demand on schools and doctors - previously denied planning permission

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alex Gee [4167]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will result in loss of playing pitches and recreational facility when there is a critical shortage of pitches and facilities for matches and training in area, should be retained in line with policy to use for sport only with leaseholder forced to deliver to local community, loss of wildlife, exacerbate traffic congestion, pollution and gridlock at both ends of Sharmans Cross Road and development has previously been refused as site unsuitable and unavailable.
Alison Young [4029]			Q15/18	<p>Existing traffic congestion will be exacerbated which could have highway safety implications and increase pollution.</p> <p>Requirement for more parking will put pressure on on-street parking which is already problematic.</p> <p>Will not be in keeping with the local area and density will be at odds with surrounding properties. Neighbouring residential amenity could also be affected.</p> <p>There are not enough school places in the area and GP surgeries are overstretched . The development would put additional pressure on services.</p> <p>Sports pitches will disappear.</p> <p>Impact on trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>The site is not within accessibility criteria in the NPPF.</p>
Alistair Hayward [4520]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will increase detrimental impacts such as traffic leaving site early in morning and in evenings, will exacerbate traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road to Streetsbrook Road junction and affect safety of pedestrians and cyclists, will increase risks of flooding that has already severely affected rear garden, house electrics and floor joists, there is a lack of sports facilities in Solihull and participation rates are low so existing sites should be retained as sceptical would be replaced with equivalent facilities, impact on environment/TPOs, and schools and medical services at already at capacity.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alyson Guiel [3649]			Q15/18	Object to site 18 as insufficient primary and secondary schools for additional residents, medical facilities already struggling to manage existing demands which may mean more people having to travel further afield, will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and queues especially in peak times, and the existing facilities are enjoyed by many.
Amanda C Ball [4342]			Q15/18	Site 18 Objection
Amanda C Ball [4342]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Council said they would not sell freehold in 2013.</p> <p>Density out of character with area.</p> <p>Increased volume of traffic in congested area.</p> <p>Impact on pedestrians, e.g. schoolchildren, and cyclists.</p> <p>Pressure on local schools, doctors etc.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>None of above concerns appear to have been taken into account.</p>
Andrew & Fiona Gilyead [4402]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Contrary to the green nature of Solihull/damaging to the character of the area</p> <p>Inappropriate land use/loss of sporting facilities</p> <p>Increased traffic volumes</p> <p>Capacity of local services, e.g. schools</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew Cherry [4230]			Q15/18	object to the development for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - style and density will be different to existing local area - traffic situation will be worse, safety of people will be compromised and health affected by - more demand for on-street parking spaces - local schools are already full more pressure on them - some very old trees on the site. - loss of sports pitches - area prone to flooding - too far from Solihull town centre to satisfy accessibility requirements
Andrew Dellbridge [4653]			Q15/18	Site 18 Objection with photos of traffic Site 18 Objection for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of sporting facilities and impact his will have on the local community - increase in traffic and associated risk to pedestrians, esp young children - increased pressure/demand on schools and doctors - proposed development is not in keeping with the surrounding area/character

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew Harries [4160]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion, pollution and accident risk in Sharmans Cross Road at Streetsbrook Road and Woodlea Drive junctions and into Solihull especially at peak times during school terms, and congestion and risk on Streetsbrook Road in Birmingham direction in evening peak with use of service road by speeding vehicles to jump queues.
Andrew Robbins [4162]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as involves loss of sporting facilities and green space when there is a covenant for sports use and demand from a neighbouring club, unacceptable overdevelopment completely out of character with area and location, will exacerbate traffic and parking in already busy area increasing danger to pedestrians, schoolchildren and cyclists especially at peak times, and flooding in area, and will cause serious difficulties to Arden club through loss of parking and open outdoor aspect of club which could result in decline in membership and ultimate closure and loss of recreational facility.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Andy Talliss [4415]</p>		<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Previous applications been refused or withdrawn.</p> <p>Proposal will destroy local character; overdevelopment and 5 times density of local properties.</p> <p>Inevitable that 50% affordable homes will be over 2 storeys high leading to loss of light, privacy and overshadowing.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Understand the land is under a covenant to be used for sporting purposes.</p> <p>Appears that developers are circumventing covenant by moving tennis club.</p> <p>Pressure on oversubscribed services, i.e. schools, colleges, doctors, hospitals.</p> <p>Site not comply with P7 accessibility criteria on distances from amenities or frequency of bus services.</p> <p>Increase to existing flooding issues.</p> <p>Additional traffic and parking.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Angela Southall [3992]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Out of keeping with the character of the neighbourhood in terms of density of housing and suitability and may impact on neighbouring residential amenity.</p> <p>Will increase existing traffic congestion and impact on highway safety.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues will worsen.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility, particularly when SMBC stated in 2013 that this land would be used for sports use only and that the freehold would not be sold.</p> <p>Impact on TPO trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Local Schools and Doctor / Dentist surgeries are already full and oversubscribed.</p> <p>Distant from local amenities.</p> <p>There will be parking problems.</p>
<p>Anita Savin [3994]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>High density of proposed plans is out of character with existing houses. It will overshadow existing houses and create additional noise.</p> <p>Impact on schools and GPS, loss of green space and sports facilities.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p> <p>Increased congestion and impact on road safety as a result of additional traffic.</p> <p>The development will have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area and on the amenities of all who live in the neighbourhood.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Nunn [4261]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion, journey times and pollution especially at peak times, loss of sports ground will make already low participation in sport worse with consequent impact on health, additional population will increase pressure on schools and medical facilities, and development would lead to overcrowding and change the character of the area.
Ann Panaser [4390]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Further increase to traffic pollution and congestion at both ends of Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Congestion at peak hours.</p> <p>Black soot on plants and shrubs in front garden from traffic pollution.</p> <p>Will result in overcrowding, environmental and noise pollution, parking problems etc. More neighbour disputes.</p> <p>Oversubscribed GPs.</p> <p>How will local amenities cope with added population?</p>
Anna Belcher [4357]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. Already hazardous at times for schoolchildren.</p> <p>Consider impact on residents as well as commuters.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Anne Rudge [4046]			Q15/18	<p>Existing traffic congestion and parking issues will be exacerbated, detrimentally impacting on highway and pedestrian safety and increasing pollution.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities are already over subscribed. Further development will place an additional burden on those facilities.</p> <p>Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area and loss of Urbs in Rure.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p>
Anup & Minal Sodha [3987]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Existing road congestion, especially around Junior School. Development will worsen traffic and safety issues.</p> <p>Rugby ground is essential to sporting aspiration of local children. Should not lose this facility.</p> <p>Understand need for affordable housing, but this is a premium location. Affordable homes will be sold very quickly to private landlords and will not retain long term benefit.</p> <p>More appropriate to build affordable housing near to Bickenhill.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Arul & Lye Quen Hon Kanagarajah [4288]</p>		<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment.</p> <p>Will not provide sufficient basic amenities and lead to oversubscription of schooling, healthcare and recreational facilities. Unsustainable.</p> <p>Loss of existing sporting grounds which will not be replaced.</p> <p>Thought land was under covenant for sporting uses only.</p> <p>Loss of greenery and habitat for wildlife.</p> <p>More houses lead to more pollution.</p> <p>Higher risk of flooding within local area.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and lack of parking will affect local school and pre-existing residents. Direct impact on safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Understand good intentions of the Council to provide housing but this will have negative impact on local population.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Audrey C Nutt [4017]			Q15/18	<p>Loss of sporting facilities. The land site should remain in sporting use.</p> <p>Development would be out of character with surrounding area.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Impact on mature trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of parking at the Tennis club will increase parking on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Impact on already oversubscribed schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Does not conform with NPPF in terms of access to facilities.</p>
B B Tran [4186]			Q15/18	<p>Objecting on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - accessibility (not compliant with P7) - suitability/sustainability of the development - increased traffic - permanent loss of sporting facility - parking - restrictions on the land

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
B G Cheshire [4355]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic congestion. Existing infrastructure under huge strain, especially at peak times.</p> <p>Jams on all surrounding roads.</p> <p>Safety concerns for road users and pedestrians. Causes frustration, loss of productivity and pollution.</p> <p>Existing adverse impact of on-street parking by commuters to avoid car park charges or using public transport.</p> <p>Is there up to date traffic modelling and traffic impact study.</p> <p>What are the proposed access and egress routes?</p> <p>What are proposed mitigation measures?</p> <p>What are measures to consider side road parking and effect upon existing and future traffic flows?</p>
Bal Panaser [4124]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as development will increase existing air pollution, additional traffic and pollution is not good for local school, loss of sports facility is unacceptable and alternative sports user has been blocked by leaseholder, facilities must be retained to encourage young people and others to participate in sport, Council policy has been to retain site for sports use, and increase traffic adding to already high volumes especially at peak times.</p>
Barbara Dennis [4088]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18, as may affect the TPO between Arden club and houses to east, Council has indicated land should be used for sport only, there is a shortage of pitches in Solihull and prospective occupiers deterred by rent demanded, Arden club is vibrant active club with sufficient parking and assets for expansion, which would be lost if relocated, development is too high density and out of character with area and would be affected by floodlighting and noise, Sharmans Cross Road is already congested especially near school and Streetsbrook Road, and insufficient capacity in schools and medical facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Barbara Hall [4361]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Out of character with area.</p> <p>Increased traffic will exacerbate existing issues.</p> <p>Increase in pollution.</p> <p>Impact of traffic and pollution on pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>High demand for sporting facilities in area. Sports ground should not be lost.</p> <p>Should be encouraging sport participation from an early age.</p> <p>Obesity and other health problems rising. Solihull low in national league tables for sport participations according to Sport England.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Barbara Haste [3969]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Understood land is covenanted for sporting purposes only.</p> <p>If SMBC are leaseholders, why are they contemplating such a venture?</p> <p>Local football groups have approached the developers to rent a pitch and high fee has prevented them.</p> <p>Solihull has a shortage of pitches; under-represented nationally for over-16s. Continue to fall in national league tables.</p> <p>Area very congested.</p> <p>Added safety problem for pupils and parents going to school.</p> <p>Designated cycle route; cyclists would be more at risk from extra traffic.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Site 18 is 1700m from town centre and 1000m from station; exceeding NPPF requirements.</p>
Belinda Farrelly [3194]		Q15/18	<p>Object to the loss of leisure facilities at this site.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Access would be inadequate.</p> <p>Part of the site used as a sports and community facility. Allocation of the site in its entirety runs counter to the sustainable development objectives in the NPPF where the health and well-being of a community and the protection of existing community and recreational facilities are important objectives.</p> <p>It is inappropriate for land at Solihull Arden Club to be developed. Development on Solihull Arden Club site would be unsound as no evidence has been provided to justify the loss.</p> <p>Any required re-provision of sports facilities would raise viability and deliverability issues.</p>
Benjamin Hill [3966]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Parking already very disruptive on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Traffic already gridlocked at peak times.</p> <p>Consequent high pollution.</p> <p>Will affect highway and pedestrian safety and increase congestion.</p> <p>Too few sporting facilities in Solihull. Solihull has poor position in rankings.</p> <p>Density of proposal will destroy local character. Loss of light and privacy.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding issues.</p> <p>TPO trees.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Beryl Waters [4053]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Moving the Arden Tennis Club onto leasehold land means that the Club has lost its asset. Members are likely to go elsewhere making the club unviable.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility, contrary to Sport England policy.</p> <p>Loss of parking for the Tennis club will result in increase parking on the surrounding roads.</p> <p>Increased traffic congestion, noise and pollution and impact on cyclist safety on the designated cycle route.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Loss of TPO trees and habitat for wildlife.</p>
<p>Billy Mills [4007]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>This will be yet another greenfield taken by greedy developers to build more expensive homes, the cost of which will be out of reach of most ordinary people wishing to live in Solihull.</p> <p>There is already a shortage of sports pitches in Solihull.</p> <p>The site is not accessible to local facilities and will increase car use, thereby exacerbating existing congestion.</p> <p>Doctors' surgeries will not be able to cope with extra patients.</p> <p>Schools will be over-subscribed.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Loss of a designated cycle route.</p> <p>Drain on local resources and will ultimately add to noise and pollution.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Binoy Skaria [4064]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate already unacceptable levels of traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross and Streetsbrook Roads in peak times, with increased danger to children walking to/from school, and will affect the value of housing in the neighbourhood.
Bob Grainger [4566]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as need to protect sports fields and open spaces in the same way we need to protect the green belt, urban intensification has to have proper infrastructure including schools, medical services, transport and roads, and development will change character and social demographics of the area. Absurd that houses nearby are being enlarged then infill taking place with smaller houses.
Bob Martin [4008]			Q15/18	<p>It is of inappropriate scale and character for the locality and will place pressure on local education and medical services. it will add significant traffic pressure at the intersection of Sharmans Cross road and Streetsbrook Road, which is already becoming a problematic junction with risk-taking commonplace. it removes open space and recreation facilities at a time when the obesity/public health debate is top of the health agenda</p> <p>I feel sure that there are other places in the wider borough where this kind of development would be better suited.</p>
Bonita Lewis [4372]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic on Sharmans Cross Road gridlocked, particularly in the morning.</p> <p>Drivers go at excessive speed, and use Woodside Way as a cut-through.</p> <p>Will increase traffic problem tenfold.</p> <p>Put schoolchildren at greater risk.</p> <p>Increase in pollution.</p> <p>Need to build more schools, or increase funding to current schools. Already oversubscribed. Cannot let the current high education standards suffer.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Brian Savin [4024]			Q15/18	<p>The site is not as accessible as claimed. Distances to Solihull are understated and bus service frequency is overstated. This will increase car traffic and congestion along Sharman's Cross Road.</p> <p>This 'accessibility' is being used to justify high density which will be out of keeping with the area and neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Schools and doctors are already oversubscribed and what sports facilities will future residents use if yet another one is being taken away?</p>
Bridie O'Rourke [4047]			Q15/18	<p>Existing traffic congestion and parking issues will be exacerbated, detrimentally impacting on highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Need to retain the land for sporting use.</p> <p>Development would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.</p>
Briege Lawson [4143]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will increase traffic and have an impact on parking on Sharmans Cross road especially with the loss of 70 odd car parking spaces at Arden Club, density is out of scale and proportion with surrounding neighbourhood, Council policy is to retain for sports use and should be maintained for health and well-being benefits, will diminish natural habitats as trees removed, and exacerbate increasing flooding problems.</p>
C Saunders [4048]			Q15/18	<p>Will substantially increased volume of traffic in the immediate area and surrounding environment. There is already very heavy traffic at peak times flowing in and of Solihull town centre causing hazards to cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The amenities such as medical centres, utilities like water, electricity & gas will all be over stretched and lead to strain more than at present.</p> <p>The development will erode the character of the town which is much appreciated for it's environmental character and green living space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Carol Leech [4228]			Q15/18	<p>Reasons for objecting to this site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flooding, sections of sharmans cross regularly flood - impact on infrastructure (schools, doctors, dentists etc) - traffic increase will impact directly on local communities - local sporting facilities will be lost with detrimental impact on health
Carol Finchen [3494]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Flooding issues in nearby back gardens, water table is very high. New development would exacerbate surface water run-off.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues and pollution. 100 households could generate 300-400 new cars.</p> <p>Risk to pedestrians accessing Sharmans Cross Junior School.</p> <p>Loss of existing trees and hedgerows for wildlife.</p> <p>Local services already overstretched.</p>
Carol Johnston [4059]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will add 200 more cars to Sharmans Cross Road and local roads already dangerous due to traffic and parking, will result in loss of sporting facilities important for health and well being as recognised by the Council's own strategy and policy to retain the ground for sports purposes, and local medical facilities and schools cannot cope with additional residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Carolyn Ostler [4428]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic and road safety issues.</p> <p>Additional pressure for local amenities, including schools, medical centres, waste collection.</p> <p>Loss of parking.</p> <p>Can local bus services cope?</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>
Catherine Eaton [4003]			Q15/18	<p>Increased traffic - The roundabout with Danford Lane is already too busy at peak times. Further traffic would lead to severe congestion, particularly around school times. This would also lead to increase traffic pollution, which is a concern in particular for Sharmans Cross School.</p> <p>Environmental impact - the rugby ground and the surrounding hedgerows, trees and more natural areas provide an important habitat for wildlife, including badgers. The land also improves the local environment.</p> <p>Character of the neighbourhood - in order to fit 100 houses on this site the development would be significantly more dense than the surrounding areas.</p>
Catherine Williams [3650]			Q15/18	<p>Object to site 18 as would worsen already terrible problem with traffic around the junction between Stonor Park Road and Sharmans Cross Road gridlocked at times, will destroy the character of the neighbourhood with an out-of-scale and overdevelopment of the site, and should be retained for its intended use as sport only.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Charles Thomas [4572]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as overturning of existing policy to protect land for sports use not justified, retention of freehold exposes future occupiers to risks of ground rent rises and unsellable properties, does not meet accessibility criteria in NPPF, unclear where lost pitches will be replaced which is statutory responsibility, will worsen problems of flooding and loss of drainage area and extra load will require extra works, will impose additional loads on medical and educational services, will exacerbate traffic congestion and risks to school children at peak times, and not satisfied that all preferable brownfield opportunities have been considered.
Chris Smith [4411]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Loss of opportunity for children's play.</p> <p>Need to protect our open spaces.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Christine Greig [3975]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Scale and density of proposal are wholly inappropriate. Neighbourhood of mature, single dwelling family homes.</p> <p>Increase in noise, traffic and pollution on existing busy local residential streets.</p> <p>Increased danger to pedestrians, cyclists and road users.</p> <p>Parking chaos.</p> <p>Overlooking and lack of privacy for existing residents.</p> <p>Local amenities would not adequately support size of development.</p> <p>Solihull Council reneging on promises that rugby ground for sporting use only. Need more not less.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding issues.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Existing narrow single point of access off Sharmans Cross Road would be inadequate.</p> <p>Circa half of site is in regular use as a sport and community facility by the Solihull Arden Club.</p> <p>Allocation of land in its entirety is contrary to NPPF objectives on community health and well-being.</p>
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q15/18	<p>Does not agree that this should be used for housing in the plan period. would like to see it retained for sporting use.</p>
D G Dabner [4571]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 due to loss of sports facilities for local people and lack of capacity of local services such as schools.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
D J Walker [4682]			Q15/18	<p>Object to scale of development on Sharmans Cross Road. Local Infrastructure such as medical facilities and schools are already under strain. New houses will add to this.</p> <p>Existing flooding and drainage problems will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and parking problems will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility.</p>
D V Rawkins [4089]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as local infrastructure is inadequate and allocating further development would be irresponsible, school places and medical facilities are oversubscribed, development will exacerbate traffic problems on a very busy local through road and bus route with school and sports clubs where parking restricts carriageway and congestion backs up from Streetsbrook Road, will worsen existing flooding problems, loss of wildlife, loss of sports facility that Council has indicated should be retained for sporting use without adequate replacement, Arden club is not party to proposal and development must enable access and turning of refuse vehicles.</p>
Daniel Freville [4476]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as development will be out of character and scale with the local area, the density amounts to overdevelopment and is likely to impact on surrounding residents, will reduce already overflowing car parking for Arden club causing chaos on surrounding roads already suffering from school parking, will exacerbate congestion on Sharmans Cross Road and at Streetsbrook Road junction, and worsen flooding during heavy rain.</p>
David Paice [3985]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Object to additional access to proposal from Winterbourne Road. Would increase traffic on Beaminster Road and Winterbourne Road. Narrow roads unsuitable for construction vehicles and large amounts of traffic. Hazardous to cars leaving driveways.</p> <p>Main drainage system may not cope with extra load. Expensive pumping station was installed at Beaminster/Dorchester Road junction to prevent houses in Arley Road being flooded with sewage.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David & Patricia Vincent [3896]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Detrimental to local character.</p> <p>Impact on Tennis Club amenities. Moving it is illogical financially and logistically.</p> <p>Concern about extra traffic and increased pollution. Extra parking around school.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility.</p> <p>Over last 6 years several appeals at the site have been dismissed.</p>
David Chamberlin [4502]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as density is excessive, out of character with surrounding area, will have detrimental affect of privacy, noise and traffic and should be reduced, will exacerbate congestion on Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road already subject to gridlock at peak times and which displaces traffic on to other roads, increased traffic will endanger pedestrians and school children, will exacerbate already chaotic parking at peak times and when events take place, will impact on oversubscribed schools and medical services, will worsen flooding problems, and any potential access to Winterbourne Road would cause traffic chaos in residential roads.</p>
David Gee [4275]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as resubmission of failed application rejected as unsuitable, will have detrimental affect on local area through loss of recreational/sporting facilities in area short of suitable pitches, use should be retained in line with lease and covenant, will exacerbate traffic congestion and pollution at junctions at both ends of Sharmans Cross Road at peak times, density is out of character with surroundings and will require high rise overlooking properties, increased built area will worsen flooding in heavy rain, and will destroy rich natural break between built-up area and Pow Grove and displace/destroy wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Deborah Gould [3873]		Q15/18	<p>site 18</p> <p>Affordable houses will encourage young families but I have concerns regarding schools in the area, already struggling to cope with demand. Before building more homes shouldn't we look at the bigger picture and look at expanding schools or building larger schools.</p> <p>I am a professional Registered Childminder in the area and should encourage the build as it would promote work for myself, but I see the problems the families in the immediate area are facing.</p>
Deborah King [3437]		Q15/18	<p>The site has covenants regarding is use solely for sporting purposes.</p> <p>It would damage the existence of Solihull Arden Club and would impact on the club in terms of noise, access and parking.</p> <p>Would increase traffic within the surrounding area.</p> <p>Would impact on schools where there is lack of places and doctors.</p> <p>Lack of sports ground facilities for football and Rugby in the local area.</p> <p>Object to a land swap between the site promoters and the tennis club as this could inhibit future growth aspirations.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Derek Goodban [4204]		Q15/18	<p>Object to the sites inclusion on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - size, scale and density of development not in character with surrounding area. will lead to noise, loss of light, privacy etc - destroys green space used by local people - lack of sporting facilities in Solihull and in particular in central Solihull - covenant in place since 1969 for land to be used for sports/recreational facilities only - will result in increased traffic, pollutions and risk to pedestrians - potential increase in on-street parking - increase in flooding - pressure on social and medical infrastructure
Dick Andrewartha [3404]		Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will add to the already dangerous traffic congestion and situation at school arrival and departure times and with school and local business parking, increase safety risk for children walking to school, and medical services are oversubscribed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Dick Andrewartha [3404]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Development would further add to the traffic chaos and dangerous situation which is Sharmans Cross road at certain times of A.M. and P.M.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road and Solihull Road vary between a rat run and parking lot at varying times.</p> <p>With development currently on Woolmans site and the proposed Rugby Club site there is likely to be upwards of 250 or more vehicles joining the group.</p> <p>The road is too narrow for what is currently allowed to take place and any further addition of housing will create a more serious situation</p>
<p>Don Maclean [4180]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>The 'public open space' has been & still is most important to us.</p> <p>a shortage of football & rugby pitches in the centre of Solihull & wasn't this area designated for that & nothing other than that?</p> <p>Getting to the squash club at certain times of the day is already a nightmare, another 100 houses each with two cars would add to the traffic problem.</p> <p>do not have the infrastructure to cope with such an influx. don't concrete over our town, leave us some grass where people can exercise & enjoy sport in an area designated for just that</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Donald Berrow [4370]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities. Well-used.</p> <p>Increase volume of traffic onto Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road.</p> <p>Surrounding roads will be gridlocked.</p> <p>Extra demand on oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Other access routes will be danger to residents and children walking, cycling and skateboarding.</p> <p>Loss of trees and greenery.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Donald Haste [3588]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Previous planning applications refused.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sport use.</p> <p>Current rugby site not affordable.</p> <p>Loss of local character.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion, noise and air pollution</p> <p>Insufficient local amenities - schools and surgeries.</p> <p>Long walk from train station.</p> <p>Loss of green area and wildlife.</p> <p>Build on brownfield sites for affordable housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Donna Ponsonby [4345]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Out of character with surrounding area.</p> <p>Severe traffic problems at Sharmans Cross Road, especially during morning rush hour and school run.</p> <p>Will cause traffic chaos.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrians, especially schoolchildren.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Council must seek to safeguard them.</p> <p>Should investigate why requests to use pitches by local clubs are being ignored.</p>
Dr Ajay Farmah [4554]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion at junction with Streetsbrook Road, put further strain on already stretched schools and medical services, be a serious misuse of intention to retain sporting facility which should be of benefit to younger generation and to promote activity, and development better suited to brownfield sites.</p>
Dr Eva Robbins [4700]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 which contradicts policy to retain high quality environment, green infrastructure assets and create better neighbourhoods, is out of character with area and isolated from local amenities, would result in loss of sporting facility and opportunity for other sports facilities of benefit to community when there is a shortage of good quality facilities which is killing off grassroots participation, there is no mandate for use given freehold restrictions, relocation of Arden club to leasehold land would be detrimental to its viability, and development is in direct contravention of Council's sporting and community objectives.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Jonathon Chard [4380]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Out of character with area. Density 5 times higher. Affordable/social housing change to residential character.</p> <p>Accessibility of development does not comply with Policy P7.</p> <p>Increase in traffic.</p> <p>Risk to safety of schoolchildren, other pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>increase in parking issues.</p> <p>Increased flood risk.</p> <p>Insufficient local services, e.g. schools and primary healthcare.</p>
Dr Nadya Polunin [4634]			Q15/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - will cause intolerable traffic misery and be a danger to pedestrians including the many children who use this route - development which is out of character with the surroundings will destroy trees and be an eyesore - increase in of human traffic in t
Dr Nigel Williams [4367]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Distance to station and other facilities is beyond limits for accessibility.</p> <p>Development will put pressure on parking in area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr P J M Sloan [4155]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as no infant school provision within 1 mile and there are no places available for older children at any level, no spare capacity at medical facilities, site poorly served by public transport, additional population will exacerbate severe traffic congestion and pollution especially during peak times and at Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction, will increase parking in nearby roads, further loss of sporting pitches when provision in Borough is poor and site is close to town centre, and site does not meet accessibility criteria.
Dr Phillipa Ann Roberts [3993]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of playing fields.</p> <p>High density of development (87 houses at last planning refusal).</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and mature trees.</p> <p>Increase traffic volume and exacerbate existing congestion.</p> <p>Likely accidents and potential fatalities. Lots of schoolchildren walk, bike and use scooters.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists on cycle route.</p> <p>Increased pollution.</p> <p>Increase in on-street parking and consequent dangers to pedestrians, cyclists and residents.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Insufficient local school places or GP vacancies.</p> <p>Will destroy Solihull character and encourage apartment buildings.</p> <p>SMBC should enforce use of land for community sports.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Dr Rebecca Kitson [3980]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Density 5x existing. Out of character for area.</p> <p>Increased traffic.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists and pedestrians, especially to Junior School.</p> <p>Extra congestion and parking.</p> <p>Already feel impacts several roads away from Sharmans Cross.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>SMBC renege on 2013 commitment to retain land for sporting use only. Should be reaffirmed to prevent inclusion of land in LDP.</p>
Dr Sarah King [4348]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic. Roads cannot currently cope. Congestion and danger to pedestrians, especially school children.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Arden Tennis Club well used.</p> <p>Understand several groups have tried to use sports pitch, but not succeeded.</p> <p>Increased pressure on local services and amenities, such as schools, GP.</p> <p>Appreciate need for new housing in Solihull, but this site is unsuitable.</p>
Dr Tarlochan Jheeta [3620]		Q15/18	<p>Object to housing site 18 which will exacerbate traffic congestion and gridlock and make the road less safe for children and parents walking or cycling to school, and further compromise parking at Arden sports club and highway and residents safety.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Tony Payne [3999]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Retain use of ground for sporting and recreational purposes. Club was accessible to all. Many local football teams need more pitches. Council need to support sporting use.</p> <p>Local traffic infrastructure already at gridlock at peak times. Slow traffic increases pollution. Increase delays to buses.</p> <p>Adverse impact on road safety. Main pedestrian and cyclist route; increase in cars will result in increase in accidents.</p> <p>Pressure on community infrastructure. Local infant schools are oversubscribed and cannot be extended. Nearest GP surgery 1 mile away. All add to parking and traffic problems.</p>
E D Vanes [4148]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as results in loss of sporting facilities on site earmarked for sports use at a time when obesity is acknowledged as a growing problem, over intensive density and inclusion of affordable housing makes proposal totally out of character compared with existing area, will increase vehicles accessing Sharmans Cross Road at peak flow times and hazard for children going to/from school, whilst junctions with Streetsbrook Road/Prospect Lane already strained, and on-road parking on nearby roads, and development will worsen drainage problems.</p>
Edward Trowsdale [3761]			Q15/18	<p>Objecting to the site as it would lead to increased pressure on schools and doctors, add to the existing flooding problems, increase traffic and congestion.</p> <p>the development will also lead to a loss of sporting facilities/grounds with it impact on health of population.</p> <p>There will also be a impact on wildlife and existing trees</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Elisabeth Eversden [4467]			Q15/18	Object to Site 18 as will result in loss of sports facilities when there is a shortage in Solihull, there is an epidemic of obesity and related illnesses which will require encouragement for increased exercise/more active lifestyles, vital that Arden club is retained and that sports use is reintroduced on adjacent land, which should be made available at affordable rent, involves gross overdevelopment out of keeping with area, plans for parking for replacement facility inadequate and will cause street parking, will exacerbate traffic congestion, pollution and risks to pedestrians and cyclists, and pressures on oversubscribed medical and educational services.
Ellie Hill [3974]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Local character will be adversely impacted. Loss of light and privacy. TPO trees must be protected.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Need more sporting facilities, not less. Solihull in very poor position in the rankings.</p> <p>Traffic and parking cause chaos already and dangerous for pedestrians at peak times. Proposed development will make it worse.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Emma Hayward [4612]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Existing traffic issues, particularly at peak times.</p> <p>Been several collisions on road.</p> <p>100 extra homes and 200+ cars will be intolerable.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues, and high water table. E.g have drowned trees in our garden (see attached pictures).</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Proposed development will spoil character of the area.</p> <p>Will devalue our property.</p>
<p>Evan Winter [4205]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - will increase traffic volumes, risks to pedestrians and other road users - impact negatively on air quality with higher levels of air pollution from vehicles - lack of infrastructure to support the development - density of development is not appropriate for this area - loss of sporting facilities

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Fal Naik [3996]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased demand on schools. Expansion of Oak Cottage will change character of lovely small school.</p> <p>Difficult to get into local secondary school.</p> <p>Increased traffic. Already gridlocked in mornings at Sharmans Cross Road/Streebsbrook Road junctions.</p> <p>More dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>Oversubscribed medical practice - 3 weeks to get an appointment at Northbrook Group Practice.</p>
Frances Friel [4156]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as not consistent with character of the area, upheaval, traffic and trauma of development would greatly affect residents backing onto site in Winterbourne Road, many of whom are elderly, additional vehicles will exacerbate existing heavy traffic on Dorchester Road/Streebsbrook Road, create health and safety issue for local school children, school is already oversubscribed so how and where will children be educated, land should be retained for sporting purposes for community, and affordable housing element will not meet family's needs.</p>
Frank Thompson [3887]			Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection as do not consider the development is right for the neighbourhood. Will also lead to a further loss of green space.</p>
G P Warren [4715]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as previously objected to planning application which was refused, and points relating to loss of amenity, potential traffic problems, environmental/ecological damage and loss of green space remain relevant, and proposal for significantly larger development.</p>
Gaynor Dolby [4274]			Q15/18	<p>Object to inclusion of Arden club in housing Site 18 as club members not informed of proposals, proposed replacement Community Club with multi use sports hall and no bar is inadequate, reduction in parking to Arden club ludicrous as already struggle to park, floodlighting of courts likely to be an issue, and housing an unsuitable use which will adversely affect people's enjoyment.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gemma Kentish [4273]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as would be a health and safety to children walking to schools and colleges, schools already oversubscribed, concern about access for emergency vehicles, will exacerbate existing traffic congestion/gridlock in peak hours, will result in loss of parking at Arden club, loss of pitch undermines importance of sport in area with few facilities when benefits of exercise are known and people should be encouraged to take up sport.
Gerard Bourke [4251]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as concerned proposed development will have access to Winterbourne Road and become principal route to Solihull, via narrow estate roads not meant as through routes and with serious issues of road and pedestrian safety, increased pollution and loss of character, development would exacerbate infrastructure issues with schools oversubscribed and limited amenities, increase serious drainage risks and does not have suitable roads or highway infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gillian Golder [4352]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Past planing application been refused by Council.</p> <p>Council affirmed policy in 2013 that land would only be used for sport.</p> <p>Solihull needs more sporting facilities.</p> <p>Extra traffic will add to pollution.</p> <p>Streetsbrook Road is already gridlocked at peak times. Sharmans Croos Road a very busy road.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists on cycle route.</p> <p>Danger of increased traffic to pedestrians, particularly schoolchildren.</p> <p>Local schools and medical centres already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Proposed development out of scale for the area. Out of keeping with surrounding roads.</p> <p>Will destroy trees and wildlife habitat.</p>
Gillian Tune [4169]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion and pollution at peak periods, additional traffic on top of nearby developments will cause gridlock especially at Streetsbrook Road junction, traffic and parking could result in danger to pedestrians especially school children, increase pressure on already oversubscribed school and medical services, and previous proposals have been rejected as this is a designated sports ground that should be retained for sporting use.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Godfrey Frith [3510]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Impact on:</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Playing fields</p> <p>Infrastructure</p>
Graham Law [3875]			Q15/18	<p>consider that the site is inappropriate for residential as it would increase congestion on the roads and put pressure on other infrastructure.</p>
Graham Wilson [3940]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground - at a time when physical activity is important to health and wellbeing</p> <p>Loss of green space and trees</p> <p>Inadequate facilities such as schools and doctor surgeries</p> <p>Existing high traffic density on Sharmans Cross Road and surrounds. New development will exacerbate this.</p> <p>Council own freehold on pitch and designated it as a sports ground, therefore should not be used for housing.</p>
Grahame Holdgate [4514]			Q15/18	<p>Object as land designated as sports area and should be retained for purpose for lease period with pressure put on leaseholder to make available to local sports groups, lack of recent use due to level of rent demanded rather than lack of users, development previously rejected, insufficient sports facilities which should be retained on health and social grounds, density out of keeping with surrounding area and unsuitable, will lead to parking problems for residents and Arden club, not within stated distance of town centre/station, will increase congestion, noise and safety hazard for school children, and local facilities already stretched.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Guy Turley [4464]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as density is much greater than surroundings so unsuitable/out of character with area, smaller development rejected previously setting precedent for not developing site, will exacerbate traffic congestion and danger to pedestrians and cyclists on already busy roads suffering severe congestion at peak times, will cause parking problems on Sharmans Cross Road from additional cars and loss of parking to Arden club, well established green space with mature trees and wildlife should be maintained, and will put extra pressure on already oversubscribed schools and medical services.
H E & Mrs J L Biggs [4685]			Q15/18	<p>Impact on surrounding residential area.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Inappropriate development and overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Environmental and ecological damage.</p> <p>Will create further traffic problems and congestion.</p> <p>Pressure on drains from surface water and sewage.</p> <p>Local schools and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>
H L Williams [3880]			Q15/18	<p>I strongly object to the building of 100[50] affordable homes on Sharmans Cross sports ground.</p> <p>The road is already busy even more so during the school runs and rush hour.</p> <p>The road is subject to flooding.</p> <p>It will be totally out of character to its environment.</p> <p>Pressure on local services is already evident witness the parking at Sharmans pub.</p> <p>Where does it end the concreting of green spaces I could go on but you know the rest.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Hardeep Sunner [4433]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of land.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution. Risk to road safety.</p> <p>Risk of flooding.</p> <p>More pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Loss of parking at Arden Club.</p> <p>Unsustainable distance from other amenities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hazel Truman [4368]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green open space, should be used for recreation.</p> <p>Absorbs rainfall and reduces flooding.</p> <p>Poor drainage in area.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sports ground.</p> <p>Will impact character of the area. Too high density. Loss of right to light and privacy of existing homeowners.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues. Sharmans Cross Road is already very busy. Particularly hazardous at times of school run. Danger to children. Will increase congestion.</p> <p>Will cause increase in pollution, and impact on health.</p> <p>Insufficient parking for club at peak times. Will cause greater parking issues on surrounding roads.</p>
Ian & Janet Thomas [3755]			Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection as it would lead to increased pressure on stretched medical resources, as well as impacting on the health of the local community.</p>
Ian Leach [3982]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Will change local character and quiet area.</p> <p>Bring yet more congestion on already busy roads.</p> <p>Schools, doctors and hospitals oversubscribed.</p> <p>Flooding in bad weather.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J A Woodall [4683]			Q15/18	<p>Loss of sports facility which is the most appropriate use of the site.</p> <p>Unsuitable for high density residential development. This would impact on surrounding residential amenity and out of character with the local area. Perhaps 20 dwellings at the most would be acceptable.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues</p> <p>Impact on mature trees</p> <p>Impact on wildlife</p> <p>Access to the site is unsuitable and will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and parking issues.</p> <p>Additional pressure on local schools and medical facilities</p>
James Ball [3627]			Q15/18	<p>As an occupier backing on to the site, object to housing site 18 as proposal is unsuitable for the site, the density will place unbearable demands on local facilities and the road network, is completely out of character and is higher than a scheme previously refused, will exacerbate the already impossible task of turning towards Streetsbrook Road in the morning peak, worsen traffic pollution close to Sharmans Cross school, exacerbate parking problems associated with the school, Arden sports club and other local clubs, increase risk of flooding, will lead to loss of biodiversity and this important recreational resource.</p>
James Mawson [4268]			Q15/18	<p>Object to Site 18 as will increase traffic on Sharmans Cross Road which is already a bottleneck with on street parking, traffic and cyclists using footpaths, creating problems for visiting ambulances and hazards for children walking to/from school, will result in loss of yet another sporting facility following Tudor Grange, Lucas, Sharmans Cross middle school, Widney Lane and Robin Hood golf club, contrary to policy to retain land in sports use, additional population will put pressure on already stretched local medical services, and development is too dense, out of character with surrounding area and will create extra noise and pollution.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
James Reeve [4065]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will intensify traffic congestion particularly at the junction of Sharmans Cross and Streetsbrook Roads and in the vicinity of local schools, will increase danger to cyclists and pedestrians, will reduce sporting facilities which are vital for the health and well being of future generations, will put additional strain on schools and medical facilities, and will impact on the environment and wildlife, including TPOs.
James Rogers [4223]			Q15/18	reasons include: - will increase pressure on existing public services (GPs, Dentists, Hospitals) - residential development already happening in area nearby (retirement homes)
James Thomson [4110]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as a longstanding member of Solihull Arden club, as the owners of the freehold land on which the club is located were not party to the developers submission, and the proposal would involve relocating from freehold to leasehold land, which would leave the club with no land asset to support loans for future developments.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jane Clapham [3962]			Q15/18	<p>Unacceptable overdevelopment and out of scale for the land available. Also out of character with the area.</p> <p>Increased traffic, congestion and on-street parking impacting on highway safety and inconveniencing buses and emergency services.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife and TPO trees.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>The sports grounds are a unique and an important amenity and loss will create pressure on other sporting facilities in the area.</p> <p>Loss of parking facilities at the Tennis Club may lead to a reduction in members and impact on its future.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Sustainability issues in terms of access to local amenities.</p>
Jane Frith [3509]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Further housing would increase traffic.</p> <p>Crossroads of Streetsbrook Road, Sharmans Cross Road, Stonor Park Road & Dorchester Road is gridlock between 8am to 9.15am.</p> <p>Touchwood Phase 2 will make it worse.</p> <p>Additional 100-200 cars on the route will be worse and potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Pulling out into traffic is dangerous.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jane Winfield [4009]			Q15/18	<p>100 houses on this site is not in keeping with the current density of residential buildings in the Sharman's Cross area.</p> <p>This is a very busy road with regular traffic jams. The scheme needs provision to alleviate this problem.</p> <p>There should be more public open space and sports facilities for the people of Solihull not fewer. The scheme should have more.</p> <p>School and local services are already oversubscribed. What is the provision for the extra residents?</p> <p>I understand the need for some development on this site but would strongly urge you to reduce the scale of this proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Janet Holden [4403]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Existing high levels of congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Development will be out of character and proportion with surrounding area.</p> <p>Negative impact on local community due to overdevelopment, congestion and pressure on services.</p> <p>Council should retain sporting use on site.</p> <p>Understand that current freeholders are proposing unreasonable rent rates.</p> <p>Loss of open space.</p> <p>Loss of trees, greenery.</p> <p>Oversubscribed medical services.</p>
Janet Steele [4013]			Q15/18	<p>Loss of sports facilities which are needed in the area. The use of the land should remain for sporting use. A new tenant should be found and helped to provide much needed new and up-to-date facilities within the borough.</p> <p>Impact on the Tennis club through loss of parking, which would affect the surrounding streets.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion would be exacerbated.</p> <p>Schools and doctors are already over subscribed.</p> <p>Recognise the need for more housing and Solihull has to provide land but this is land to be used for 'sports facilities', not dense housing that cannot be sustained within the local infrastructure.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Jean Hollis [3888]		Q15/18	increase in road traffic, more traffic pollution, safety issues for school children and pedestrians, from increased traffic and parking are all reasons for opposing this development.
Jennifer Kentish [4033]		Q15/18	<p>Existing traffic congestion and parking issues will be exacerbated, detrimentally impacting on highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities are already over subscribed. Further development will place an additional burden on those facilities.</p> <p>Development of this scale will destroy the local environmental quality enjoyed by many residents and may also have a significant impact on the natural habitats for local wildlife.</p> <p>Over-development of the site and impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility.</p> <p>Does not conform with NPPF in terms of access to facilities.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q15/18	<p>The site is currently unused but this because of the unwillingness by the development company to allow the facilities to be used. Development of the site would require re-provision of the sports pitches if not in surplus. Difficult to see how they can be replaced with a facility that has the same quality.</p> <p>Density of new development will be at odds with local character and could impact on neighbouring residential amenity.</p> <p>Impact on existing congestion and parking, and could impact on highway safety.</p> <p>Would not conserve the qualities of the mature suburbs.</p> <p>Pressure on local services.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p>
Jessica Hill [3973]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Too few sporting facilities. Will be further loss. Solihull very poor position in the rankings.</p> <p>Traffic and parking already a huge problem. Will result in negative impact on highway safety and cause more congestion.</p> <p>Harm to local character of neighbourhood. Loss of light and privacy. Must protect TPO trees.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding issues.</p>
Jinette Thomson [3594]			Q15/18	<p>Object to site 18, as 100 new homes would choke the sports club compared to the current position, with new occupiers closer to floodlighting, noise and vehicle movements associated with the sports club including tournaments, would not support any proposal to release or exchange current site, and additional traffic problems on Sharmans Cross Road from new residents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joan Rochford [4271]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as local schools oversubscribed so where will new children attend, will add to congestion on roads and route to town centre with consequent impact on attractiveness, compromise road safety in the vicinity of the school during construction, discourage cycling being promoted by Government, exacerbate issues of parking and pollution at the school affecting children's health, local medical services are oversubscribed, will reduce green space learning opportunities for schoolchildren and recreational facilities to encourage healthy exercise, loss of green space will increase risk of flooding and reduce wildlife habitats, and development out of character with surroundings.
Joanna Hill [3961]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion at peak hours on Streetsbrook Road and adjoining roads.</p> <p>Will increase gridlock and frustration.</p> <p>Added pollution and pothole damage.</p> <p>Concern for pedestrian safety, particularly schoolchildren.</p> <p>High density housing plan will negatively impact local character. 5x as dense as surrounds.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground.</p> <p>SMBC policy to retain grounds for sport use and not to sell freehold.</p> <p>Add to existing parking issues on road and loss of spaces at Arden Club.</p> <p>Existing flood issues on Sharmans Cross Road will be exacerbated by increased hard surfaces.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joanne Brindley [4150]			Q15/18	Object as housing will increase traffic on roads already suffering congestion at peak times especially at junctions with serious impact on highway safety and accident risk to pedestrians, especially school children, and cyclists, Arden club members have not been consulted and the club is not party to proposals, question rationale for relocation of the club as existing site would be lost to sports use and parking reduced, potential users put off by extortionate rent, contrary to Council and health and well-being policy, density out of character, does not meet accessibility criteria and schools and medical services already oversubscribed.
Joanne Talliss [3941]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Lack of local amenities to service an increased population, i.e. school and college places, doctor, hospitals etc.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road. Drainage systems couldn't cope with 100 extra houses.</p> <p>Additional traffic, congestion and parking issues. Safety of pedestrians, particularly children walking to school.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Understood Rugby pitch has stipulation which requires site to be used for sporting purpose.</p> <p>Need to invest in our youth to ensure a healthy lifestyle.</p>
John & Ashi Bentley [4236]			Q15/18	<p>Objection on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic is already chaotic on the local roads, will only increase with additional housing - concerned about impact on the infrastructure (schools/medical facilities)
John Bishop [4475]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 due to increased traffic volumes, loss of recreational space when site is ideal opportunity for a community facility/sports club, larger development than that previously rejected, additional strain on local healthcare and amenities, and increased congestion and safety issues for pedestrians and schoolchildren from additional parking by new occupiers.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Canning [4471]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as loss of green space contrary to Council motto, loss of sports pitches contrary to policy to retain pitches which are vital for community, and is contrary to covenant restricting to sports use.
John Franklin [4038]			Q15/18	<p>The developer could purchase further houses backing on to the development in Winterbourne Road with a view to creating a further exit for the 100 new houses that would feed directly into Winterbourne and Beaminster Road. These roads are unsuitable and would become a 'rat run' for future residents.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing the need for more housing, the site is unsuitable for the number of houses proposed. There will be a loss of sports facilities and green space which conflicts with the Urbs in rure motto.</p>
John Gee [4094]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as proposal is rehash of applications refused as unsuitable, involves loss of open space and sports ground where sporting facilities are critically low, is contrary to Council policy to retain the sporting use, loss of biodiversity and wildlife, too high density out of scale and character with the area, will cause serious overloading and gridlock of already busy junctions on Sharmans Cross Road with increased pollution and accident risk particularly to school children, insufficient parking to serve development and other needs and loss of overflow parking for Arden club, overloading of drainage systems.
John Green [4030]			Q15/18	<p>Will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and increase danger to pedestrians including children.</p> <p>Will increase pressure on already stretched GPs and Schools.</p> <p>The land is green belt and was to be used for sporting facilities for the local area.</p> <p>There would not be enough parking for Arden members resulting in parking on side-roads leading to further dangers.</p> <p>A small scheme with a housing density to match the area would be more in-keeping, not 3 storey properties with little garden space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Handford [4032]			Q15/18	<p>Increased traffic congestion in an area that is already heavily congested and will add to the considerable safety concerns for school children and parents who are all over that road at those peak times.</p> <p>Capacity of medical and dental facilities. Such a vast increase in housing as proposed is going to stretch the already inadequate availability of such services beyond acceptable limits. Irrespective, of whether new residents are able, or not, to sign up to such local services they, inevitably, will travel by car.</p> <p>Loss of green space and sporting facilities which will impact upon health.</p>
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/18	<p>Although unused this is still a loss of Sports pitches.</p> <p>Unsure how this impacts on sports provision within Solihull.</p> <p>No reference directly to relocation or compensation.</p>
John R Isaac [4633]			Q15/18	<p>The proposed development in on a scale wholly inappropriate to and out of character with the surrounding housing. It was cause a destruction of the character of the area and result in unacceptable noise pollution.</p> <p>Will also lead to flooding of existing properties.</p>
John R Smith [4133]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as high density is completely out of keeping with surrounding area, results in loss of green space asset for local residents with recognised health and well-being benefits for all time, additional traffic will cause accessibility problems to Sharmans Cross Road, overwhelm current road infrastructure with traffic congestion notwithstanding affordable element, increase risk to pedestrians and cyclists, especially children going to/from school, will require major road improvements at Streetbrook Road junction, schools, medical services and drainage infrastructure will not cope without expensive improvements, damage wildlife and adjacent Pow Grove, so does not meet planning guidelines.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jonathan Rudge [4225]			Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased traffic - increased pollutions - draining - flooding already during heavy rainfall - services - new housing will put pressure on water, gas and may reduce pressures to unacceptable levels - sporting amenities - loss of leisure opportunities - Access - no access to winterbourne road for pedestrians/cyclists travelling to town centre, will result in increase use of vehicles. - proposed development is several times density of housing in surrounding areas.
Julia Smith [4419]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Aware of need for new and affordable housing. Proposal would be detrimental to local character. Land should be retained for sports use.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Increase in traffic in already congested area.</p> <p>Pressure on oversubscribed schools and doctor surgeries.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julia Williams [4244]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as land designated for sporting use and development will result in loss of facilities vital for health and well being of children, prospective club users have been deliberately prevented by developer and rent demanded, loss of green space highly valued by local residents, will exacerbate traffic congestion in area increasing risks to road users and school children, inadequate school and health provision, oppose relocation of Arden club and development provides insufficient parking which will result in unauthorised parking on Arden club car park or in local roads.
Julian Buttery [4694]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as land is a vital green space that is under constant threat of development which needs to be resolved by its retention for the benefit of the whole community, and development will exacerbate traffic problems already experienced in area and close to junior school.
Julie Appleton [4629]			Q15/18	Site 18 Objection due to: - a loss of sporting facilities for young people, - increase in traffic and congestion on the roads, as well as increased pressure on the rail services from Solihull station - pressure on existing road, parking on the street and doctors and schools infrastructure, - flooding already happens in the area
Julie Burrows [3773]			Q15/18	concerned about the loss of green space /playing pitches.
Julie Westman [4074]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will result in loss of much needed sports facility when obesity such an issue, potential club users have been deterred by extortionate rent, Sport England has found that over 16 participation is falling compared with other areas, should be encouraging play rather than taking facilities away, contrary to Council policy to retain freehold and use for sport, will increase traffic and pollution on roads that are gridlocked at peak hours and during school pick up times, roads are unsuitable for increase and danger to pedestrians, children and cyclists.
K M Davis [3598]			Q15/18	Object to loss of sports ground for housing on Site 18 and as a member of Arden Club, would not agree to giving up freehold land or having new facilities built on adjoining land. Not convinced that alternative sports use could not be found if realistic price asked.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
K Mary Rowley [4090]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as increased traffic would cause massive hold ups especially at school drop off and pick up times, safety of school children should be top priority, density and style of development is out of character with area, land should be retained for sports ground to help with shortage of facilities, loss of established trees and open space, and schools and medical facilities already oversubscribed and it would be impossible to accommodate additional numbers.
K Vanes [4154]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as covenant restricting use of land to sport should be maintained due to shortage of pitches and is only vacant as developer has refused to rent land to clubs, development will be out of keeping with surroundings and will overlook houses, additional traffic will cause further gridlock during peak and school times and aggravate dangerous junction with Streetsbrook Road, will result in further overflow parking in adjoining roads such as Woodside Way, local schools and medical services are already oversubscribed and will struggle to meet demands, and will add to drainage/flooding problems.
Kalpesh Thakrar [4468]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will overburden schools and medical services, will exacerbate traffic volumes and road safety issues on already very busy roads, especially at peak times, development will be out of character with area, and will result in loss of valuable green space and sports facilities.
Karen Clarke [4165]			Q15/18	Object to housing which will have detrimental effect on area from extra traffic increasing difficulty for crossing road to school and creating more pollution, worsen current gridlock during peak periods towards Solihull and Birmingham, high density will increase street parking problems that already exist with school traffic, schools are oversubscribed and shops and medical facilities struggling to meet current demand, loss of wildlife habitat, density proposed will drastically alter character of area with necessity for buildings over 2 storeys, land used for overflow parking by Arden and Silhill clubs, informal recreation and should be retained for sport as previous policy.
Karen J Davis [4049]			Q15/18	Impact on birdlife that occupy the surrounding woodland. Education and medical facilities are already over subscribed. Further development will place an additional burden on those facilities. Flooding and drainage issues. Existing traffic congestion and parking issues will be exacerbated, detrimentally impacting on highway and pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Karen O'Rourke [3697]			Q15/18	<p>Objecting to the site principally on two grounds:</p> <p>that it will impact on the local road network and other infrastructure (schools cited).</p> <p>that it will result in greater flooding through the loss of green/open space.</p>
Karen Trueman [4652]			Q15/18	<p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities when support should be given for open space and recreation. There is a demand from sports teams to use the facilities and there is a covenant that restricts usage for sports use only.</p> <p>Additional traffic will exacerbate existing problems of congestion and pollution. Impact on highway safety and health and well being of pedestrians, including school children and cyclists.</p> <p>Parking arrangements for the proposed houses are likely to be cramped and there will be a reduction in parking for the Tennis Club which will compound existing problems on side roads.</p> <p>Impact on flooding and wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Kate Routledge [4335]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Development will ruin local character. 100 houses is out of scale. Likely to be more than 2 storeys high, loss of light and privacy.</p> <p>Already extremely busy road. Increased traffic will worsen congestion and cause pollution. Harm to pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p> <p>Loss of TPOs.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities. Already a shortage of pitches in Solihull.</p> <p>Increased parking on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Schools and surgeries already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Not comply with NPPF accessibility criteria. 1000m from Solihull Station and 1700m from town centre.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sports use by Council.</p> <p>Previous application was refused.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Keith Dennis [4346]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on character and ambience of Winterbourne Road and surrounding area. Density too high. High density and 50% affordable homes will result in tall buildings that will be out of scale.</p> <p>No reference in constraints to TPO No. 174.</p> <p>Seek assurances that TPOs will be retained and protected during construction.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Council agreed to retain freehold for sporting use.</p> <p>Seems that owners of sports pitch have not encouraged sports use.</p> <p>Solihull falling in league tables.</p> <p>Arden Tennis Club very popular.</p> <p>Reduced parking due to loss of Arden Tennis Club.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Existing narrow single point of access off Sharmans Cross Road would be inadequate.</p> <p>Circa half of site is in regular use as a sport and community facility by the Solihull Arden Club.</p> <p>Allocation of land in its entirety is contrary to NPPF objectives on community health and well-being.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Laurie Neal [3981]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Housing development is necessary for progress but detrimental to put it here.</p> <p>Existing traffic problems, particularly on Streetsbrook Road, Blossomfield Road and surrounds. Incessant queueing.</p> <p>New development will adversely affect:</p> <p>Schools and colleges in the area, cycle route users, pedestrians using these amenities and Touchwood, pollution levels.</p> <p>Negative impact on local character. Too intensive. Loss of trees.</p> <p>Need for green open spaces and sporting facilities. Applications to use this land for sport have been blocked by current owner.</p> <p>Additional pressure on schools and medical centres.</p> <p>More hard surfacing will exacerbate existing flooding and drainage issues.</p>
Liam Swan [4360]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic. Existing congestion, parking and highway safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Increased demand on already oversubscribed schools and doctor surgeries.</p> <p>Out of character with area.</p> <p>Detrimental to trees and wildlife.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Parker [3965]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased number of vehicles would result in negative impact at all times, not just peak hours and school finish times.</p> <p>Right turn from development onto Sharmans Cross Road and right turn onto Streetsbrook Rd will cause major traffic congestion. Already an issue.</p> <p>Will add to increasing parking issues on roads.</p> <p>Severn Trent will need to provide additional infrastructure.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues, e.g. drains outside school are unable to cope in heavy rain.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Local schools and medical facilities are oversubscribed. 50% affordable housing suggested younger families requiring these facilities.</p>
Louise & David Marklew [4151]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as should be retained as sports facility for community, important to retain green space for recreation, safety and sporting activity, development would destroy character of area, the quality of the environment with TPOs and wildlife habitats, and impact on adjacent residents, and will increase traffic noise and pollution on roads that are already chaotic and dangerous for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Louise Fallon [3950]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Considerable volume of existing traffic in this area, particularly at peak times and due to shoppers for Touchwood on weekend.</p> <p>Long queues of traffic along Streetsbrook Road - hazardous junction with Sharmans Cross Road/Dorchester Road/Stonor Park Road.</p> <p>100 houses is out of scale for area.</p> <p>Loss of open space.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists if traffic increases further.</p>
<p>Louise Gee [4200]</p>			<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Site 18 Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of wildlife habitat - permanent loss of sports field - loss of local recreational facility - unsuitable development - increased traffic - lack of adequate parking - poor drainage - overload of schools and medical facilities

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lynne Chamberlin [4527]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as excessive density totally out of character with surroundings, detrimental affect on traffic congestion and pressure on schools, medical services and drainage infrastructure, will worsen existing flooding problems, any access to Winterbourne Road would cause traffic chaos and be hugely environmentally damaging to this and adjoining roads, should restrict to more modest development.
M E Tregellas [4747]			Q15/18	<p>Understand the old rugby ground is designated land for sport. Losing another facility would leave us very short of green open spaces.</p> <p>100 homes is overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Will increase risk of flooding.</p> <p>Increase in traffic will be catastrophic. Regular accidents and gridlocking at peak times.</p> <p>Significant increase in danger for school children.</p> <p>Local amenities, e.g. schools, are unlikely to cope with added population.</p> <p>Council will have to provide additional schools, medical and sporting facilities.</p> <p>Understand that Oakmoor have acquired a house on Sharmans Cross Road to enable access.</p> <p>Access from Winterbourne Road is not supported.</p>
M Taylor [4125]			Q15/18	Object to housing on Site 18, as not large enough to accommodate 100 houses of size and type to maintain local character, and increased volume of traffic will cause significant congestion and safety hazard on already very busy road.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
M Trueman [4538]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as development out of character with local area and density and impact on neighbouring properties inappropriate, will compound existing congestion and air pollution problems with gridlock at peak times, increase risk of danger to children discouraging parents from allowing walking to school with impacts on health, will lead to deterioration in services as schools and medical services already oversubscribed, results in loss of sporting facilities when covenant restricting to sports use exists and local participation low, importance of pitches for health and well-being, loss of green space, wildlife habitats and increased risk of flooding.
Margaret Burling [3984]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>No mention of TPOs on the plan.</p> <p>Many birds and protected bats in the area.</p> <p>Rugby club ground not being used as Oakmoor refuses to speak to interested parties.</p> <p>Provision of sports pitches and facilities in Solihull is already poor compared to other parts of the country.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road already congested.</p> <p>Further traffic add to danger of pedestrians to Junior School.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing parking issues. Will be compounded by loss of spaces at Arden Tennis Club.</p> <p>Potential loss of privacy if taller buildings.</p> <p>Moving Tennis Club would contravene NPPF.</p> <p>Site better suited for improved sports uses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Margaret Mawson [4266]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as Sharmans Cross Road is a traffic bottleneck with vehicles reversing out of drives, on street parking, traffic using footpaths and verges, cyclists using footpaths, creating problems for visiting ambulances and hazards for the disabled, elderly and children walking to/from school, will result in loss of yet another sporting facility contrary to policy to retain land in sports use, additional population will put pressure on already stretched local schools and medical services, and development is out of scale and character with surrounding area with loss of privacy and peace and quiet.
Margaret Nutt [4466]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as the scale and density of development is far too large and will create huge problems for traffic, parking, schools and medical services, and result in the loss of yet another sporting facility.
Margaret Young [3960]			Q15/18	<p>Development not in keeping with the surrounding area. There will be too many homes on too small a space and impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion will increase impacting on highway safety.</p> <p>Reduction in the number of spaces at Solihull Arden Club will exacerbate on-street parking.</p> <p>Increased pollution will result from the additional traffic.</p> <p>100 new homes will increase the pressure for places in schools and for GP facilities which are both oversubscribed.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife and trees which have TPOs.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>The site does not meet sustainability criteria.</p> <p>Sporting facilities will be lost.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Marion Smith [3696]			Q15/18	objecting to the site as 1) it will impact detrimentally on the road infrastructure from increasing onstreet parking; danger to cyclists and pedestrians by increasing traffic volume. 2) loss of playing/sports facilities 3) lost of mature trees on the site, 4) accessibility to services is not making the development sustainable. 5) flooding will increase from the new housing.
Mark Bartlett [4305]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Planning application was previously refused.</p> <p>Potential access road into or near Winterbourne Road will cause traffic congestion and noise.</p> <p>Loss of open space and sporting facilities.</p> <p>Huge loss in Solihull over last 30 years.</p> <p>Majority of site is covenanted for sporting use. SMBC said they would not sell freehold.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Scale of intrusion of building works on wildlife.</p> <p>Density will destroy residential character of neighbourhood.</p> <p>Increase in traffic; busy junctions already overloaded.</p> <p>Increased pollution.</p> <p>Highway safety risk to pedestrians, especially children on way to school.</p> <p>Inadequate parking.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/18	<p>SHELAA states that key suitability issues are upgrading the existing road access and bad neighbour use with no potential for mitigation.</p> <p>Submission includes demolition of a house to increase access - Owner of dwelling on Sharmans Cross Road is unwilling to relocate.</p> <p>Further detail is required to determine deliverability.</p> <p>We have spoken to Solihull Arden Club who have not been part of land promotion process, do not want to relocate or stop operations, and do not know if use is included in the site.</p> <p>A recreational space assessment still needs to be undertaken.</p> <p>LWS on site also.</p>
Mark Phillips [4103]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as there is a need for sports pitches and the high quality pitches on the site would have been utilised by a club but for the unrealistically high rent demanded, the density of development proposed is out of character with the area, local infrastructure would need significant and costly upgrading, and housing would potentially have a serious affect on Pow Grove, a SINC.</p>
Martin Fallon [4067]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as around 100 new dwellings is over-intensive and out of character with surrounding homes, will exacerbate existing traffic congestion around the Sharmans Cross/Streetsbrook Roads junction, add pressure to local services, and layout of site is only suitable for a much smaller number of properties, around 30-35 at most.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Martin Gollogly [4192]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to the inclusion of this site in the DLP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - congestion - noise pollution from traffic on sharmans cross road. esp during peak hours - schools will face increased demand and will respond in one of several ways: expand, children will travel further. - potential increase in crime and ASB with increased housing density - character of the area will deteriorate
Martin Jones [4517]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion and pollution on Sharmans Cross Road especially at peak times, increase danger to cyclists and worsen flooding, does not meet accessibility criteria, and is designated for sports purposes and should be retained for use.</p>
Mary Jones [3702]			Q15/18	<p>objecting to the planning application on a number of grounds (car parking, and road infrastructure pressures, need to retain as sports/leisure facility, flooding)</p>
Mary R Butler [4254]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as permanent loss of sports facilities should not be permitted, the Council has power and responsibility to ensure protected for all, and should adhere to its policy to restrict use to sport not include in Local Plan.</p>
Marylyn Trowsdale [4214]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wrong to reduce number of facilities for healthy sport & recreational activities - increase in density/resident will add pressure on support services and infrastructure - development will result in higher/faster levels of surface water run-off - congestion and associated dangers to other road users will increase - current balance between resi and open/green spaces will be lost-

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Maureen Bartlett [4306]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>This planning application was previously refused and should not be allowed to go ahead.</p> <p>My grounds for objections are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Potential access road that might be introduced into or near by Winterbourne Road from the new development and the traffic congestion and noise this will create. * Loss of open space and sporting facilities * Loss of a nature rich site * Suitability and density of development * Access and traffic issues * Complete lack of adequate parking * Drainage and Flooding
Meg Purvey [4364]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Understand importance of building new houses.</p> <p>High intensity of a hundred new homes.</p> <p>Will add pressure to oversubscribed amenities, such as schools, health care, parking and more traffic congestion.</p> <p>Growing problem around Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Melvyn Broadhurst [4749]			Q15/18	<p>Out of character with the area.</p> <p>Traffic, congestion, pollution.</p> <p>Add pressure to local resources.</p> <p>Sports area is unique feature and should be kept for sport.</p> <p>Volunteers have contributed a lot.</p> <p>Should not give up freehold.</p>
Merrill Flood [3878]			Q15/18	Increased traffic and congestion alongside associated air pollution, pressure on infrastructure, and a loss of sporting facilities, safety for school children are all given as reasons for objecting to this site.
Michael Foster [3654]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as infrastructure to support development clearly not in place contrary to national policy for increased house building. Will exacerbate already excessive traffic delays during peak hours and associated with Arden club which cannot be mitigated. Proposed development is too dense, out of character with surroundings and will adversely affect existing properties. Loss of grassland and additional dwellings will worsen drainage and current flooding issues. Extra school traffic and pedestrians will create clear safety dangers. Cumulative loss of sportsgrounds will compromise participation in sport and is contrary to Council policy. Does not meet accessibility standards
Michael Garvey [3658]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as will exacerbate already considerable morning peak time congestion and gridlock on Sharmans Cross, Stonor Park and Streetsbrook Roads, with attendant risks to safety of children walking to school, the development involves overdevelopment which will destroy local character, and additional residents will result in degradation of local services with schools and medical facilities already oversubscribed.
Michael Glynn [4137]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 due to density of development proposed, increased traffic and delays on Sharmans Cross Road, additional on-street parking and consequent danger to pedestrians and other road users, additional pressures on schools and medical services, and loss of local sporting facilities.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Hannon [4429]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sports pitches. Lack of sporting facilities in Solihull. Negative impact on health and wellbeing and children's play.</p> <p>Significant strain on infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion and road safety issues.</p> <p>Increased pollution.</p> <p>Schools and GPs already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and capturing air pollution.</p>
Michael Nutt [4465]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as involves overdevelopment that will remove much needed sports/recreational facilities, destroy wildlife habitats and be detrimental to surrounding residents from increase in traffic in already congested area with gridlock at Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction at peak times, additional highway safety problems and overburdened local amenities.</p>
Michael Sims [4748]			Q15/18	<p>Land should continue as community use for recreation and children.</p> <p>Important for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Young families need this facility.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Thomas Finchen [4523]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as results in loss of green space in an area with acute shortage of green space and sports grounds, sports use has been deterred by demanding unrealistically high rent, loss of important natural drainage in an area of Alder Brook floodplain which floods in heavy rainfall, loss of trees which help to reduce flooding and add to character of area, potential access to Winterbourne Road would destroy quiet residential character, and loss of recreational facility which supports varied wildlife.
Mick Westman [4056]			Q15/18	<p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is over development of the site and the density is out of keeping.</p> <p>The distance to local facilities is further than submitted by the developers.</p> <p>Issue with access off Winterbourne Road.</p>
Mike Golder [4262]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as contrary to policy to restrict use of land to sport and inappropriate given interest in increasing active participation to improve health and ease pressure on NHS, would exacerbate peak time traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road which is greater now than when policy confirmed in 2013, increased dangers to children walking to/from school from accidents and pollution, density and house type will be totally out of character with surrounding area, and will not improve desirability of Solihull with only gain to the developer.
Mike Clapham [4536]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion caused by local school, result in more parking due to loss of facilities for Arden club, will increase danger to cyclists, children and parents and from transport services, density is much higher than surroundings, will increase already high pressure on schools and medical facilities with no provision to expand, result in loss of local sports facilities contrary to recognition of need to increase health and fitness, does not meet accessibility criteria in NPPF, and Council should maintain policy to restrict use and not sell freehold.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/18	<p>Although unused this is still a loss of Sports pitches.</p> <p>Unsure how this impacts on sports provision within Solihull.</p> <p>No reference directly to relocation or compensation.</p>
Miss Emma Voogd [4385]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site, density too high. Out of keeping with surrounding area.</p> <p>Adverse impact on green and leafy character.</p> <p>Proposal for significant affordable housing is inconsistent with streetscene.</p> <p>Will detract from desirability of the area.</p> <p>Street parking already unacceptable to pedestrians and road users alike.</p> <p>Roads used as overspill car park for commuters using Solihull train station.</p> <p>Reducing parking facilities at Arden Club will add pressure.</p> <p>Proposed entrance is unsuitable.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility in accessible location.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Hannah Voogd [4384]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site, density too high. Out of keeping with surrounding area.</p> <p>Adverse impact on green and leafy character.</p> <p>Proposal for significant affordable housing is inconsistent with streetscene.</p> <p>Will detract from desirability of the area.</p> <p>Street parking already unacceptable to pedestrians and road users alike.</p> <p>Roads used as overspill car park for commuters using Solihull train station.</p> <p>Reducing parking facilities at Arden Club will add pressure.</p> <p>Proposed entrance is unsuitable.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility in accessible location.</p>
Moirá Dwyer [3706]			Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection due to the proposed density of the development, concerns over the increased levels of traffic and associated pollution and its impact on local schoolchildren.</p>
Mr & Mrs David hull [3876]			Q15/18	<p>Reasons for objecting to the site are: Traffic, Safety to cyclists / pedestrians, Parking, Environmental impact particularly flooding Loss of sporting facilities Effect on essential amenities</p>
Mr & Mrs A Greene [3411]			Q15/18	<p>Development would be up to the boundary of the property.</p> <p>Property values will decrease.</p>
Mr & Mrs Harris [4679]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate already ridiculous levels of traffic, put additional strains on medical services and schools and growth levels will ruin Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Jewitt [4394]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Will add to existing traffic congestion. Impact of construction traffic.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing parking issues.</p> <p>Flood risk and drainage issues.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools, doctors, dentists and hospitals.</p> <p>NPPF requires development to have access to local amenities within 800m/10 mins walk. Development not meet these criteria.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Existing shortage.</p>
Mr & Mrs Parm Kang [3767]		Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection as it would increase the volume of cars and lead to increased congestion on the surrounding roads</p>
Mr & Mrs R A & SC Hardcastle [3434]		Q15/18	<p>Already a shortage of sports pitches in Solihull, especially for rugby.</p> <p>Other than this rugby club, there is only one set of sports pitches in Solihull with changing rooms, and none with facilities for women.</p> <p>Moving a pitch to the outskirts of the Borough makes it less accessible by public transport.</p> <p>Lease issues and suggestions of excessive rent to suppress demand.</p> <p>Sport England did not support Oakmoor's previous application.</p> <p>Existing congestion on Sharmans Cross Road will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Schools and GP surgeries are at capacity.</p> <p>3 storey blocks will be out of keeping with the area and lead to overlooking.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr B Hughes [3616]		Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as it would infringe the previously stated support of sports use and require the Council to sell the freehold, will exacerbate the increasing flood risk resulting from increased storm events and the clay soil, exacerbate the already unacceptable level of congestion and gridlock in Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road at peak times with impact on quality of life, pollution and safety of children at Sharmans Cross school, and the additional burden on already buckling school and medical services.
Mr C J Voogd [4388]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Out of character with local area.</p> <p>High density will conflict with traditional housing plots, mature trees, green surrounds and provision of recreational space close to residential areas.</p> <p>50 affordable homes is inconsistent with nature of the surrounding properties.</p> <p>Will result in higher storey blocks of flats.</p> <p>Pressure on roads, schools, hospitals and clinics.</p> <p>Increase to street parking which is already an inconvenience, and danger to children, infirm and cyclists.</p> <p>Detrimental impact on visual amenity.</p> <p>Loss of 'Urbs in rure' character.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Will make Solihull a less desirable place to live.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Christopher Allen [3031]			Q15/18	<p>Road infrastructure -The present roads are unable to cope with the volume of traffic at certain times of the day, especially at school starting and finishing times. To add another 100 houses could potentially mean another 200 cars trying to access the road system which the present infrastructure would be unable to sustain.</p> <p>School places - both primary and secondary are oversubscribed. Future demand will be difficult to meet.</p> <p>Sports facilities - Could the pitches be used for some form of sporting facilities which would be less costly than a re-provision of sports facilities elsewhere.</p>
Mr Christopher Freville [3621]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing site 18 as development has previously been rejected, housing will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and gridlock on weekday mornings, there will be an increased danger to families and children going to Sharmans Cross school, especially children and pedestrians, the school is already oversubscribed, and development will result in the loss of a designated sports facility which should be retained.</p>
Mr Christopher Hall [3220]			Q15/18	<p>Reasons for objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - negative impact on health esp of younger people but the wider population with the loss of sports spaces/pitches - there is massive demand to use the playing fields - Council affirmed its commitment that Sharmans Cross playing fields should be used only for sport and that they would not sell the freehold - will have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. density is inappropriate. - risk to pedestrians and cyclists from increased traffic - increase in pollution, congestion, on street parking - pressure on schools and medical facilities

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Christopher Hall [3220]			Q15/18	site 18 comment
Mr David Smith [3130]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Need to encourage healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>Lack of playing pitches in Solihull.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sporting use.</p>
Mr David Smith [3130]			Q15/18	site 18 - comment on extent of area to be developed
Mr John Southall [2995]			Q15/18	<p>Existing traffic congestion will be exacerbated, increasing noise, pollution and impacting on highway safety.</p> <p>Likely to be insufficient parking, resulting in more on-street parking.</p> <p>It will be out of character with the existing area in terms of density. Three storey properties could also have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. SMBC said that the land would be used for sport use only.</p> <p>Impact on protected trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Pressure on existing schools and GPs which are already stretched.</p> <p>Not compliant with NPPF accessibility criteria.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr M A Bardsley [4540]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Out of character with area. High density proposal.</p> <p>Affordable housing development is likely to exceed 2 storeys.</p> <p>Will provide minimal garden space.</p> <p>Unlikely to provide adequate parking, will exacerbate existing parking issues.</p> <p>Loss of 75 spaces at Arden Club is unacceptable.</p> <p>Existing drainage issues during heavy rain.</p> <p>Development will increase hard surfacing.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Will create hazards for cyclists on designated cycle route.</p> <p>Not comply with NPPF accessibility criteria.</p> <p>Land should be safeguarded for sporting use as per freehold.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution.</p>
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]		Q15/18	<p>Area 17 and 18 should not be included as they are already established areas and the infrastructure will have an adverse effect on the existing area</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr Patrick Montague [3329]		Q15/18	<p>The site is not derelict. The pitches could be used after marking out.</p> <p>The site includes TPO trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Schools and doctors are over full and the site is not as accessible as portrayed.</p> <p>No evidence that there are ample pitches to support the needs of the local population. There is a demand for pitches which is not being met. Loss of facilities will further reduce participation in sport.</p> <p>The estimate of the space available for residential is exaggerated and the density will be out of keeping with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Will increase traffic.</p> <p>Impact on flooding and drainage.</p>
Mr R J Baker [4712]		Q15/18	<p>As trustee and member of Silhill FC object to housing Site 18 as results in loss of further sporting land, there is a covenant restricting to sports use ignored by landowner and Silhill FC interested in expanding with boys/youth and senior facilities, relaxation of planning restrictions contrary to policies to promote healthy activity, likely to worsen flooding in area, affect on public right of way to Pow Grove, development proposed out of character with area, and impact on parking, school places and medical services.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Access would be inadequate.</p> <p>Part of the site used as a sports and community facility. Allocation of the site in its entirety runs counter to the sustainable development objectives in the NPPF where the health and well-being of a community and the protection of existing community and recreational facilities are important objectives.</p> <p>It is inappropriate for land at Solihull Arden Club to be developed. Development on Solihull Arden Club site would be unsound as no evidence has been provided to justify the loss.</p> <p>Any required re-provision of sports facilities would raise viability and deliverability issues.</p>
Mr Terence Woodruff [3570]			Q15/18	<p>Will exacerbate existing traffic congestion and impact on pedestrian safety</p> <p>There is a lack of capacity at schools and GP surgeries.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities despite restrictive covenant specifying that the land should only be used for sporting purposes.</p> <p>There has been interest from sports clubs about using the site.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues</p> <p>Density would result in little or no room for off road parking and lack of outdoor space.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Existing narrow single point of access off Sharmans Cross Road would be inadequate.</p> <p>Circa half of site is in regular use as a sport and community facility by the Solihull Arden Club.</p> <p>Allocation of land in its entirety is contrary to NPPF objectives on community health and well-being.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Hawkes [4474]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as land should be retained for sporting use in line with existing policy, development will increase traffic, pollution and danger to pedestrians, especially school children and users of Arden club, existing schools, shopping and other amenities already fully subscribed, will result in permanent loss of sports facilities a number of which are at risk from proposals in the Draft Local Plan when it should be a priority to retain or improve provision for young people, and involves unacceptable overdevelopment.
Mrs A L Tran [4231]			Q15/18	<p>object to the development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - style and density will be different to existing local area - traffic situation will be worse, safety of people will be compromised and health affected by - more demand for on-street parking spaces - local schools are already full more pressure on them - some very old trees on the site. - loss of sports pitches - area prone to flooding - too far from Solihull town centre to satisfy accessibility requirements
Mrs Amanda Donlon [3691]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as will have a serious effect on congestion, road safety, roadside parking and pollution from traffic, which is already an issue with numerous accidents, gridlock in peak hours and inconsiderate school parking creating a dangerous situation that will be made much worse. Loss of sports ground when there is a shortage of sports facilities, which will need to be replaced and Council policy is to retain the site for sports use. Will worsen existing flooding problems on Sharmans Cross Road.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs B Hukin [4014]			Q15/18	<p>Loss of sporting facilities in a Borough where participation in sport is poor.</p> <p>Would be out of character with surrounding residential development and could have impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.</p> <p>Will add to traffic congestion in the area and will impact detrimentally on highway safety and pollution.</p> <p>Difficult to see how parking will be accommodated.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Impact on TPO trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Impact on schools and medical facilities which are already over subscribed.</p> <p>Access to amenities are beyond walking distances in NPPF.</p> <p>Land should be used for sport only.</p>
Mrs B Thomas [4397]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of local character.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution.</p> <p>Pressure on local services such as schools and healthcare.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Detrimental impact on local community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Brenda Knight [4212]			Q15/18	<p>development is not supported on this site as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would lead to a loss of open/sports land - increase the density of housing in the area - increased pressure/demand on schools and medical facilities - TPOs on the trees surrounding the club - increase in traffic
Mrs C Rawkins [4100]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18, as density involves overdevelopment of site out of scale and character with surroundings which will impact on adjoining residents, will exacerbate congestion and gridlock on Sharmans Cross/Streetsbrook Roads and increase traffic on side roads increasing danger to pedestrians especially school children, local medical services are full and question whether schools have sufficient places, Council policy supports retention of site for sport, bus services not as frequent as suggested, and Arden club is not party to proposal.</p>
Mrs Deborah Chard [3418]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing site 18 as will add to serious congestion on road system already under enormous pressure, the access will cross designated pedestrian and cycle route to detriment of safety of children walking to school, the proposed development is over intensive, out of character with the surrounding area, will increase noise, affordable housing will adversely change the feel and prestige of the area, will destroy wildlife habitat, exacerbate risk of flooding, and involves the loss of valuable recreational land important for health and well being conflicting with national policy guidance.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Foster [3943]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Too high a density. Will destroy local character.</p> <p>More housing will exacerbate existing traffic volumes.</p> <p>Highway safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians due to increased traffic.</p> <p>Pollution from traffic will increase.</p> <p>Existing parking issues will be increased.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road will get worse.</p> <p>Permanent loss of a sports facility, at a time when obesity is a national concern. Solihull in 3rd quartile nationally for over 16s in sport.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and TPOs.</p> <p>Schools and medical centres already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Not meet accessibility criteria.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sporting use.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Ioanne Burnell [3445]		Q15/18	<p>The site has covenants regarding is use solely for sporting purposes.</p> <p>It would damage the existence of Solihull Arden Club and would impact on the club in terms of noise, dust, access and parking.</p> <p>Would increase traffic within the surrounding area.</p> <p>Would impact on schools where there is lack of places and doctors.</p> <p>Lack of sports ground facilities for football and Rugby in the local area.</p> <p>Object to a land swap between the site promoters and the tennis club as this could inhibit future growth aspirations.</p>
Mrs J A Edwards [4593]		Q15/18	<p>objection for the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -number of houses being proposed on the above site is not realistic -will have an adverse effect on the character of the surrounding neighbourhood -development will result in many trees being destroyed, and impact on wildlife -increase in traffic which will result, having a serious effect on the safety of the roads and the increase in pollution levels

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Wort [4418]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Description of site in Appendix C is misleading. Large area of allocation is Arden Tennis Club which is not unused.</p> <p>Loss of tennis club would be detrimental to local community. Other facilities are well-used.</p> <p>No other similar facility locally.</p> <p>Loss of accessible sports pitches in a residential area.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools.</p> <p>Allocation is premature, should be considered as part of a planning application.</p>
Mrs Jane Howe [4697]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as relocation of Arden club unacceptable on leasehold land as no means to raise funds for repairs, would make parking at peak times even more difficult and likely to spill out onto Sharmans Cross Road, and although land needs something to happen to it 100 houses is not the solution.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs K A Voogd [4391]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Out of keeping with local character of area. High density of housing and apartment blocks.</p> <p>Loss of trees and greenery.</p> <p>Increase danger to residents from on-street parking on Sharmans Cross Road and surrounds.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Will increase flood risk in area.</p> <p>Increased pollution.</p> <p>Increase in cars.</p>
Mrs K Phillips [3938]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on Pow Grove Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>How will right of way through Welcombe Grove be managed?</p> <p>Concern about loss of sports pitch.</p> <p>Need for sports pitches will rise with increased population due to housing allocations. Should be considered.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs L J Bull [4440]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Overcrowding of houses. Will destroy local character.</p> <p>Affordable housing will be more than 2 storeys in height; resulting in loss of light, privacy and overshadowing.</p> <p>School and medical centre already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road has flooding issues.</p> <p>Increase in traffic, pollution.</p> <p>Impact on highway safety, danger to pedestrians, cyclists.</p> <p>Parking issues.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Loss of TPOs.</p> <p>Harm to wildlife.</p> <p>Further parking issues if Solihull Arden Club remains.</p> <p>Previous application been refused for some of above reasons.</p> <p>Should be removed from allocations.</p>
Mrs Muriel Welsby [4692]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as would increase the traffic and noise nuisance on Sharmans Cross Road and the strain on local health and medical facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs P Goodban [4405]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Out of scale and character of surrounding area. High density development will cause loss of light and privacy. Increase in noise and pollution.</p> <p>Loss of open space.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Impact on trees.</p> <p>Should retain historical covenant on land for sport use.</p> <p>Increase flood risk.</p> <p>Increase traffic on busy roads. Increase hazards to road users, particularly walking children to school.</p> <p>Many road accidents at Sharman Cross/Streebsbrook Road junction.</p> <p>Local infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic, sewage, flooding, hazards.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pat Cropper [4184]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ALTClub Ltd is freeholder of club land, as intimated, will be asked to exchange it for a piece leasehold land on which a new club will be built, we will become asset less - proposal has been described as being 'dense' - contrary to Sport England Policy of retaining all sporting land, - Parking spaces are already at a premium, will result in parking problems - many members would leave Solihull Arden rendering this prestigious club unviable - TPOs - not accessible to/from PT
Mrs Sandra Stephens [4347]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Development unsuitable, will destroy local character.</p> <p>Concerned about impact of affordable housing on area of expensive housing.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing traffic issues. Near a school and cycle route. Danger to children.</p> <p>Parking already bad at peak times and sports matches.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sport use.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Valerie Young [3410]			Q15/18	<p>The land is designated for the playing of sports and I would very much like this to remain so as I believe there are a number of local sports clubs looking for affordable fields.</p> <p>Concern about the increased level of traffic exiting onto Sharmans Cross Road and any other roads involved in the development and the resulting impact on safety, noise and pollution.</p> <p>Local services of schooling and medical which are already under pressure would only suffer further with such a development.</p> <p>High density of housing is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area.</p>
Mrs Y A Warren [4717]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 due to loss of amenity for sports activities, unsympathetic and over intensive development out of keeping with surrounding area and increased traffic and parking problems.</p>
Mrs Zoe Edwards [2907]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as too intense, density out of keeping with character of neighbourhood, additional residents and deliveries will exacerbate traffic problems in Sharmans Cross Road and surrounding roads which are already gridlocked at certain times and unsuitable for cycling and walking due to traffic and pollution, destroy further quality of life in the area, increase danger to pedestrians and children walking to/from school, increase pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical services, worsen flooding during heavy rain, remove a valuable green space that Council policy has been to retain for sport, and loss of wildlife habitat.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Susan Holden [4423]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sporting use. Site not been well promoted by existing owners.</p> <p>Lack of sporting facilities in the area.</p> <p>Add to existing traffic issues, particularly at peak times and school run.</p> <p>Additional pollution.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p> <p>Increase to flood risk.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Local amenities already overstretched, e.g. GPs and Solihull hospital.</p>
Neal Clements [4379]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of too much green space.</p> <p>Loss of trees and green character.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>More pressure on oversubscribed schools and services in the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Neeta Karelia [3655]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as loss of green space and increased traffic will ruin character and local wildlife, additional residents will put more pressure on schools and medical facilities already subject to high demand, development will exacerbate traffic congestion, delays and pollution around Sharmans Cross roundabout creating difficulties using road for work and schools, and safety risk for younger users, and destruction of sports ground will ruin the appearance and appeal of Solihull.
Neil Eaton [4181]			Q15/18	#NAME?
Neil Jones [4469]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as density too high and will create parking problems exacerbated if Arden club lose parking spaces and cause chaos on Sharmans Cross and adjacent roads already overburdened at peak times, will diminish local services through extra pressure on schools and medical services, development is out of character with area, will worsen drainage/flooding problems, destroy wildlife, and result in loss of valuable sports facilities which have been and should continue to be protected for recreation.
Nicola Moriarty [3622]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as a large development of this type is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood and houses, will exacerbate already significant peak hours traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road and at junction with Streetsbrook Road where accidents have occurred, on what is an important route for pedestrians and children, will contravene covenant on use of land for sporting purposes at a time when retaining sports grounds is vital for health and well being, and lead to loss of natural habitat and wildlife.
Nigel Canning [4185]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection principally on the ground that it will lead a loss of the sports ground/facilities.</p> <p>I represent Solihull FC based at the Silhillians Sports Club in Solihull where we have 26 youth football teams but next season will exceed the capacity of the site and need additional pitch capacity to facilitate the growth of the club. We are a charter standard club and expect to need a home for 6 - 8 teams that cannot be accommodated at our current location.</p> <p>covenant in place which restricts the land use to sporting/recreation only.</p> <p>refers to the playing pitch strategy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nigel Dwyer [3692]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as Sharmans Cross Road already suffers from flooding and developing this sports ground will increase the risk in addition to climate change, the increase in traffic and parking will be more than the already congested roads can safely accommodate, social infrastructure especially medical facilities which are already overstretched will be a problem, and retention of sporting facilities is good for people's health.
Nik Hayfield [3656]			Q15/18	Object to housing on site 18 due to the increased volume and density of traffic, which will worsen the issue of roadside parking on Sharmans Cross Road increasing the risk for cyclists, and the impact of additional residents on already stretched local amenities including medical facilities.
Norman Bird [4248]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as development of sports and recreation facilities contrary to commitment to protect facilities and will aggravate current shortage, high density and height of proposal out of character with surroundings, will exacerbate congestion and gridlock on Sharmans Cross Road causing hazard to school children, pedestrians and cyclists, suggestion of access to Winterbourne Road unsuitable as narrow residential road, and concerned that impact on Arden club published and handled in devious way.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/18	Support the site's inclusion in the DLP. provide details on: design & layout; social benefits; flood risk and drainage; trees and ecology; highways, traffic, and connectivity.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oliver Turley [4333]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Will be out of character with surrounding area.</p> <p>Previous application less houses and refused.</p> <p>Cause increased traffic and congestion on already busy road.</p> <p>Increased danger to pedestrians and cyclist.</p> <p>Increased in parking and congestion.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities. Land covenanted in 2013 for sports use. Solihull has low adult participation in sports.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Existing narrow single point of access off Sharmans Cross Road would be inadequate.</p> <p>Circa half of site is in regular use as a sport and community facility by the Solihull Arden Club.</p> <p>Allocation of land in its entirety is contrary to NPPF objectives on community health and well-being.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Pam Canning [4211]			Q15/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concerned about additional traffic being generated - difficult junction on to Streetsbrook road - loss of parking spaces within the site will mean additional on road parking - site does not meet key national sustainability criterias ie need to be
Pamela Cheshire [4383]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing high volume of traffic.</p> <p>Long traffic queues on Streetsbrook Road and Sharmans Cross Road at peak times.</p> <p>Junction of Dorchester Road/Streetsbrook Road is particularly dangerous.</p> <p>Consider safety of schoolchildren walking to school.</p> <p>Parents dropping children off are partially blocked by parked cars.</p> <p>On-street parking issues caused by people parking car in area and walking to station or town centre.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools and doctors surgeries.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sport or leisure activities.</p>
Patricia Mangan [3711]			Q15/18	<p>increased traffic, pressure on medical and school facilities, as well as flooding are all given as reasons for objecting to this site.</p> <p>express concerns about scale/character of any new development and impact on existing residents.</p>
Paul Cowley [3626]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing site 18 as will result in loss of another playing pitch facility to add to those developed over the years, and will be totally inappropriate due to the increased number of vehicles on the road and further pressure placed on local schools and medical facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Ponsonby [4738]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as it is a much needed sporting facility for which there is local demand that is being ignored, density is far too high and out of character with surrounding area, would put at risk trees on site and worsen already significant flooding problem, and would make already significant traffic problems on road unbearable leading to road safety issues.
Paul Robbins [4392]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Out of scale, out of character and inappropriate development for local area. Building more than 2 storeys high will result in loss of privacy, loss of light and overshadowing.</p> <p>Increased pollution and traffic.</p> <p>Increase in parking issues.</p> <p>Increase in flood risk.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p>
Paul Umbers [4140]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as additional loading on existing drainage system upgraded some years ago to address flooding may have undesirable consequences, proposals may include vehicular access from site to Winterbourne Road/Beaminster Road, which are unsuitable for increased traffic and would increase hazards and risk of accidents, as witnessed when major functions at Tudor Grange, roads especially Sharmans Cross Road with its school unsuitable for construction vehicles or additional traffic, and will exacerbate traffic problems associated with junctions with Streetsbrook Road/Dorchester Road.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Woolman [4209]			Q15/18	- Object on the grounds that it will lead to a: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of sporting facilities - green space - compromises the road safety (increases pollution, - increase in the carbon footprint - negatively impacts on schools and health provision
Pauline Owen [3678]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as Sharmans Cross Road is a very busy road and additional people and vehicles will cause chaos in peak times, as Streetsbrook Road and town centre are gridlocked, building on green fields will exacerbate flooding problems in the road, and will worsen the existing parking problem with school, sports clubs and commuter parking.
Peter Butler [4234]			Q15/18	objecting to the inclusion of the site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - designated as sports land as per lease (covenant) - demand which exists is being suppressed by the current owners of the land, thereby contravening the lease agreement.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Owen [3493]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18</p> <p>Density of proposal out of character for the area.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Doubt there will be sufficient parking for Arden Club and properties.</p> <p>Flooding issues in nearby back gardens.</p> <p>Schools and medical centres overstretched.</p> <p>Loss of sporting use.</p>
Peter Steele [4025]			Q15/18	<p>Loss of sporting facilities. The land should be retained for sporting use as SMBC policy is not to sell the freehold.</p> <p>Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area. Out of scale and character compared to housing in the vicinity.</p> <p>Will reduce existing car parking and provides inadequate spaces for the volume of homes proposed. On-street car parking will increase.</p> <p>The site is unsustainable as it does not meet the accessibility criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>There will be degradation of services for local residents whose schools and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Swingler [4020]			Q15/18	Too many open spaces have already been lost to development. At this rate Solihull will become a concrete jungle instead of the leafy borough it was once known as. Both the Government and councils are hypocritical over the development of sports grounds - campaigning for people to become fit and healthy by having more exercise to take the pressure off NHS on one hand, while cutting down on walking areas and sports fields on the other. The rugby ground is used by hundreds of walkers, apart from being used for sport. The amenity should be kept as it is.
Phil Leech [4543]			Q15/18	Site 18 Objection. Impact on infrastructure; current utilities under pressure e.g. surface water and foul drainage. Impact on oversubscribed schools and doctor surgeries. Local traffic congestion at peak times and school run. Loss of local sporting facilities. Previous applications been refused.
Phillip Ellis [4183]			Q15/18	Site 18 Objection for the following reasons: - has always been used for a sporting purpose. - will increase the volume of traffic on Sharmans Cross Road to such an extent that it will cause a danger to pedestrians, cyclists, - will also increase the parking in Sharmans Cross Road - immediate and surrounding area of this site is subject to raised water levels
Phillip Leyland [3701]			Q15/18	recent flooding, traffic congestion pressure on infrastructure and impact on local area are all cited as reasons for objecting to this site.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Professor Derek Sheldon [3955]</p>		<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Understand that land is only to be used for sporting purposes and SMBC would not sell freehold.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Existing shortage of pitches in Solihull. Should be replaced with equivalent accessibility and quality.</p> <p>At least 1700m from town Centre and 1km from train station. Contrary to NPPF.</p> <p>Solihull Arden Club were unaware of Oakmoor/Cerda Call for Sites submission. Proposal should be withdrawn.</p> <p>Will increase volumes of traffic; already heavily congested area.</p> <p>Serious impact on highway, pedestrian and cyclist safety, especially schoolchildren.</p> <p>High density will destroy local character; overshadowing and loss of privacy for existing dwellings.</p>
<p>R Courtney [4488]</p>		<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as density proposed is too high and will exacerbate parking problems and flood risk, increased traffic will exacerbate traffic congestion on road and at junction with Streetsbrook Road often gridlocked, impact on road safety and levels of pollution, and should be retained for sports use as originally dedicated as few pitches in Solihull and should be encouraging participation in sporting activities.</p>
<p>R E Montague [4533]</p>		<p>Q15/18</p>	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as results in permanent loss of sporting facilities when other facilities under pressure and Solihull falling short of provision for over 16s, fail to see how could be replaced with equivalent accessibility and quality, will exacerbate traffic congestion especially at peak times and parking problems compounded by loss of spaces for Arden club, will worsen flooding and drainage problems by loss of natural drainage, loss of green space, development out of keeping with and will impact on surroundings, and Council should maintain policy restriction to sports use and recognise use deterred by high rent demanded.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
R J Griffiths [4285]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as whilst recognises need for additional housing, disagrees that should be resolved at local rather than national level or through infill developments which will exacerbate infrastructure issues, surrounding roads suffer from acute traffic congestion with volume of traffic already exceeding capacity both during and outside peak periods and additional traffic will increase gridlock and pollution and reduce road safety, loss to quality pitches will reduce quality of life and sports use should be retained in line with covenant, will exacerbate surface water flooding and overburden road, medical and educational infrastructure.
R S Windebank [4210]			Q15/18	site 18 objection as it would lead to increased: traffic, congestion, pollution and it would be out of keeping with the local area.
Raghu Devarajan [4374]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic will lead to significant noise and pollution, and adverse impact on residents and those walking and cycling for leisure/commute.</p> <p>Increase in congestion.</p> <p>Impact on road safety.</p> <p>History of traffic related accidents on this stretch of road.</p>
Rajko Pajic [3828]			Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection on density and loss of privacy for existing residents from new developments.</p> <p>loss of sporting facilities - and health impact,</p> <p>increased pressure on infrastructure - roads, parking, medical and schools.</p> <p>impact on highway safety</p>
Ralph Holden [3625]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as schools already overcrowded, will exacerbate flooding in area, parking is very difficult, and loss of valuable venue for sporting activities for current and future generations.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Raphala Holdgate [4516]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as results in loss of playing field, when more facilities for recreation required, demand for pitches at affordable rent, density much higher and unsuitable in area and high rise will impact on surrounding residents, schools and medical facilities already stretched and additional residents will make worse with some facilities well away and accessible by car only, will exacerbate traffic congestion, risk of accidents and pollution on Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road, and parking problems around site and reduce safety of school children.
Rebecca Stephen [4282]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as additional traffic will exacerbate congestion and pollution on Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road especially at peak times and be danger to school children, pedestrians and cyclists, access to Winterbourne Road/Beaminster Road is unsuitable owing to width and quiet residential character, would increase demand for school places where local schools already oversubscribed and for medical services, design and density out of character with surrounding area, and will result in loss of sporting facilities.
Reginald & Ida Patrick [4182]			Q15/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SCR is subject to severe traffic congestion at rush hours - Vehicles exiting or entering the new proposed site will cause chaos, - The road junction with Streetsbrook Road is subject to heavy flooding. A housing development of the nature proposed wi
Rhys Ponsonby [4739]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as site is valuable amenity for local residents and should be protected for sport and recreation use, will be detrimental to character of area, put unacceptable pressure on local schools and medical services, and would exacerbate already bad traffic congestion especially in peak times.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rich Westman [4314]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Site 18 is put forward in response to Government requirements to delivery affordable housing.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. 5x local density. Will require 3 storey properties which will be visible from existing houses.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Not meet accessibility criteria in Policy P7.</p>
Richard Burbidge [4263]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as will increase issues of oversubscribed schools and medical services, exacerbate gridlock at peak times on Sharmans Cross Road and parking associated with relocated Arden club and new development, worsen unacceptably existing flooding and problems with sewage systems, and land designated for sports use with policy to retain and there is no reason to change this.</p>
Richard Shaylor [4323]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic movements.</p> <p>More pollution.</p> <p>Loss of wildlfie.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Existing lack in Solihull.</p> <p>Extra demand on overstretched hospitals, GP services, schools.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Young [4484]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as the pitches have been an important sporting facility for the local area and should be retained and offered at affordable cost, would exacerbate traffic congestion and pollution, will add to pressure on local services such as doctors, density and type of development proposed is out of keeping with area and will impact surrounding residents, and any removal of natural and mature woodland around the site will result in loss of wildlife.
Rishi Jassal [3523]			Q15/18	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>SMBC state in 2013 that grounds for sports use only.</p> <p>Not comply with Policy P7 - town centre not within walking distance</p> <p>Loss of character and green areas</p> <p>Negative impact on amenity and wildlife</p> <p>Add to existing congestion and parking issues</p> <p>Flooding on Sharmans Cross Road</p> <p>Need for sports ground</p> <p>Schools and medical centres oversubscribed</p>
Robert May [4002]			Q15/18	<p>Concerned about the impact that the development will have on the Silhill Football Club Sports ground adjacent.</p> <p>Already suffer problems from dog mess and public access to the pitches.</p> <p>Impact on drainage.</p>
Robert & Marilyn Williams [4519]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 due to loss of sporting facilities in an area of shortage, cost of replacement facilities, impact on environment and TPOs, failure to meet accessibility criteria, policy to retain for sports use only, and development having previously been refused.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Blond [3614]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as it is out of scale and character with the existing area, will increase traffic congestion, air pollution and safety concerns close to Sharmans Cross school, will exacerbate parking problems when Arden sports club hold functions, will result in loss of recreational facility when residents should be being encouraged to play sport, and will threaten trees and wildlife in adjoining Pow Grove wood.
Robert Hopkins [4243]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as development too large and should be restricted to the affordable housing element not exceeding 50 houses, as more will greatly increase traffic, be a hazard to pedestrians close to school, will worsen potential flooding in area and be contrary to previous attempts to obtain permission.
Robert J Price [4750]			Q15/18	<p>Loss of sports ground. Inadequate supply in Solihull.</p> <p>Cheap-cost housing is out of character with surrounding area.</p> <p>Loss of green space and green character.</p> <p>Doctors, primary schools and other local services are not 'accessible' in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Parking would be inadequate.</p> <p>Local sewerage system overloaded.</p> <p>Site been designated for sporting uses only by Council.</p> <p>Should be leased for sport and not social housing.</p>
Robert Jones [3970]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of leisure amenity facility. In decline generally.</p> <p>Increased traffic to Junior School. Junction with Streetsbrook Road highly dangerous.</p> <p>School expansion to cope with increased pupils would result in loss of play areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Verrion [3613]			Q15/18	Object to housing site 18 as it will increase the population density in Sharmans Cross Road by 76.3%, worsen the already bad traffic situation with gridlock or highly congested junctions with Streetsbrook Road and other roads, especially at peak times, mean a further deterioration in the local environment and increased danger for pedestrians and cyclists, increase the congestion and safety risk to children associated with Sharmans Cross junior school, and exacerbate flooding issues in Sharmans Cross Road and at the junction with Streetsbrook Road already made bad by a civil engineering error.
Robin Davis [3959]			Q15/18	<p>The site is surrounded by houses of a far less density.</p> <p>It will result in a considerable increase in traffic on Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road, both of which are gridlocked during rush hours.</p> <p>There is unlikely to be sufficient parking space for the Solihull Arden Club.</p> <p>The site has been designated for sporting activities and SMBC has a Statutory requirement to provide such facilities.</p> <p>Schools and medical services are not capable of dealing with further demands.</p>
Roger Clench [4213]			Q15/18	<p>development is not supported on this site as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - would lead to a loss of open/sports land - increase the density of housing in the area - increased pressure/demand on schools and medical facilities - TPOs on the trees surrounding the club - increase in traffic, parking issues,

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Roger Chapman [3972]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Negative impact on high quality of local character and TPO trees.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Increased traffic volumes on Sharmans Cross Road and surrounds.</p> <p>Increased highway and pedestrian safety risks, especially to Junior School.</p> <p>Increased congestion at peak times.</p>
Roger Flood [3937]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Distressed to see more sports areas being used for housing.</p> <p>Sport England will not support.</p> <p>Shortage of pitches currently in Solihull.</p> <p>Any loss of pitches should be replaced.</p> <p>Inadequate local facilities e.g. schools and medical care.</p> <p>School on Sharmans Cross Road already been lost to housing.</p> <p>Extra traffic would aggravate existing issues and increase danger to children walking to school.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Roger Hopper [4132]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as current Council policy to restrict to sports use should be retained as Borough short of sports facilities compared with elsewhere and lies in good location for users, development will add traffic to local roads where peak time congestion is out of control close to school with its extra traffic and danger to pedestrians, represents unacceptable overdevelopment out of scale and character with surroundings, and would overload local schools and medical facilities that are already oversubscribed.
Roger Nunn [4220]			Q15/18	Objection to the sites for the following reasons: - loss of wildlife habitat - Traffic, associated pollution will increase - loss of sporting facilities for local population - density of development not in keeping with surrounding are - covenant on land/freehold for sports use
Roger Taylor [4087]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as too high density, will destroy the character of the area and social housing out of character, additional traffic will increase congestion on Sharmans Cross Road, close to school and Streetsbrook Road junction, loss of parking at Arden club which will worsen congestion, schools and medical services oversubscribed, development will worsen current flooding problems, and proposal for vehicular access to Winterbourne Road will increase traffic and safety risk in unsuitable roads and congestion in Dorchester Road.
Roger W Ball [4701]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as density out of keeping with area and will exacerbate traffic volumes which often result in gridlock, extra traffic will impact on pedestrians and school children going to nearby schools, will increase demands on local schools and medical services, will result in loss of more sporting facilities despite Council policy to retain in sports use, and loss of green space and wildlife.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Edwards [4237]			Q15/18	Objection on the basis that; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased levels of pollution esp for schoolchildren - traffic gridlock and concerns about safety of pedestrians - more pressure on schools and doctors - development will be out of character with existing housing - less public amenities and parkland in central Solihull - loss of valuable habitat for wildlife
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/18	Although unused this is still a loss of Sports pitches. Unsure how this impacts on sports provision within Solihull. No reference directly to relocation or compensation.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/18	Although unused this is still a loss of Sports pitches. Unsure how this impacts on sports provision within Solihull. No reference directly to relocation or compensation.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Rosemary Bowcott [4742]		Q15/18	<p>Overdevelopment of site. Over 2 storeys high will result in loss of light and privacy.</p> <p>Out of character.</p> <p>Land has been safeguarded for sporting use only. Sporting facilities are precious and should not be lost.</p> <p>Schools and services will suffer.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues.</p> <p>Added pressure to additional congestion and school traffic.</p> <p>Access from Winterbourne Road would result in too much traffic, roads are too narrow.</p> <p>Whole idea unviable.</p>
Royden Hukin [4163]		Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as developer has demanded unaffordable rents precluding use by local sports clubs, will worsen already shameful provision for sport for over 16s, contrary to policy to retain land in sports use and previous decisions, high density likely to mean some 3 storey development ruled out elsewhere in area, will worsen risk of flooding during heavy rain and traffic congestion and parking on Sharmans Cross Road heading towards Streetsbrook Road and Solihull in peak times, additional hazard to children walking or cycling to school, and schools and medical srvices already oversubscribed.</p>
S A Kirby [4741]		Q15/18	<p>Development would cause considerable loss of amenity in the Sharmans Cross area. The increased traffic would endanger children attending the adjacent school and cause further obstruction to emergency services who use the road for rapid response</p> <p>There is already roadside parking which would be made worse.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues at times of heavy rainfall which would be made worse by the development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
S A Sheldon [4194]			Q15/18	<p>site 18 objection on the basis that the area is:</p> <p>already busy with cars</p> <p>increased pollution</p> <p>issues with parking leading to difficulties for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>impact on infrastructure (schools & medical provision)</p> <p>loss of sporting facilities</p> <p>flooding of the area in the past.</p>
Sadia Ahmad [4297]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Unacceptable overdevelopment of the site. Buildings will be more than 2 storeys leading to loss of light, loss of privacy and overshadowing.</p> <p>Development will result in:</p> <p>Increased traffic and associated pollution</p> <p>Serious effect on highway safety and convenience of road users as well as pedestrians.</p> <p>Increased volumes of traffic moving in/out of site, especially those turning right out of site towards town.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrians, in particular unaccompanied children going to/from Sharmans Cross Junior School.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sahad Zaman [4539]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will exacerbate traffic congestion especially at Streetsbrook Road junction, cause health and safety concerns around school, be danger to pedestrians and school children, density of development too high and out of character with surroundings, there are insufficient playing fields and green space and area should be protected.
Sam Robbins [4193]			Q15/18	reasons given are: - lack of suitability of development with the area - traffic and pollution will be increased as a result of the development - issues surrounding parking will be increased. - loss of sporting facilities will be permanent - flooding is a problem when there is heavy rainfall - social infrastructure is already over-subscribed
Sarah Glynn [4141]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as Sharmans Cross Road is already very busy and junction with Streetsbrook Road hazardous and could not cope with impact of additional traffic, will exacerbate problems associated with on-street parking especially at school drop off/collection times, increased danger to pedestrians especially children from traffic and construction vehicles, schools and medical services are already oversubscribed and will require investment/expansion to cope, land designated for sport with Council policy to retain use and loss of facility will make ensuring healthy lifestyles more difficult, and development is excessive and completely out of proportion with local area.
Sarah La Touche [4265]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as would result in loss of sporting facilities when there is already a shortage and other facilities at capacity, contrary to policy to retain land in sporting use, demand exists but developers have prevented use, loss of green space, trees and wildlife habitats, proposed development is out of character with surroundings and inclusion of affordable housing will change the range of people moving into the area, and will exacerbate traffic problems and disruption on already busy road and at junction with Streetbrook Road both during construction and when occupied.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Shaida Zaman [4341]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Heavily congested area with commuters and school run.</p> <p>More development will result in serious impact on highway safety and danger to pedestrians, especially children.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Will destroy current character of neighbourhood.</p> <p>Lack of amenities. Train station and town centre 1000-1100m away.</p> <p>Local bus services only run every half hour Mon-Sat and every hour on Sunday.</p> <p>GPs and primary schools 1500m from site with no direct bus links.</p> <p>Local junior school oversubscribed.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sports use. Only publicly accessible sports ground in the vicinity.</p>
Sharon Anne Burbidge [4264]		Q15/18	<p>Object to housing Site 18 as proposal is totally out of scale and overdevelopment, additional vehicles will exacerbate traffic problems and pollution especially at peak times with serious impact on pedestrians, children walking to/from school and cyclists, worsen problems with inconsiderate parking especially at school times, exacerbate flooding from poor drainage, increase pressure on local schools and medical services, development likely to include 3 storey properties and impact on TPOs, severely jeopardise dwindling supply of sports facilities, when adults and children being encouraged to exercise, and concerned that Arden club land may also be used.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Shaun Friel [4199]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitability of this site as a housing development is questionable. - additional demand on local amenities, Doctors, Dentists, Schools are already oversubscribed will lead to their degrading. - increased volume of traffic, totally destroying the character of this well established neighbourhood. - the area remains, prone to flooding. - Pedestrian safety will also become an issue, - existing community needs to be considered. - Affordable housing on a premium location is an oxymoron . - Communities need recreational sites.
Shivangee Maurya [3764]			Q15/18	<p>increase traffic and congestion will lead to a less safe place for children and families.</p> <p>Will also stretch the health services.</p>
SILHILL FOOTBALL CLUB (MR PHIL HAYNES) [3612]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing on site 18 on behalf of Silhill football club members as part of concerted damaging proposals to identify sports pitches across the Borough for development contrary to planning guidelines and policies protecting playing pitches, site is in area where the few sports pitches that remain are of key importance for health and well-being, development is likely to worsen flooding and drainage problems, and lack of attempts to retain use for rugby or other sports.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Eastwood [4159]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as will increase pressure on already oversubscribed schools and the number of rejections in an area already experiencing the highest number of rejected applications, with no provision for increasing places at local infant/junior school, will increase traffic congestion and danger to school children and cyclists on Sharmans Cross Road especially around the school start/finish times and at junction with Streetsbrook Road, will result in loss of sporting facilities when there is a covenant to retain, great demand from local sport teams but priced out by rent demands, and local services already stretched.
Solihull Arden Club (Richard Dumbleton) [3067]			Q15/18	owner occupier of part site - no commitment to the plans
Solihull Arden Club (Richard Dumbleton) [3067]			Q15/18	<p>No commitment to such development plans and fully reserve our rights regarding the land and premises which we own and occupy. However, we do have specific criteria that need to be complied with in order to ensure further cooperation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Tenure of the land occupied by the club comparable to existing arrangements i.e. Freehold -Beneficial improvements to the structure and buildings of the clubhouse and its associated playing and fitness facilities. -Ease of access into and out of the site. -Significant improvement regarding car parking arrangements. -Significant improvement to the club's potential for future sustainability.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q15/18	<p>Sport England are aware that work is currently underway on the completion of an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strateg(PPS).</p> <p>The PPS should be used to determine whether or not the playing fields proposed for allocation is surplus to sporting requirements by demonstrating that there is an excess of playing fields in the catchment.</p> <p>If this cannot be demonstrated then the playing field or formal recreation land would need to be replaced with equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality.</p> <p>In the absence of evidence to justify the loss of sporting facilities, Sport England object.</p>
Stan Lewis [3879]			Q15/18	<p>Use of land, flooding, environmental reasons, traffic and associated air pollution, pressure on schools and medical facilities are all given as reasons for opposing the proposals.</p>
Stephen Clarke [4164]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing which will have detrimental effect on area from extra traffic increasing difficulty for crossing road to school and creating more pollution, worsen current gridlock during peak periods towards Solihull and Birmingham, high density will increase street parking problems that already exist with school traffic, schools are oversubscribed and shops and medical facilities struggling to meet current demand, loss of wildlife habitat, density proposed will drastically alter character of area with necessity for buildings over 2 storeys, land used for overflow parking by Arden and Silhill clubs, informal recreation and should be retained for sport as previous policy.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Stephen O'Connor [3951]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic regularly gridlocked in Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Parents bring children to school in sometimes dangerous circumstances.</p> <p>Medical centre appointments oversubscribed.</p> <p>All of above will worsen with 100 additional houses.</p> <p>Will destroy local character. Loss of light and privacy.</p> <p>Understood land was only for sport use and freehold would not be sold. Inappropriate development.</p>
Steve Harris [3947]		Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and consequently pollution.</p> <p>200+ extra cars.</p> <p>Road safety concerns, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians. Will worsen current situation, despite cycle lane. Safety of children walking to school will be jeopardised.</p> <p>Under law local amenities should be within 800m. Site 18 would be 1700m from Solihull Town Centre and 1000m from train station.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Steven Kentish [4005]			Q15/18	<p>Will exacerbate existing congestion, thereby increasing pollution. Will impact on road safety, increase risk to pedestrians and cyclists. Will exacerbate existing on-street parking issues and see result in less parking for the Arden Tennis Club.</p> <p>Out of character and appearance of the area and potential impact on living conditions of neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Impact on mature trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Accessibility not in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities, which SMBC gave a commitment to retain.</p> <p>Additional pressure on schools and doctors.</p>
Stewart Millman [4050]			Q15/18	<p>Existing traffic congestion and parking issues will be exacerbated, detrimentally impacting on highway and pedestrian safety and increasing pollution.</p> <p>The development should not proceed on if this fails to meet requirements of Policy P8.</p> <p>The council is hell bent on producing a housing plan without any regard or solution for the associated problems that will be caused. This I believe will have the effect of making Solihull a less desirable place to call home, both short term and into the foreseeable future.</p>
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/18	<p>Although unused this is still a loss of Sports pitches.</p> <p>Unsure how this impacts on sports provision within Solihull.</p> <p>No reference directly to relocation or compensation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sue Buttery [4695]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as land is a vital green space that is under constant threat of development which needs to be resolved by its retention for the benefit of the whole community, and development will exacerbate traffic problems already experienced in area and close to junior school.
Sue Clements [4178]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 due to loss of sports facility when community should be being encouraged to be more active/healthy, would reverse previous decisions to retain in sports use, added traffic will increase congestion over a wide area at peak times, and one of few green spaces still remaining in central Solihull.
Sue McDermott [4703]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as development should take place where infrastructure already exists, not where roads are currently gridlocked at peak times with pollution affecting children at local school, pedestrians and cyclists will have increasing safety hazards, local schools and medical services are oversubscribed, and would result in loss of viable sports ground when there is a need to encourage exercise to combat obesity by retaining existing facilities.
Suren Bharadwa [3944]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Local amenities being stretched by invasive developments.</p> <p>Been little effort to balance schooling with development.</p> <p>Existing traffic volume at peak times is excessive. Will increase and lead to increased accidents, increased air and noise pollution, danger to cyclists.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Surinder Jassal [4381]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Will change character of area. Loss of leafy green appearance.</p> <p>Increase flood risk.</p> <p>Land safeguarded for sports use. Policy should be reaffirmed.</p> <p>Increase in traffic volume, already busy road and hazardous to schoolchildren.</p> <p>Parking will get worse.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>More pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Site not accessible, i.e. not within walking distance of town centre or train station.</p>
Susan Sloan [4122]			Q15/18	<p>Object to development as would exacerbate traffic congestion and pollution on Sharmans Cross Road at Streetsbrook Road and Woodside Way junctions made worse by on street parking despite complaints and school and tennis club traffic, lead to rat running on unsuitable roads and further hazard for cycle route, reduce parking for Arden club, developer has blocked attempts made by sports clubs to use land in line with Council policy and loss will further deplete already poor provision of pitches, density of development will worsen flood risk, is out of character, will strain local infrastructure and fails accessibility criteria.</p>
T S Bett [3666]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing site 18 as environmentally detrimental to Solihull and will lead to further loss of playing pitches adjacent the site. Endorses and supports objections submitted by Sharmans Cross Action Group.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Teresa Freville [4376]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Past planning application been refused.</p> <p>Schools and medical centres oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of TPOs. Loss of green character. Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Shortage of pitches in the area. Understand Council has a responsibility to ensure lost pitches are replaced with facilities of equivalent quality and accessibility.</p> <p>Traffic on Sharmans Cross Road already gridlocked every morning.</p> <p>Increase journey times by 6 times already.</p> <p>Parking issues.</p> <p>Dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Will get worse.</p>
Terry Lloyd [3710]			Q15/18	<p>objecting as the development would lead to increase traffic congestion and pressure on local services</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	<p>Existing narrow single point of access off Sharmans Cross Road would be inadequate.</p> <p>Circa half of site is in regular use as a sport and community facility by the Solihull Arden Club.</p> <p>Allocation of land in its entirety is contrary to NPPF objectives on community health and well-being.</p>
Theresa Rogers-Garvey [3657]			Q15/18	<p>Object to housing on site 18 as will exacerbate already considerable morning peak time congestion and gridlock on Sharmans Cross, Stonor Park and Streetsbrook Roads, with attendant risks to safety of children walking to school, the development involves overdevelopment which will destroy local character, additional residents will result in degradation of local services with schools and medical facilities already oversubscribed, the impact of the cumulative loss of sports facilities, and will increase flooding problems in future.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/18	Existing narrow single point of access off Sharmans Cross Road would be inadequate. Circa half of site is in regular use as a sport and community facility by the Solihull Arden Club. Allocation of land in its entirety is contrary to NPPF objectives on community health and well-being.
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15/18	Solihull Arden Club in active use. Existing access is poor, likely that wider access would be required to serve residential development. If Tennis Club excluded from allocation, yield would be ca. 69 dwellings. Development of sports pitch would be loss of recreational land. It would be necessary to consult with Sport England on this matter.
Val Hone [4128]			Q15/18	Object to housing Site 18 as member of Arden club as will increase pollution and traffic with Sharmans Cross Road already gridlocked during peak times, compromise safety associated with adjacent school and football ground, decrease light and privacy to tennis club potentially impacting on TPO and wildlife, reduce parking available for tennis club, and result in loss of club identity with incorporation of community facilities within club land.
Vernon Basford [3708]			Q15/18	objecting to the site as it would increase traffic, congestion and add to the flooding issues from past.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Victoria Linekar [4359]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. Concerned for children's safety. Risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross School is oversubscribed. Development will have major effect on school places. Will require children travelling further to school.</p> <p>More traffic pollution.</p> <p>Loss of sporting area.</p>
Vikki Sunner [4432]			Q15/18	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Existing high levels of traffic.</p> <p>Land has been intended for sports and recreational use.</p> <p>Not sustainable under NPPF.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of the site.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q15/18	<p>Pow Grove Local Wildlife Site forms the western and southern boundaries of this site allocation, part of which includes ancient woodland. Mitigation will need to be in place to make sure that there is no direct or indirect harm to these habitats. Ancient woodland will need a semi-natural buffer to protect it from harm from neighbouring development.</p> <p>Likely that the Green Infrastructure required will need to include a semi-natural buffer of the neighbouring ancient woodland so as to protect it from harm.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/19 Land at HS2 Interchange				
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q15/19	<p>Support allocation of 1000 dwellings at the UKC Hub. However, this figure should be a minimum. More development could be delivered on the Arden Cross site.</p> <p>It would be prudent to set out separately the amount of housing Arden Cross and the NEC is expected to deliver over the plan period.</p> <p>Despite the allocation of housing to the UK Central Hub Area, there is concern that Arden Cross is not specifically included in the 'Summary Table of Allocated Sites'. This is contradicted by Policy P1 which promotes Arden Cross as providing residential opportunities.</p>
Armac Ltd [3949]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/19	No objection to the allocation, although it would encroach into the Meriden Gap.
Bickenhill & Marston Green Parish Council [3391]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/19	Support the concept of mixed development around the HS2 Interchange, but the Garden City approach outlined in 2014 must not be diluted in design terms just to accommodate the considerable increase in housing numbers now proposed for the site. The expectation that this will be an exemplary example of design with a public realm/open space and truly high quality sense of place that meets expectation, not a second rate development that will not justify taking the site out of the Green Belt.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/19	I can understand the logic of building residential properties in the vicinity of UK Central,
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q15/19	Fully support mixed use of site
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/19	should be removed from the section of the Plan relating to Policy P3

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15/19	Site 19 - UKC Hub: Further explanation required on 1000 figure.
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q15/19	Concerned Site 19 will not deliver sufficient homes.
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q15/19	Comment - Notes that the site includes and/or is adjacent to listed building(s). Concerned that SMBC has failed to demonstrate that the Plan will be consistent with the national objective of achieving sustainable development; that evidence has been gathered and applied to indicate a positive strategy for the historic environment will be employed or that great weight has been given to the conservation of affected designated heritage assets and their setting in accordance with national policy and legislative provisions.
John Robbins [4272]			Q15/19	Development should be focussed around areas with current and new infrastructure, such as HS2/NEC rather than South Shirley where it would add to congestion on routes to HS2 and the Resorts World complex.
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/19	<p>Whole of site is safeguarded by HS2. Council will have to consult with HS2 Ltd before any planning applications are determined.</p> <p>Consider 1,000 dwellings would have considerable impact on deliverability of HS2 site, and HS2 Ltd would not permit it.</p> <p>1,000 dwellings would need to be brought forward post HS2 construction, period 2026-2033. Very unlikely timescale.</p> <p>Deliverability requires more evidence from the Council.</p>
Mark Taft [3595]			Q15/19	Whilst the HS2 project is supported, it will attract a lot of extra residents to the area, who wish to commute to London, so a much more detailed plan to develop and accommodate people in close proximity to the station is required.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q15/19	state that 600 units (out of allocated 1000) could be delivered on NEC site during plan period. Overall may need a higher level of residential but not clear as whether this would be within Plan period.
North Warwickshire Borough Council (Mr M Dittman) [3848]			Q15/19	Note the emphasis the plan places on economic growth. Notwithstanding the above, there are significant local concerns over impact of UK Central proposals and development around HS2 Interchange station with regards to local, rural highway network and increased traffic flows and levels. Need to consider and include in DLP measures to address any potential adverse impacts, in parallel with maximising connectivity to the HS2 station.
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q15/19	Support, but more land should be released.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/19	Danger that the initial concept of garden village will get diluted. Risk that the Council will debase any high quality design to achieve the housing numbers. The Masterplan for Arden Cross should be the subject of consultation with MADE.
Richard Cowie [4276]			Q15/19	This area with its significant infrastructure improvements should take more growth rather than South Shirley and specifically instead of Site 13.
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/19	Areas of car park such as NEC and airport should be converted to multi-storey and the land save developed close to major infrastructure of HS2 and to compliment the Resort World, which would alleviate pressure on south to north traffic flow and use brownfield land.
Sheryl Chandler [4179]			Q15/19	Airport and NEC car parks should be used for housing instead of sites in South Shirley, as on main A45 which has capacity and is close to area of infrastructure improvements around HS2/NEC.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15/19	<p>Further explanation required on location and source 1000 figure.</p> <p>Site 19 has only been assessed as housing and not an employment site in SHELAA.</p> <p>Inaccuracies in measuring amount of Grade 1-3b land. Impact of Site 19 on SSSIs in vicinity has not been assessed.</p> <p>Compares less favourably with other sites including flooding, biodiversity and heritage concerns as well as impact of HS2 safeguarded land.</p>
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15/19	<p>Delivery of 1000 dwellings is optimistic in plan period up to 2031 (sic).</p> <p>Residential development could only commence once HS2 opened in 2026.</p> <p>143 dpa over 7 years would require 3 outlets per annum.</p> <p>May be pushed back further if delivery of HS2 is delayed.</p> <p>Delivery of housing before HS2 would mean construction issues, undesirable location and lack of facilities in close proximity.</p> <p>If site not come forward, will require other sites. SHELAA Site 207 is suitable alternative.</p>
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q15/19	Support.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 15/20 Land at Damson Parkway				
Armac Ltd [3949]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/20	<p>Site 20 will be for additional facilities for Land Rover or their supply chain. Land on the east side of Old Damson Lane through to the Coventry Road will impact significantly on sports clubs which will find it difficult to relocate.</p> <p>The allocation of land on the east side of Old Damson Lane would into more open land over the ridge line and into areas of woodland.</p> <p>Old Damson Lane would be a more defensible Green Belt Boundary and protect the character and appearance of the area as a gateway into the conurbation.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/20	should be removed from the section of the plan relating to policy P3
D Hartley [3068]			Q15/20	<p>Development is a bad idea and will change the setting of this Damsonwood area from mainly rural to the opposite of rural.</p> <p>Will downgrade our housing area making it like an area surrounded by industry. There is no need to make that negative change.</p> <p>What has the Council itself done to to clearly tell us about this?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q15/20	<p>EMPLOYMENT (NOT HOUSING).</p> <p>Allocation of land at Damson Parkway is in the right location owing to its relationship with the existing JLR Solihull plant.</p> <p>Insufficient space at existing plant to accommodate a logistics operation centre of sufficient size to meet business requirements of JLR.</p> <p>Will prevent the need for parts and components to be driven to of-site storage facilities.</p> <p>Policy needs to remain flexible.</p>
Mr Adrian Jones [3065]			Q15/20	<p>1) Site will probably reduce the number of people employed in the midlands within JLR supply chain.</p> <p>2) By freeing up the land identified in allocation 20 will create an uninterrupted length of commercial land in excess of 5 miles from Lode Lane in the West to beyond the current NEC site in the East.</p> <p>3) The buildings proposed by JLR for the logistic centre are totally disproportionate in terms of scale and height.</p> <p>4) JLR will take the cheapest solution as they have demonstrated already.</p> <p>5) Several thousand homes East/North East of Lugtrout Lane will be negatively affected.</p>
Mr John Outhwaite [3785]			Q15/20	do not consider Green Belt should be released for use by JLR
Mr W A Wood [3664]			Q15/20	The cumulative and long term impacts of development at site 20 including the new JLR Logistics Centre, and site 16 on traffic congestion in the area.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q15/20	Part of Site 20, at Dunstan Farm, should be allocated for housing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nigel Barney [4583]			Q15/20	JLR just extending for financial gain to reduce freight costs. Use the land for housing instead. Close to A45 and Damson Parkway, which have been designed to cope with large volumes of traffic.
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q15/20	Site 20, is a location that the Airport has previously formally identified as a potential site for a second shorter runway. The Government White Paper of 2003 'The Future of Air Transport', recommended safeguarding this area. This site seems to be allocated for Jaguar Land Rover expansion but is vaguely defined in the plan. A second runway, utilising Site 20, would be preferable to that of a new runway to the east of the A452, currently suggested by the Airport. Therefore Site 20 should not be developed until a long term plan is adopted for Birmingham Airport.
Prologis UK Limited (Alan Sarjant) [4635]			Q15/20	Support, but more land should be released.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/20	Object to going east of Old Damson Lane as the soft landscape context of that edge of the area is critical in the approach to the conurbation. The bulk of the site is likely to be mainly for Land Rover or their suppliers. The Local Plan offers nothing else in term of mixed employment sites. Those submitted through the Call for Sites have been ignored.
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/20	The proposed JLR site on Damson Parkway, is purely financial gain for the company to reduce freight costs. Why not build houses on Site 20 instead, which would be in the right area north of the town centre on the main arterial route of the A45, which has been developed to handle a large amount of traffic. The cost of JLR distribution is not the taxpayers concern.
Sheryl Chandler [4179]			Q15/20	Object to extension to JLR which is purely for company financial gain, land should be used for housing instead of sites in South Shirley, as on main A45 which has capacity and is close to area of infrastructure improvements around HS2/NEC.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stoford Properties [4587]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q15/20	<p>Consider that the proposed allocation of Site LPR 20 should be extended to include JLR, their supply chain and B1, B2 and B8 uses, in response to the significant need and market demand for large scale logistics and industrial floorspace in this location to meet the Borough's and wider sub-regional demand;</p> <p>Support the need for a masterplan to be prepared for the whole site to ensure that appropriate and effective development with necessary infrastructure, especially improvements to the A45/Damson Parway junction, can be delivered across the allocation.</p>
The Ramblers, warwickshire Area (Mr Michael Bird) [3483]			Q15/20	<p>Objection to Site 20.</p> <p>Proposal would cut Elmdon Park off from the adjoining countryside and Green Belt.</p> <p>Loss of landscape character.</p> <p>Reduced to totally enclosed urban park with industrial use to east.</p> <p>Public footpaths SL5 and SL6 traverse Site 20, could be connected to Elmdon Park.</p> <p>SL3 on north side of JLR plant been enclosed already.</p>
Question 15/alts Alternative Sites (Where a Call for Sites Submission Already Made)				
Alan Douglas [4166]			Q15/alts	<p>There is 100 acres of brownfield land at Lincoln Farm screened from Kenilworth Road, which is ideal for starter homes that are desperately needed, whilst most development in Balsall Common has been 4 and 5 bed homes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Amrit Teja [4784]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Andrea Baker [3471]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Andrew Hodge [3103]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
Andy Wilson [3394]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to Site 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Angela Lane [4769]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Angela Miller [3453]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Anne Hazlewood [4775]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Armac Ltd [3949]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>There is only one site allocated in the Draft Local Plan for employment purposes. Site 87 should be allocated as an employment site. Similar Green Belt Assessment score to site 19.</p> <p>it is a degraded site and not open countryside or agricultural land. Some of the site is a potential location for an alternative site for the Moat Lane Council Depot should that be released for residential development.</p> <p>There is a good and unique case for developing the site as part of the wider Solihull Gateway concept and UK Hub Growth Area.</p>
Ayaz Mahmood [4485]			Q15/alts	<p>Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.</p>
Balsall Common Properties (Mrs Catherine Cortez) [3778]			Q15/alts	<p>The North of Balsall Common (Wootton Green) is more suitable for homes. Good access to motorways for commuting to Birmingham, can help with the shortfall of new houses that has been identified in Birmingham and enable commuters to get many different places quickly without causing delays in village. There are defensible boundaries of HS2 and existing railway line. Building houses here is logical since it is on the edge of the village, historic sites will not be impacted, there are existing businesses so makes Brownfield use of the space, and the bypass gives an urban feel.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q15/alts	Alternative to Frog Lane that could be further investigated are SHELAA refs 135 and 104. These do not have significant negative SA impacts and the Green Belt performs poorly.
BC BARRAGE (BC Barrage) [3479]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be allocated as an alternative to sites 2 and 3.
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q15/alts	Support for SHELAA Site Reference 142, Grange Farm, Balsall Common. Disagree with findings in GBA, Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Character Assessment in relation to SHELAA Site 142. Site compares favourably with proposed allocations 1, 2 and 3. Our findings should be reflected in DLP and site included for development.
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	SHELAA site 1004. The site meets the Council's objectives. Contribute less to purposes of Green Belt than all of the proposed allocations that are in the Green Belt. More accessible, less impact on landscape character and would not impact on community facilities. Could contribute to a dispersed pattern of growth, be delivered quickly and does not involve the loss of existing community facilities. Include land south of Hampton Lane in addition to Allocation 16. This would provide a realistic alternative to the potential under-delivery of existing Solihull sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q15/alts	<p>New garden village on site 76.</p> <p>Site 2016 - Marsh Farm truck Stop.</p> <p>Lavender Hall Farm.</p> <p>Wooton Green lane (site 240).</p> <p>Springhill</p> <p>Site 43.</p> <p>Pheasant Oak Farm</p> <p>There are lots of other sites across the Borough with lower Green Belt value than site 1 and with better public transport links.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q15/alts	Land to the south of Hampton Lane Solihull,(SHELAA site 20)
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q15/alts	<p>putting forward land to the rear of Meriden C of E Primary School, Fillongley Road, Meriden (SHELAA 144) as a location that could appropriately accommodate sustainable residential development.</p> <p>ability of part of the site identified in these representations to provide much needed additional education development through the provision of an extension to the existing primary school</p> <p>proposed residential allocation will enable the school to expand and provide additional facilities including an all-weather pitch and a purpose built hall to ensure health and fitness requirements are met</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Catherine Langton [3384]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to Site 3.
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Copt Heath Golf Club [3026]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	requesting that council reconsider allocation of the site submitted (SHELAA site 244) as part of CfS exercise.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	Propose to put a smaller part of the original SHELAA Site 64 as a Rural Exception Site. Should be noted that whole of site is available. Important to specifically allocate sites that do not site close to the villages identified for housing growth as the lack of such allocations will leave a good deal of the Borough where the affordable housing requirement will not be addressed.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	Potential to enlarge proposed urban extension at Site 16 to include land south of Hampton Lane. Could provide a realistic alternative to potential under-delivery of existing SLP sites. (N.B. Implied this would include SHELAA Sites 16 and 17).

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Land at Barston Lane/Oak Lane.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref: 64</p> <p>Meets objectives of Growth Option F.</p> <p>Sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>Development would be compatible with adjacent residential uses and would ensure protection and facilitate enhancement of services and facilities.</p> <p>Would result in new defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Compares favourably to some proposed allocations: less Green Belt impact, less landscape character impact.</p> <p>See attached supporting evidence.</p> <p>Rejection of site not been justified.</p> <p>Allocation would accord with Government Housing White Paper.</p>
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q15/alts	viability of site immediately adjacent to site 16 should be assessed.
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q15/alts	<p>Alternative sites to Site 15 in the SHELAA that belong to SMBC and could be developed for housing:</p> <p>Ref 220 - Chapelhouse Depot</p> <p>Ref 226 - Land at Damson Parkway and Coventry Road</p> <p>Ref 54 - Clopton Crescent Depot and British Legion Club</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q15/alts	SHELAA Site 225, Chelmsley Wood Town Centre, could be used partly for housing too.
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q15/alts	Should make further allocations and identify reserve sites in sustainable locations such as SHELAA Site 192 in Dickens Heath/Tidbury Green.
Daron Gay [4545]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>RE: SHELAA Site 93, Heronfield, Warwick Road.</p> <p>Site performs well under suitability, availability and achievability criteria.</p> <p>It has good marketability and viability.</p> <p>Capacity for 17 dwellings.</p> <p>Broad Green Belt assessment does not consider the specific nature and character of the individual sites such as this.</p> <p>Should have been assessed in Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Should be considered for allocation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Darren Abreu [4794]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
David Langton [3382]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to site 3.
David Munton [3378]			Q15/alts	Site 240 should be considered as an alternative to site 3.
David Sunner [3946]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>Alternative proposed as site 85 plus an extended area of land now in the same ownership. It is a small / medium site which taken with others could better and faster achieve the Council's housing requirement. It has a similar Green Belt score to the neighbouring parcel of land that is a proposed allocation.</p> <p>In broad terms there is nothing to choose between extending the Solihull urban area eastwards in this sector of Field Lane, or Catherine-de-Barnes westward to Field Lane.</p>
David Acton [3396]			Q15/alts	SHLAA site 88 should be included as a site allocation as it has been wrongly identified and therefore incorrectly assessed.
David Harvey [3379]			Q15/alts	Site 240 should be considered as an alternative to site 3.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Shaw [4772]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Diane Langton [3380]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative.
Diane & Andrew Cunningham [2975]			Q15/alts	Oakes Farm Scheme as an alternative to site 2.
Diane Mahmood [4490]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q15/alts	<p>Illogical to take high scoring sites out of the Green Belt for development.</p> <p>The Council could consider alternatives, which do not have such a high Atkins Green Belt score.</p> <p>Residents drew attention to the following sites from SHELAA:</p> <p>49, 82, 83, 87 (brownfield employment site), 89, 121, 132, 133, 136, 139, 175, 184 & 244.</p> <p>Cannot agree with statement in Para. 229 that there are no alternative sites to justify release of Sites 4 and 13.</p>
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q15/alts	There are 14 previously developed sites in Balsall Common which should be considered before allocating green belt greenfield sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Donald Lowe [4783]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Dr Anna Griffin [4206]			Q15/alts	<p>part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3. Given that the area is larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3</p>
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3.</p> <p>Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Dr I G Beasley [4055]			Q15/alts	<p>Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Elaine Kell [4771]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Ella McGarry [4246]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q15/alts	<p>Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Eric McClenaghan [4555]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 238, land at 33 Wootton Green Lane.</p> <p>Site performs well under suitability, availability, but some issues around achievability criteria.</p> <p>Capacity for 15-20 dwellings.</p> <p>However, more likely that site would be put forward with SHELAA 1015 (Grange Farm) or SHELAA 1017.</p> <p>Broad Green Belt assessment does not consider the specific nature and character of the individual sites such as this.</p> <p>Performs well in Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Should be considered for allocation.</p>
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 68: Land north east of Knowle, Jacobean Lane, Copt Heath.</p> <p>Appropriate to release land to north east of Knowle in addition to existing allocation at Site 8.</p> <p>Land adjoining this site and on the other side of Jacobean lane could be brought forward to meet plan needs and longer term to 2050.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
G S Oliver [4773]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA 195 'Land at Damson Parkway'</p> <p>Category 1 in SHELAA. Major constraint in assessment is LWS. Indicative masterplan (submitted) would exclude this from development.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations 16 and 20 in terms of SHELAA, Green Belt, Sustainability Appraisal and other scores.</p> <p>Recommend land allocated for 300 dwellings.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA 197 'Land South of Meriden'</p> <p>Category 2 in SHELAA. Suitability score was lowered to account for flooding and contaminated land. Further technical work has been carried out regarding Flood Zone 3 and contaminated land. Neither matters are considered a constraint to development.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations 10 in terms of SHELAA, Green Belt, Sustainability Appraisal and other scores.</p> <p>Recommend land allocated for 200 dwellings.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA 199 'Land at Four Ashes Road'</p> <p>Category 1 in SHELAA. No physical constraints.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations 8 and 9 in terms of SHELAA, Green Belt, Sustainability Appraisal and other scores.</p> <p>Recommend land allocated for 110 dwellings.</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 59: Land at Golden End Farms:</p> <p>Closest site to the Knowle centre;</p> <p>Sustainable growth opportunity as it is accessible, suitable, available and deliverable;</p> <p>Opportunity for at least 250 dwellings to meet range of needs;</p> <p>Includes 6 ha of new public open space;</p> <p>Additional parking facilities for primary school;</p> <p>High pedestrian connectivity;</p> <p>Protect existing trees and hedgerows;</p> <p>Protect views into countryside and Conservation Area;</p> <p>Protect nature conservation area north of Kixley Lane.</p>
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q15/alts	<p>Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p>
Helen Blyth [3350]			Q15/alts	<p>Sites in Dorridge should be considered</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Helen Reed [4641]			Q15/alts	Developments close to HS2, and allocation 11 at TRW would allow for developments of a similar size but are already excellently served by existing transport infrastructure, and where it would be comparatively cost effective to increase capacity.
Helen Young [3390]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to Site 3.
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q15/alts	Support SHELAA Site 104 - Land Blue Lake Road, Dorridge. Disagree with findings in GBA, Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape Character Assessment in relation to SHELAA Site 104. Site compares favourably with proposed allocations 8 and 9. Our findings should be reflected in DLP and site included for development.
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q15/alts	SHELAA Ref. 141. Land around Earlswood Station. 51ha site crossing boundary with Solihull and Stratford upon Avon district. Could deliver up to 3000 dwellings, shop, school, extension to Earlswood station carpark. Will help encourage use of rail network and reduce need to travel by private vehicle. Accords with 'Public transport corridor' spatial option in SHNS Stage 3 report. Location performs poorly in Green Belt Assessment. SA impacts would be mitigated by on-site shop. Key opportunity for land release in this and next plan period. Stratford have signed MoU with Birmingham to look to contribute 3,300 dwellings towards Birmingham's shortfall.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Sites 187 & 211 (part)</p> <p>Land should be allocated for 180 houses north of Main Road, Meriden.</p> <p>Evidence base demonstrates this is a highly sustainable location. It is available now, offers a suitable location and is achievable without significant new infrastructure. There is a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered in the short term.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 211 (part)</p> <p>Seek removal of land north of the Site and south of Fillongley Road from Green Belt and its designation as 'safeguarded land' to meet longer-term development needs within and post the plan period.</p> <p>Assessment of the Local Plan Review evidence base shows that the Site scores well and performs as well and better in many cases than the sites proposed to be allocated. It is highly accessible; has moderate impact on Green Belt; is not constrained by minerals safeguarding; is visually well contained; and has the maximum SHELAA score. There are no known technical constraints.</p>
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q15/alts	<p>Should make further allocations and identify reserve sites, particularly in sustainable locations such as Dickens Heath/Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of SHELAA Site 192.</p> <p>Land holding is available in early part of Plan period.</p> <p>On opposite side of road to Bellway development, on the edge of the original Dickens Heath, with its existing services.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J & A Creba [4753]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
J Griggs [4755]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
James Langton [3383]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to Site 3.
James Neale [3406]			Q15/alts	In support of alternative site at Oakes Farm Balsall Common (SHELAA site 204).
Jean Fleming [3444]			Q15/alts	Suggest SHELAA site 240 as an alternative to site 3.
Jeanette McGarry [4247]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jill Hubbleday [4462]			Q15/alts	<p>Would propose that serious consideration be given to previously developed land such as the fisheries located in Lavenderhall lane or other brownfield sites in Balsall common that have been suggested.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 146.</p> <p>Make Blythe Valley Park the new Dickens Heath and allocate the 600 homes from Site 13 there instead.</p>
John Maguire [3543]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q15/alts	These representations therefore promote land to the west of 227 Lugtrout Lane as suitable for residential development and it is requested that the Council consider its release from the Green Belt. The site was considered a suitable site for development which was available and achievable, scoring highly on all matters considered in the Council's SHELAA (site ref 28) and in accordance with the recent White Paper on housing, local planning authorities should be looking to allocate sites for smaller developme

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/alts	Support for SHELAA Site 143, Land adj. to 161 Lugtrout Lane. Lies immediately north to proposed Site 16. Is brownfield land within the Green Belt. Has firm defensible boundaries. Could make substantial contribution to housing requirement, particularly in combination with SHELAA Sites 2 and 12. Low landscape value. SHELAA states site is suitable, achievable and available. Performs lower in GB terms than proposed sites south of Shirley, and better in accessibility terms than proposed Site 16.
John Taylor [4136]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	proposed site 94 land at Diddington Lane
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q15/alts	Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.
Judith Dean [4222]			Q15/alts	part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3. Given that the area is larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3
Julie Betts [3173]			Q15/alts	Instead of building houses south of Shirley, should develop at Blythe Valley close to the M42 junction

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Karen Munton [3377]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to site 3.
Karen Bell [4586]			Q15/alts	There are brownfield sites in the Borough that have not been included but should be brought forward instead of building on green belt land in Balsall Common, and Grange Farm, Balsall Common would have current road infrastructure and less impact than Site 1 Barratts Farm.
Karin Chessell [4284]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Ken Hazlewood [4774]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/alts	(SHELAA sites 104, 135, 241) - Limited constraints, bus stops located conveniently, railway station close by. Moderately performing Green Belt. There are more neutral and positive effects than negative and potential for the site to deliver additional housing.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/alts	SHELAA site 107 - Disagree with the SA assessment of the site. It is located in an excellent position, close to the edge of Solihull town centre, and junction 5 of the M42, and within walking distance of many bus stops serving various routes. It relates much more closely to the adjoining built development than to the open countryside. Impacts on the Green Belt would be minimal; M42 and A41 already serve as an effective, physical barrier to the extension of the Green Belt. Its development would greatly assist the Council to meet the needs of housing within the HMA.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/alts	SHELAA site 106 - the site can be developed for up to 55 new homes in a sustainable manner. The proposals will provide a strong defensible Green Belt barrier and would help to integrate the built form into the landscape and soften the transition from open countryside to built urban form that currently exists at the edge of the village. Development of this site would be less harmful to the Green Belt than the proposed allocation at P016, and is more responsive to its setting.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Land at Wootton Green Lane, Balsall Common.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref: 1017</p> <p>Meets objectives of Growth Option F.</p> <p>Sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>Development would be adjacent to existing settlement boundary of Balsall Common and presents a natural extension of the village.</p> <p>Would result in clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations: less Green Belt impact, less landscape character impact, higher accessibility, no loss of community facilities.</p> <p>Greater local support.</p> <p>Would not result in loss of community facilities.</p> <p>See attached supporting evidence and studies.</p> <p>Rejection of site not been justified.</p> <p>Allocation would accord with Government Housing White Paper.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	Potential to enlarge proposed urban extension at Site 16 to include land south of Hampton Lane. Could provide a realistic alternative to potential under-delivery of existing SLP sites. (N.B. Implied this would include SHELAA Sites 16 and 17).
Liam Sawyer [4768]			Q15/alts	Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria. Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities. Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated. Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q15/alts	Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q15/alts	Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.
Louis Burns [4069]			Q15/alts	Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.
M Dunn [4139]	Toby Haselwood	Sworders (Toby Haselwood) [2641]	Q15/alts	proposed land rear 114 Kenilworth Road Knowle SHELAA ref 110

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
M J Beasley [4051]			Q15/alts	Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative.
Margaret Walls [4681]			Q15/alts	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Mark Horgan [4578]	Jessica Graham	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Ref. 171 Winterton Farm.</p> <p>Capacity to accommodate up to 600 homes plus potential for community facility.</p> <p>Opportunity to create a connection between Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley Park developmenmt, including direct walking route.</p> <p>Site compares the same or more favourably than proposed allocations 4, 5, 9, 11, 18 and 19 in terms of SHELAA, Accessibility, Landscape Character, Green Belt assessment, loss of recreational facilities, impact on Local Wildlife Sites and overall deliverability.</p> <p>Site compares favourably to Sites 5 and 9.</p>
Matthew Becker [3402]			Q15/alts	SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to site 3.
Matthew Quinn [4344]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
McLean Estates Limited (Mr N McLean) [2241]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>Suggest allocation of sites 86 and 96. They are small / medium site which taken with others could better and faster achieve the Council's housing requirement.</p> <p>Site 86 is degraded land and a brownfield site. It is sufficiently contained to have far less impact on the Green Belt than Site allocation 6.</p> <p>Site 96 - in broad terms there is nothing to choose between extending the Solihull urban area eastwards in this sector to Field Lane, or Catherine-de-Barnes westwards to Field Lane.</p>
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q15/alts	<p>As mentioned throughout this response, Solihull MBC have failed to follow their own Policies in establishing the appropriateness of the chosen sites and yet proposals for a new village on a brown field site development to the north of the region have been ignored. This is also true of potential sites to the South/East of Solihull toward Hampton in Arden and Catherin de Barnes, these being closer to the proposed new High Speed HS2 interchange.</p>
Michael Wylde [4544]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to level of new housing in Balsall Common and there are better sites for development which would minimise impact such as Oakes Farm and north of the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 136, Oak Farm, Catherine de Barnes.</p> <p>3.4ha</p> <p>Adjoins CdB settlement boundary.</p> <p>Mix of brownfield and greenfield land in Green Belt with existing buildings.</p> <p>Firm and defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Would not encourage coalescence with Solihull.</p> <p>Would help sustain strong and vibrant community in CdB.</p> <p>Has a number of facilities and regular bus service.</p> <p>2.5 miles from Solihull and Birmingham International train stations.</p> <p>Would provide much needed affordable housing.</p> <p>GBA is similar to some allocations. Would class as more refined parcel than BA05.</p> <p>Moderate Accessibility Study score.</p> <p>High Pressure Gas Pipeline not inhibit development only amount of developable land.</p>
Mr Justin Wilkes [3090]			Q15/alts	<p>Dickens Heath / Tidbury Green. The proposed area to the West of Dickens Heath could be improved by shifting the boundary south, splitting site 176 in 2. This would divert traffic onto larger roads, move housing closer to existing facilities and preserve the businesses/amenities that currently operate to the North of this proposed area. Call for Sites ref 8 is currently categorised as a Local Nature Reserve but it hasn't been such for over 20 years when drainage alterations meant the ponds dried up. It is currently ugly scrubland which would be vastly improved if included.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs D & K Tomkins [4757]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	Paul Watson	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 69 -</p> <p>Site of little strategic impact on character or openness of Green Belt.</p> <p>Relatively close to Birmingham-Stratford rail line & stations.</p> <p>Close to local services.</p> <p>Underused land including a vacant house and commercial buildings.</p> <p>Screened by vegetation.</p> <p>Available immediately.</p> <p>Could support public transport provision in area.</p> <p>Contribute funding to proposed Earlswood Living Landscape.</p>
Mr & Mrs M Mladenovic [4754]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs N & L Treadwell [4764]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
Mr & Mrs R & B Ethell [4763]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
Mr & Mrs T & L Baines [4760]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
Mr Andrew Dean [3073]			Q15/alts	<p>The proposed site(s) at Wooton Green Lane present a better balance of development across the village. (Site 240)</p> <p>Access to jobs and the railway is better.</p> <p>Impact on through traffic would be reduced.</p> <p>Impact on surrounding existing properties would be less.</p> <p>Sites offer potential for small supporting retail development at the north end of the village around the existing Sainsbury's / George in the Tree developments.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr C Gledhill [4812]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q15/alts	<p>There are brownfield sites in the Borough that have not been included but should be brought forward instead of building on green belt land in Balsall Common, and Grange Farm, Balsall Common would have current road infrastructure and less impact than Site 1 Barratts Farm.</p>
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q15/alts	<p>Grange Farm - (SHELAA site 1015) should be included.</p>
Mr D Edmonds [4808]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Eustace [4791]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr D Perks [3399]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA site 240 should be considered as an alternative to site 3.</p>
Mr Derrick Walker [4780]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr Eric Homer [3721]		Q15/alts	<p>Do not consider full utilisation has been made of brownfield sites across WMCA.</p> <p>Should look closer at sites to east of Solihull.</p> <p>Greater opportunity to develop infrastructure around edge of smaller conurbations, better transport links, connect more readily to HS2.</p> <p>Less risk of merging settlements with distinctive identities, as gap between settlements is larger.</p> <p>Put houses closer to employment growth areas of JLR, Airport, NEC and HS2. Building high density housing, smaller and affordable homes close to employment would alleviate need to develop important green belt locations with wildlife, amenity and resident benefits such as Site 13.</p>
Mr G Wilkinson [4788]		Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr G Frost [4809]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q15/alts	<p>Developed land, for example, to the north of Balsall Common has been ignored. The west of Balsall Common has more room to accommodate development sensitively.</p>
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q15/alts	<p>Alternatives suggested:</p> <p>Grange Farm (SHELAA site 1015);</p> <p>The site enclosed by Wooton Green Lane and Kenilworth Road (site 240);</p> <p>Lavender Hall Farm (site 9);</p> <p>New Mercote Farm (site 92);</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr H Keene [4806]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q15/alts	<p>Land at Grove Farm, Knowle (site 5) is not a site which is large enough to fulfil a strategic housing allocation, but it could nevertheless, if removed from the Green Belt, assist the Council in reducing its reliance on windfall permissions and in delivering some of the specialist housing that the Plan identifies a need for.</p>
Mr J Stanley [4786]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr John Field [3870]			Q15/alts	<p>Detailed comments relating to Village Farm, Berkswell, which is not proposed for development in the draft local plan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr John Outhwaite [3785]			Q15/alts	should consider re-allocating land that is allocated for industrial/employment use in the DLP instead fro housing.
Mr John Wilson [3890]			Q15/alts	Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative.
Mr K Millican [4779]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q15/alts	I understand that that more housing could be created by resurrecting the Berkswell Parish Council proposals for use of reclaimed land at Cornets End Lane for creation of a new settlement. Has this been considered and if so why was it rejected?
Mr Leslie Noble [3503]			Q15/alts	I would support a plan where one housing site catering for all the housing needs and incorporating a school and shops is built. I understand that land is available to the north of the village (Balsall Common) for such a proposal.
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA site 107 Gentleshaw lane Solihull. Disagree with unfairly low score in SHELAA assessment as no part is contaminated/landfill or needs treatment, location is suitable adjacent to residential development and bypass/M42, close to town centre and other facilities/services, and M42 provides separation between Solihull and Knowle.</p> <p>In view of the likely requirement for an increase in provision for housing numbers, or indeed as a replacement for less popular selected sites, this one should be kept in the frame.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q15/alts	These representations therefore promote land to the west of 227 Lugtrout Lane as suitable for residential development and it is requested that the Council consider its release from the Green Belt. The site was considered a suitable site for development which was available and achievable, scoring highly on all matters considered in the Council's SHELAA (site ref 28) and in accordance with the recent White Paper on housing, local planning authorities should be looking to allocate sites for smaller developments to meet up to 10% of their housing targets. This site would suit that purpose.
Mr P Phillips [4798]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr P Greasley [4813]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr R Vernon [4801]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr R A Smith [4782]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr R Fox [2357]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	proposed site - land south side of Houndsfield Lane sites 22 and 82
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q15/alts	Disappointing that the suggestion of a new village north of Balsall Common has been ignored as has significant PDL sites in favour of Greenfield sites. Balsall Common is targeted with over 1000 homes with no proposal to upgrade it's centre.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA sites 29 and 210.</p> <p>These sites meet the Council's objectives and contribute less to the purposes of Green Belt than many other proposed allocations.</p> <p>More accessible, less impact on landscape character and community facilities. The sites are infilling and a rounding off of existing residential development and provide clear defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Could contribute to a dispersed pattern of growth, be delivered quickly and does not involve the loss of existing community facilities.</p> <p>Include land south of Hampton Lane in addition to Allocation 16. This would provide a realistic alternative to the potential under-delivery of existing Solihull sites.</p>
Mr Surinder Teja [3298]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr T N Walton [4817]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr. Andreas Welzel [3137]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 84/1005 (part).</p> <p>Not allowing small scale development in Green Belt has resulted in need for large scale Green Belt release in DLP.</p> <p>Growth will be dominated by large housebuilders.</p> <p>Opportunity for more local involvement.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs E A Seal [4814]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs G Elson [4816]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Irene Thompson [4127]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>proposed call for sites 82 -Land at Kenilworth Road Balsall Common.</p> <p>Also put forward the point that there needs to be a greater number of smaller sites rather than a smaller number of large sites. This position is supported with reference to the White Paper.</p> <p>DLP should be amended to replace some of the large sites with a greater number of smaller sites.</p> <p>Request that Council reassess the proposed site (82) in light of the representation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Bliss [4803]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Potential to enlarge proposed urban extension at Site 16 to include land south of Hampton Lane. Could provide a realistic alternative to potential under-delivery of existing SLP sites.</p> <p>(N.B. Implied this would include SHELAA Sites 16 and 17).</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Land at RO Bakehouse Ln and Wheeler Close, Chadwick End.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref: 19</p> <p>Meets objectives of Growth Option F.</p> <p>Sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>Development would round off existing development accessed from Warwick Road and opposite ribbon development.</p> <p>Would result in clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations: less Green Belt impact, less landscape character impact.</p> <p>See attached supporting evidence.</p> <p>Rejection of site not been justified.</p> <p>Inclusion of site would accord with Government White Paper.</p>
Mrs Alison Eccleston [4689]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Anna Walters [4777]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs B Stanley [4785]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs C Cavigan [4810]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Catherine Kent [3473]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q15/alts	<p>Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q15/alts	<p>There are sites in Dorridge and Barston which may be more suitable and are further from the boundary with Coventry thus protecting the Meriden Gap.</p> <p>In Balsall Common the allocation of 1150 in Green Belt in is premature when the planning department officials admit they have not looked for any Brown field or heavily developed Green field sites in the village. Several such sites were identified in the Sites for Consideration exhibition on 20/08/16 but these have been ignored.</p>
Mrs Gillian Dale [3490]			Q15/alts	<p>Several potential sites (some partially brownfield) were identified to the north of the village, and they all scored more highly than Frog Lane in terms accessibility, so why were they excluded? As a matter of urgency, we ask you to consider them now.</p>
Mrs Gillian Tonkys [4787]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs H Brookes [4795]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Carpenter [4796]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs J E Smith [4781]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Vernon [4797]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q15/alts	<p>More housing could be created by Berkswell PC proposals for use of reclaimed land at Cornets End Lane for new settlement as alternative to Balsall Common proposals.</p>
Mrs Julie White [3844]			Q15/alts	<p>SITES IN DORRIDGE AND KNOWLE NEED TO BE CONSIDERED</p>
Mrs K Drakes [4793]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs L Keene [4800]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs M Edmonds [4804]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs N Walton [4818]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs P Green [4790]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs P Phillips [4799]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pam Marsden [4802]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Pamela Frost [4807]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Rita Perks [4805]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q15/alts	The NEC has miles of car parks, if they were made into multi-storey car parks, this would free large amounts of brownfield sites for redevelopment, close to where we believe HS2 will have a station.
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q15/alts	From the land available map plots 195
Mrs Salt [3362]			Q15/alts	prefer Oakes Farm site
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q15/alts	SHELAA sites 47, 240, 82, 112, 201, 238, 1, 9, 31, 76, 92, 170, 212, 216 should be fully considered. Site 240 out performs allocated site 2 and 3. This site should be proposed as an alternative as it could accommodate the number of housing units proposed on allocated sites 2 and 3.
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q15/alts	Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Myran Larkin [4296]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Nadia McGarry [4240]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3.</p> <p>Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
National Motorcycle Museum [370]	Louise Steele	Framptons Planning (Louise Steele) [4592]	Q15/alts	<p>Trustees of National Motorcycle Museum have engaged with a team of consultants to prepare a planning application for a multi-million investment at the Museum including:</p> <p>New museum (to east of existing buildings)</p> <p>New hotel (250bed)</p> <p>Museum operates two off-site hotels, which can no longer provide the level of conference accommodation which is sought.</p> <p>Museum not self-sustaining, needs conference facilities to support tourism and cultural asset.</p> <p>Proposal would use existing access arrangements from J6 of M42. Provision of overnight accommodation will reduce the amount of trip movement to and from the site.</p> <p>Site should be allocated and removed from Green Belt.</p>
Neil Sears [3923]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Larkin [3514]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Nigel & Robin Tarplin [4326]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>Support for SHELAA site 83.</p> <p>PBA SHELAA indicates that site performs well in all 3 criteria.</p> <p>AECOM50 Sustainability Appraisal indicates the site performs as well as others in that area.</p> <p>Disagree with findings of Atkins Green Belt Assessment, i.e. the site only makes a limited contribution to restricting urban sprawl.</p> <p>Site fits well with requirements of Housing White Paper.</p> <p>Recommend Site is included in DLP.</p>
Nikki Burns [4068]			Q15/alts	<p>Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p>
Norman McKeown [4113]			Q15/alts	<p>Support for CfS 240 'Wotton Green Lane'</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nurton Developments [390]	Ms Caroline Chave	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Q15/alts	<p>The Draft Local Plan is unjustified in concluding that Hockley Heath is not suitable for growth.</p> <p>SHELAA References 135 and 175, Land south of School Lane at Hockley Heath should be included as a location for housing growth in order to maintain the vitality of the settlement and provide for local housing needs.</p> <p>VISION DOCUMENT, TRANSPORT, ECOLOGY AND DRAINAGE REPORTS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED.</p>
P & C Benniman [4751]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
P A Henwood [4684]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Land to the rear of 146-152 Tilehouse Lane, Whitlocks End.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref: 1013</p> <p>Meets objectives of Growth Options A and F.</p> <p>Sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>Redevelopment of largely previously developed land within existing settlement.</p> <p>Would result in clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations: less Green Belt impact, less landscape character impact, higher accessibility, no loss of community facilities.</p> <p>1.72ha site. Would not require on-site provision of community facilities and services; or loss of existing facilities.</p> <p>See attached supporting evidence and studies.</p> <p>Rejection of site not been justified.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Potential to enlarge proposed urban extension at Site 16 to include land south of Hampton Lane. Could provide a realistic alternative to potential under-delivery of existing SLP sites.</p> <p>(N.B. not explicitly mentioned but probably refers to SHELAA sites 16, 17 and 20.)</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Ben Gray) [4570]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA site 128 West of Meriden (Area G).</p> <p>Disappointed site not included in DLP, particularly as no consultation or opportunity to discuss in advance, or whether a smaller site would be preferable.</p> <p>Wish to resubmit a smaller site (25 acres) for residential only, but flexible to change.</p> <p>Currently a depleted quarry going through a transformation of inert refill. Would be possible to ensure backfill was appropriate for future residential development.</p> <p>Immediately adjacent to Meriden and its facilities, open space, public transport, walking and cycling opportunities.</p> <p>Minimal visual impact due to existing screening.</p> <p>No infrastructure or access constraints.</p> <p>Deliverable years 11-15.</p>
Pat Milnes [3430]			Q15/alts	<p>Supports proposal at Oakes Farm as it is slightly on the fringes and does not impose on any existing green and leisure areas within Balsall Common, which other proposals do.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Deane [3120]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on</p>
Paul Morgan [3053]			Q15/alts	Dengate Drive appears to have been overlooked. (part of SHELAA site 1015)
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Peter Lowe [4776]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q15/alts	<p>SMBC should look again at the proposal to develop Grange Farm and land to North West of the village (sites 142/198 in the Call for Sites).</p> <p>Both of these sites are substantial, and score far higher than either Frog Lane or Kenilworth Road / Windmill Lane. They provide a greater opportunity for contribution to much needed village infrastructure, and could be accessed from a Northern bypass route, which would in turn form a defensible boundary. More than the existing 1150 units required in Balsall Common could be achieved at the same time as providing a bypass around the village.</p>
Phil Chessell [4287]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Philip Wood [4552]			Q15/alts	<p>Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Philippa Lowe [4778]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q15/alts	<p>Smaller sites of around 200 to 300 around Dorridge and Bentley Heath to spread the load. Sites 207 (retains adequate separation from Solihull), 104, 135, 241, 199, 029, 210, 127 would take some</p>
Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Mr Charles Robinson	DLP Consultants (Mr Charles Robinson) [3608]	Q15/alts	<p>proposed land at Woods Farm Bills Lane Shirley</p>
Rebecca Clare [3956]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Coles [3499]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/alts	<p>Sites at the western periphery of Hockley Heath.</p> <p>Land at Blue Lake Road / Norton Green, Dorridge.</p>
Richard Onions [4280]			Q15/alts	<p>Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.</p>
Robert Harrison [3968]			Q15/alts	<p>1350 houses in Balsall Common is unbelievable. 4000 extra residents and 2700 extra cars.</p> <p>Other areas on outskirts of the village. e.g. Oak Farm on bus routes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Ron Shiels [4424]</p>	<p>Ms Donna Savage</p>	<p>DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]</p>	<p>Q15/alts</p>	<p>SHELAA Site 205 - Land at Norton Lane, Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Close to recent planning approvals at Lowbrook Farm and Tidbury Green Farm.</p> <p>DLP refers to minor changes to Green Belt boundary to address anomalies - this submission addresses such an anomaly.</p> <p>Half of village will be in and half out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Needs to be inset.</p> <p>Character can be protected in other ways.</p> <p>Scores well in accessibility mapping.</p> <p>Therefore land at Norton Lane together with village of Tidbury Green should be removed from the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Ron Shiels [4424]</p>	<p>Ms Donna Savage</p>	<p>DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]</p>	<p>Q15/alts</p>	<p>SHELAA Site 206, Widney Manor Road Solihull.</p> <p>Distinctive and logical break between urban development and rural countryside.</p> <p>Existing Green Belt boundary along railway line is no longer appropriate as there is built development on either side.</p> <p>Contradicts fundamental aim of GB to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</p> <p>DLP allocation of 861 dwellings in the town centre is unachievable - windfall at Widney Manor Road would help meet this target.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/alts	<p>Land r/o 2214 Stratford Road (SHELAA 1006).</p> <p>3.4 ha.</p> <p>Poor agricultural land quality and urban fringe.</p> <p>Greenfield within Green Belt, immediately adjacent to Hockley Heath inset area.</p> <p>Hockley Heath should be included as settlement for growth.</p> <p>Could accommodate 70-80 dwellings.</p> <p>Site is close to local centre, primary school and bus service to Solihull and Birmingham.</p> <p>Well contained. Stronger relationship to character to village than open countryside.</p> <p>Would assist early delivery of housing in plan period.</p> <p>Would support existing services.</p> <p>GBA score equal or lower to many allocated sites.</p> <p>Accessibility score equal or better to allocated sites.</p> <p>See documentation by Define.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sally Anne Coles [3500]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Sarah Ravenscroft [4478]			Q15/alts	<p>Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	Mr Miles Drew	GVA (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Ref. 111 - land at Widney Manor.</p> <p>Site is deliverable and sustainable.</p> <p>Well-related to Solihull urban area.</p> <p>Almost entirely Flood Zone 1.</p> <p>No heritage constraints.</p> <p>Less than 200m from Widney Manor train station, less than 400m from bus routes.</p> <p>Accessible to local schools and doctor's surgery.</p> <p>Supermarkets within a 5 minute drive.</p> <p>Accessible to jobs.</p> <p>Makes little contribution to purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Site should be included in Local Plan Review.</p>
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q15/alts	Call for Sites reference 240 should be allocated as an alternative, as it outperforms Sites 2 and 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Severn Trent Water Limited [502]	Alban Henderson	GL Hearn (Alban Henderson) [4649]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA site 168.</p> <p>The SHELAA ignores the site's relationship with Blythe Valley Park, both in respect of the BVP allocation and the hybrid planning permission.</p> <p>It is appropriate to consider the site's GB status in the context of the 'approved' BVP proposals, its relationship to emerging Policy P1A, its potential to contribute to strategic objectives of the DLP and how it may assist delivery of the 'UK Central' masterplan.</p> <p>The principle of residential development at Illshaw Heath, and its contribution and support to BVP, is already established, as is the principle of adjustments to the GB to meet housing need.</p>
Shirley Golf Club Ltd and IM Properties Ltd [4153]	Gary Stephens	Marrons Planning (Gary Stephens) [4152]	Q15/alts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - propose land adjacent to Stratford Road - SHELAA site 62 - is partially released for housing development - Councils accessibility assessment reaches an incorrect conclusion. - not clear how the results of the Strategic Green Belt Assessment have info
Simon Clare [3953]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 206 is an example of small sub-standard Green Belt sites that would benefit from redevelopment.</p> <p>Allocation of smaller Green Belt sites across the Borough could reduce concentration of housing in the South Shirley & Blythe Villages area.</p> <p>Also opportunity for smaller builders to develop in line with the recent Government White Paper.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 206 is an example of small sub-standard Green Belt sites that would benefit from redevelopment.</p> <p>Allocation of smaller Green Belt sites across the Borough could reduce concentration of housing in the South Shirley & Blythe Villages area.</p> <p>Also opportunity for smaller builders to develop in line with the recent Government White Paper.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/alts	<p>see supporting documents for Land Old Waste Lane BC.</p> <p>1.64 ha.</p> <p>Considered suitable, achievable and available.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/alts	<p>see supporting documents for Land Warwick Rd Knowle</p> <p>Considered suitable, available and achievable.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/alts	<p>see supporting documents for Land Oakes Farm BC.</p> <p>7.78 ha.</p> <p>Considered suitable, achievable and available.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stephen Beck [2637]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to SHELAA site 104 and 135 as alternatives. There would be no affordable housing provided, unacceptable traffic impact, extension of Dorridge into the Green Belt and local services would not be within accessible distances.</p> <p>SHELAA site 199 which is located nearer transport links to the motorway network would be more appropriate.</p>
Stephen Joyce [4242]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3.</p> <p>Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Steve & Samantha Townsend & Cook [4336]			Q15/alts	<p>Support for settlement at Berkswell Quarry proposed by Berkswell Parish Council as an alternative to Sites 1 and 3.</p>
Steve & Samantha Townsend & Cook [4336]			Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Sites Oakes Farm (sic) or Pheasant Oaks Farm (#170) would better balance the village than Sites 1 and 3.</p>
Susan Lo [4208]			Q15/alts	<p>part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3. Given that the area is larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Terra Strategic [3918]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 81 - Land at Fillongley Road.</p> <p>Can provide 100 homes</p> <p>Easy walking distance to centre of Meriden village and primary school.</p> <p>Well contained site.</p> <p>Limited ecological or landscape interest.</p> <p>Long term defensible Green Belt boundaries</p> <p>Available and deliverable.</p> <p>No technical or land ownership constraints.</p> <p>Sustainable location for new housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Land at south of Hampton Lane.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref: 16 and 17</p> <p>Meets objectives of Growth Option G.</p> <p>Sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>Logical extension of Solihull Town Centre, would support its continued success.</p> <p>Would result in clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries and/or safeguarded land.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations: less Green Belt impact, higher accessibility, no loss of community facilities, less impact on ecological or heritage assets.</p> <p>Would not result in loss of community facilities.</p> <p>See attached supporting evidence.</p> <p>Rejection of site not been justified.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Potential to enlarge proposed urban extension at Site 16 to include land south of Hampton Lane. Could provide a realistic alternative to potential under-delivery of existing SLP sites.</p> <p>(N.B. Implied this would include SHELAA Sites 16 and 17).</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Q15/alts	<p>Alternative sites to south and east of Borough have been discounted.</p> <p>Sites which abut or are in close proximity to the A3400 would be a better link between Solihull and M42 Junction 4.</p> <p>Would not pass through a settlement such as Knowle.</p> <p>Council must publish its decision-making process based on their stated planning points for why Call for Sites Ref. 34, 103, 199, 13, 14, 57, 121 and 165 were discounted in favour of Sites 8 and 9.</p>
The Occupier [4873]		Q15/alts	<p>Support Call for Site 240 Wootton Green Lane as would make logical extension to Balsall Common without causing overmuch intrusion or traffic congestion and the developer could be required to fund new roundabout on Kenilworth Road.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Land at Tidbury Green Farm.</p> <p>SHELAA Ref: 209</p> <p>Meets objectives of Growth Option G.</p> <p>Sites are deliverable and developable.</p> <p>Development would extend existing settlement boundary of Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Would result in clear, defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Compares favourably to proposed allocations: less Green Belt impact, less landscape character impact, higher accessibility, no loss of community facilities.</p> <p>18.6ha site. Would not require on-site provision of community facilities and services; or loss of existing facilities.</p> <p>Planning application approved 16/12/16 on PDL part of site.</p> <p>See attached supporting evidence and studies.</p> <p>Rejection of site not been justified.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/alts	<p>Potential to enlarge proposed urban extension at Site 16 to include land south of Hampton Lane. Could provide a realistic alternative to potential under-delivery of existing SLP sites. (N.B. Implied this would include SHELAA Sites 16 and 17).</p>
Tom Walls [4687]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tracy Jolly [4770]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Trustees of the Berkswell Estate [629]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	SHELLA site 90 land at Coventry Road, Berkswell.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Trustees of the Berkswell Estate [629]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 92, New Mercote Farm</p> <p>Disagree with SHELAA on achievability; new traffic island at junction of Park Lane and A452 is included in HS2 proposals to start in Q3 2017.</p> <p>No hard constraints.</p> <p>13ha. Site is available, suitable and deliverable for meeting economic and/or housing development needs in Rural East of Solihull.</p> <p>Broad Green Belt assessment does not consider the specific nature and character of the individual sites such as this, e.g. bounded by A452 and West Coast Main line.</p> <p>Should have been assessed in Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Should be considered for allocation.</p> <p>Preferable to Site 2 at Frog Lane.</p>
Trustees of the Berkswell Estate [629]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q15/alts	<p>RE: SHELAA Site 90, Land at Coventry Road, Berkswell Village.</p> <p>SHELAA indicates the site performs well against suitability, availability and achievability criteria.</p> <p>Phase A is currently being promoted for starter homes, could deliver around 20 units.</p> <p>3.2ha. Site is available, suitable and deliverable for meeting rural housing needs in Solihull.</p> <p>Outside the Conservation Area. Allocation would not breach Green Belt principles. Fulfills Housing White Paper requirements.</p> <p>Generally performs well in Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Should be considered for allocation.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
UK Land Development (UKLD) [4431]	Grace Allen	Savills UK Ltd (Grace Allen) [2363]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 207 should be included as an allocation.</p> <p>Compares favourably to Allocations 5,9,11,18 and 19 in terms of suitability, availability, achievability, dwelling numbers, Green Belt assessment and Accessibility Study.</p> <p>Widney Manor Station is 10-15 mins walk away, and closer than Four Ashes Road development allocated in SLP 2013.</p> <p>Consider that the Smiths Lane site would be sustainable and could assist by accommodating up to 300 - 350 dwellings.</p>
Viv Smith [4670]			Q15/alts	<p>Sites proposed in Dorridge and Hockley Heath should be properly assessed and considered rather than concentrating development in Dickens Heath/Cheswick Green parishes.</p>
William B Gibbs [4369]			Q15/alts	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q15/alts	<p>SHELAA Site 6 - land off Old Station Road, Hampton in Arden.</p> <p>Location and aspect mean that it is not a particularly sensitive part of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Role considered incidental to the main purposes of the Green Belt around Birmingham and Solihull.</p> <p>Screening by mature trees.</p> <p>Bordered on two sides by existing development.</p> <p>Infilling an existing gap in the suburban frontage.</p> <p>2km from Catherine de Barnes.</p> <p>Merits recognises in Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Accessible location.</p> <p>Would not affect Conservation Area.</p> <p>Not in the floodplain.</p> <p>No nature conservation designations.</p> <p>Site can be appropriately accessed.</p> <p>No issues with utilities.</p> <p>Site deliverable.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
William Gamble [3346]	Mr Joel Hancock	Hancock Town Planning (Mr Joel Hancock) [1937]	Q15/alts	site 79 is being proposed as an alternative or additional to preferred sites in BC
Zoe Speed [4472]			Q15/alts	Using the same criteria as the Council to assess sites, part- PDL site 240 outperforms site 3 and as larger than site 3, this site should be re-assessed by the Council with a view to allocation instead of site 3.
Question 15/new Alternative Sites (New Suggestions)				
A G Douglas [4827]			Q15/new	Brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village would be far more suited to cope with additional housing without adding strain to the village centre.
A Hardwick [4836]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
A Kershaw [4832]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Adam Welch [4417]			Q15/new	Less populated areas in Borough, e.g. Knowle, Dorridge, Hockley Heath, Hampton-in-Arden should be considered. Council should ensure Birmingham have used all of brownfield sites before any overspill is allocated to Solihull.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Aidan Blanco [3056]			Q15/new	<p>Instead of 3 small sites for Balsall Common select one large, ideally brownfield or semi brownfield site (of which there are several in the village) with infrastructure included by the developers.</p> <p>Make the developers pay for the vital infrastructure needed to accommodate the expansion.</p> <p>Pick a site near the railway station and existing amenities so people can walk to the station and shops.</p> <p>Leave greenbelt sites alone when there are alternative brownfield sites available.</p> <p>This will keep SMBC and Balsall Common residents happy and satisfy the need for additional housing whilst minimising the negative impact on the village.</p>
Alan Dick [3322]			Q15/new	no site in particular but suggestion that development happen towards the west of the village
Alison Foreshew [3323]			Q15/new	suggestion that Lapworth be considered as a location for new housing development (outside of smbc)

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Andy & Rachel Bennett [4580]</p>			<p>Q15/new</p>	<p>Full consideration has not been given to Brownfield sites.</p> <p>Consider brownfield sites near to the NEC, adjacent to Coleshill and adjacent to Chelmsley Wood and Kingshurst.</p> <p>More affordable areas of Borough.</p> <p>Land pockets between:</p> <p>A452/A45/M42</p> <p>A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42</p> <p>Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly Direction</p> <p>B4438/M42/A45</p> <p>Hampton Lane/A41/M42</p>
<p>Angela Perrett [4548]</p>			<p>Q15/new</p>	<p>Adequate brownfield sites are available.</p> <p>Do not need to build on Green Belt.</p>
<p>Ann Parker [4362]</p>			<p>Q15/new</p>	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Government states that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances after all alternatives examined.</p> <p>Numerous other options.</p> <p>Development should be close to HS2.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Scholes [4618]			Q15/new	I feel that the design and development of a purpose built, self contained new rural community within the borough would be a far more responsible and productive way to reach SMBC's housing quota while allowing for a plan that could better harmonise with protecting the general biodiversity of that chosen new area while also preserving the slender but essential green belt come green corridor separation of these particular existing communities.
Ann Ward [4831]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Ann Ward [4831]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Ayaz Mahmood [4485]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/new	Site boundary of SHELAA site 1004 extended to included land at 601 Tanworth Lane.
C Berry [4838]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd [3894]	Harriet Barber	Caudwell Properties (100) Ltd (Harriet Barber) [3895]	Q15/new	Suggest that the 'Area of Influence' to the north of Solihull Town Centre, which includes the train station, Solihull Careers Centre, Solihull Fire Station and Sapphire Court, is an appropriate location for new residential dwellings and should be considered further within the Local Plan Review process. This is particularly pertinent in order to release pressure on Green Belt release.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Chris Isaacs [4450]			Q15/new	Consider golf courses for development. Solihull is overprovided with golf courses. More acceptable solution to residents. E.g. merging Robin Hood and Olton golf courses. Or Copt Heath gold club in Knowle. This would be near the M42 and generate less traffic congestion.
Christine M Philip [4830]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Christopher Kershaw [4986]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Colin Snape Golf consultancy (Colin Snape) [3919]			Q15/new	Urban golf courses are potential sites. Could relocate elsewhere in keeping with planning policy. Could provide significant areas of non Green Belt land for housing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/new	Illogical and unsound that no suitable land has been proposed for housing in Dorridge: Excellent transport links (bus and rail), New shopping centre, Excellent community facilities (park, wildlife areas, cricket club).
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q15/new	Chelmsley Wood Town Centre should be included for wider use - including housing
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/new	Retail park Marshall Lake Road should be recycled for high density housing with retail uses encouraged to relocate to Shirley town centre. Plan should focus on small sites (5-100 houses) in a range of locations including urban areas, Hockley Heath & Dorridge.
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q15/new	Small sites of 5-100 dwellings in a range of locations including at Hockley Heath and Dorridge. (See pages 4-5 above for detailed justification for selecting small sites instead of the large allocations proposed.)

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Paddock [3988]			Q15/new	<p>Housing White Paper say Green Belt should only be built on as last resort. Number of alternatives have not been considered and complement proposed growth:</p> <p>Surface carparking at NEC could be converted to multi-storey and land saved could be used for housing, on HS2 doorstep.</p> <p>JLR sports field is hardly used.</p> <p>Conversion of huge gardens to small estates like those on Blossomfield Road.</p> <p>Land Pockets between:</p> <p>A452/A45/M42</p> <p>A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42</p> <p>Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly direction</p> <p>B4438/M42/A45</p> <p>Hampton Lane/A41/M42</p> <p>Many brownfield sites and POS in Birmingham e.g. Land at Fazeley Street used for cheap parking.</p>
David Reynolds [4659]			Q15/new	<p>Undeveloped land between Catherine-de-Barnes and the current houses on Hampton Lane, or on the other side of Hampton Lane where there are no houses all the way back to the M42 and is a much larger plot should be considered as alternatives to Site 16.</p>
Diane Mahmood [4490]			Q15/new	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q15/new	Disproportionate allocation in Blythe Ward; 45% of new allocations. Note there are no housing allocations in Dorridge and Hockley Heath ward. Remote from employment growth at UKC Hub, would be better to place more development there.
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q15/new	If justification for expanding Balsall Common, should consider comprehensively starting with re-use of previously developed sites.
Dr Milla Shah [4201]			Q15/new	Knowle, Dorridge, Catherine-de-Barnes, Hockley Heath and Earlswood not being allocated the building of houses and share the burden of urbanisation? Areas in Solihull near the Birmingham International Airport or either side of the motorway M42
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q15/new	- consider another freestanding village such as suggested by Berkswell PC at Cornets Lane End. - It would also be possible to continue to build on Blythe Valley Park to create a new village - westward expansion of Coventry, utilising the potential of T
Elizabeth Sands [4123]			Q15/new	inter-Authority agreement on a site for a small town/ very large village which could meet the combined housing targets
Emma Durant [3942]			Q15/new	Sufficient brownfield land nearer to the M42, would be more suitable than building close to Shirley. Has a lower impact alternative (to Site 13) be considered?
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q15/new	- consider another freestanding village such as suggested by Berkswell PC at Cornets Lane End. - It would also be possible to continue to build on Blythe Valley Park to create a new village - westward expansion of Coventry, utilising the potential of T

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q15/new	<p>SHELAA 196 'Land at Bickenhill Road, Marston Green'</p> <p>Category 2 in SHELAA. Suitability score was lowered to account for flooding and biodiversity issues.</p> <p>Indicative masterplan (submitted) would exclude Flood Zone 3 (erroneously marked as Flood Zone 1 in submission), LWS or Ecosite from development.</p> <p>Recommend land allocated for 176 dwellings.</p>
Gemma Blanco [4349]			Q15/new	<p>In relation to Site 2 and 3 Objection.</p> <p>Unsuitable to build on Green Belt.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are available or extend existing developments.</p> <p>Development not large enough to solve housing shortage.</p> <p>Recommend one large site instead.</p> <p>One large development could provide shops, gym, community centre etc.</p>
Gemma Welch [4413]			Q15/new	<p>Less populated areas in Borough, e.g. Knowle, Dorridge, Hockley Heath, Hampton-in-Arden should be considered.</p> <p>Council should ensure Birmingham have used all of brownfield sites before any overspill is allocated to Solihull.</p>
Gill Corns [4448]			Q15/new	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider another freestanding village such as suggested by Berkswell PC at Cornets Lane End. - It would also be possible to continue to build on Blythe Valley Park to create a new village - westward expansion of Coventry, utilising the potential of T
Gillian & Carl Archer [4189]			Q15/new	<p>brownfield options, including on the north side of the village, in particular the site behind the George in the Tree</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q15/new	Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated. Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.
I Black [4824]			Q15/new	Brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village would be far more suited to cope with additional housing without adding strain to the village centre.
J Hardwick [4837]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
J M King [4842]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Jennifer Archer [4016]			Q15/new	Relocate Light Hall School to the Light Hall Farm site and redevelop the existing school site which is within an established area.
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/new	Monkspath Hall car parks could be made multi-storey and land could be released for affordable flats. These could potentially serve workers in the service industries in the town centre and younger people. Less dependency on public transport but good access to train services.
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/new	Expand Touchwood for residential rather than retail.
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/new	Use NEC car parks for housing and construct multi-storey car parks instead. This puts new homes within reach of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q15/new	Enhance Shirley by placing more homes above the retail units on the Stratford Road for the benefit of the workers in the shops and businesses. This will enhance the feel of Shirley.
John Dancer [4303]			Q15/new	In relation to Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection. Recognise urgent need for housing. 41% development in Shirley/Dickens Heath is disproportionate. Overdevelopment of Green Belt land; contrary to central government policy. Lots of brownfield land available in Birmingham. Lots of opportunity elsewhere for infilling.
Johnnie Arkwright [3903]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q15/new	Not the right locations, in particular to meet Birmingham's shortfall. Needs more cross-boundary working with neighbouring authorities. Releasing land around Hatton Station in Warwick District offers greater potential. Stratford DC worked with Redditch to meet their housing figure. Need to wait for strategic HMA work to apportion LPA numbers and where other authorities can contribute on key transport corridors into Solihull and Birmingham.
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q15/new	<p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Julie Williamson [4146]	Philip Neaves	Felsham Planning & Development (Philip Neaves) [4145]	Q15/new	<p>proposed land at Old Station Road Hampton in Arden as a site that should be included in the DLP. Response is framed in rationale against Qs 14,15&16 for why this should be the case.</p>
Karin Chessell [4284]			Q15/new	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Kay Wilkes [4000]		Q15/new	<p>Housing White Paper say Green Belt should only be built on as last resort. Number of alternatives have not been considered and complement proposed growth:</p> <p>Surface carparking at NEC could be converted to multi-storey and land saved could be used for housing, on HS2 doorstep.</p> <p>JLR sports field is hardly used.</p> <p>Conversion of huge gardens to small estates like those on Blossomfield Road.</p> <p>Land Pockets between:</p> <p>A452/A45/M42</p> <p>A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42</p> <p>Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly direction</p> <p>B4438/M42/A45</p> <p>Hampton Lane/A41/M42</p> <p>Many brownfield sites and POS in Birmingham e.g. Land at Fazeley Street used for cheap parking.</p>
Kim Cowie [4399]		Q15/new	<p>Allocations around the borough seem slightly biased towards certain areas - in particular Shirley.</p> <p>Reviewing the allocated numbers my understanding is Solihull is taking circa 900, Meriden 50 units and Dorridge is not mentioned (this may be because Knowle and Balsall Common appear to be taking a generous amount).</p> <p>But 2550 in Shirley is excessive.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kiri Monksfield [4386]			Q15/new	Pointless to put houses on other side of Borough to HS2. Consider building on the NEC. Consider smaller developments in pockets of land or brownfield sites, rather than Green Belt land.
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q15/new	- consider another freestanding village such as suggested by Berkswell PC at Cornets Lane End. - It would also be possible to continue to build on Blythe Valley Park to create a new village - westward expansion of Coventry, utilising the potential of T
L J Crumpton [4987]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
L Longstaffe [4840]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/new	Illogical and unsound that no suitable land has been proposed for housing in Dorridge: Excellent transport links (bus and rail), New shopping centre, Excellent community facilities (park, wildlife areas, cricket club).
Laura Townsend [4216]			Q15/new	- I suggest that Solihull Council examines this aspect closely and re-visits the potential of other areas in the Borough that can absorb this volume of homes. - Brownfield sites across the borough.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q15/new	<p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q15/new	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.</p>
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q15/new	<p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Louis Burns [4069]			Q15/new	<p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
M Black [4823]			Q15/new	<p>Brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village would be far more suited to cope with additional housing without adding strain to the village centre.</p>
M Hardwick [4833]			Q15/new	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mairead, Kelvin & Harry James [3986]			Q15/new	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Unfair to propose 41% of housing in Blythe Ward/around Shirley.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in Dorridge should be used.</p> <p>Housing White Paper states use Green Belt land as last resort.</p>
Margaret Foreshew [3324]			Q15/new	suggestion that Lapworth be considered as a location for new housing development (outside of smbc)
Marianne Fogarty [4395]			Q15/new	Have you considered sharing growth across the Borough. Perhaps Brueton Park?
Marjie Douglas [4828]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Mark Hathaway [3330]			Q15/new	Development in Knowle or Dorridge.
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q15/new	<p>Objection to Sites 2 and 3 in Balsall Common. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Taft [3595]			Q15/new	<p>As an alternative to the level of growth proposed in the Shirley area, to reduce encroachment on Green Belt, improve the local area and help traffic flow, demolish Light Hall school and use the site for housing with a new school built opposite Miller and Carter or behind the TRW site to meet new capacity requirements.</p> <p>Instead of relocating Solihull rail station, convert Monkspath Hall car park to multi-storey and use the remainder of the land for high quality apartments.</p> <p>Free up car park land at NEC by building multi-storey and use for offices and residential.</p>
Martin & Sharon Rabbitte [4435]			Q15/new	<p>Propose demolishing Light Hall School and replace with housing.</p> <p>School very run down and classes being held in portacabins.</p> <p>New School could be built opposite Miller and Carter, with better road connections. Would ease pressure off residences in existing school area.</p>
Michael Watkinson [3576]			Q15/new	<p>Brownfield land adjacent to Lavender Hall Lane and the railway just north of the Balsall Common is untouched as are pockets of brown belt land close to the A452 north of the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/new	<p>Harper Fields, west of Kenilworth Road, Balsall Common. 2.3ha</p> <p>Lies immediately opposite to proposed site allocation 3.</p> <p>Greenfield land, moderate agricultural value in Green Belt.</p> <p>Well contained, would create firm and defensible Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Would align with Spatial Strategy for Balsall Common.</p> <p>Excellent access onto Kenilworth Road. Would complement site allocations 2 and 3.</p> <p>Unclear why RP58 performs differently in GBA than RP57 and RP59.</p> <p>Accessibility would be comparable to proposed allocations.</p> <p>Believe it is suitable, achievable and available.</p> <p>No constraints.</p>
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q15/new	<p>Propose development south of Catherine de barnes, along and between Henwood Lane, Berry Hall Lane and Ravenshaw Lane.</p> <p>Little mention of Catherine de Barnes in the DLP.</p> <p>Village has existing amenities. Could be enlarged to a sustainable settlement with addition of a school and health centre.</p> <p>Upgrading Ravenshaw Lane to provide direct access onto A41 Solihull bypass near Junction 5 of the M42 would alleviate some of congestion on Hampton Lane. Would also preserve green space as a buffer against urban sprawl.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q15/new	alternative site suggested to the south of CdeBarnes, near the J5 of M42.
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q15/new	Much as I dislike the idea I think a purpose built new village with appropriate planned infrastructure would be the best solution.
miss susan turner [2965]			Q15/new	partial land currently used as Shirley golf club.
Mr Justin Wilkes [3090]			Q15/new	Dickens Heath / Tidbury Green The current preferred area to the West of Dickens Heath would result in the closure of several important and well supported local amenities/businesses, while the land to the south (Refined Parcel 73) would be more sustainable in terms of transportation, access to existing services, would not result in the closure of businesses and while it would bring Dickens Heath and Tilbury Green closer together, there would still be a strong enforceable boundary, and it would prevent Solihull/Bromsgrove/Birmingham merging along the Western boundary.
Mr & Mrs Bird [5004]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Mr & Mrs . Taylor [4990]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Mr & Mrs N Harris [4854]			Q15/new	Site 9 will have adverse affect on Knowle village character so if expansion is required, should be off Hampton Road towards Barston and Motorway / canal area.
Mr & Mrs Simons [4614]			Q15/new	Catherine de Barnes is suggested as a possible location for development
Mr . King [4989]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Mr Adam Hunter [3332]			Q15/new	I would question if other sites should be given increased priory over this development and if the council has truly researched other non developed area in the borough. Considering a genuinely new development rather than further extending dickens Heath.
Mr Adam Weber [3072]			Q15/new	The Government has consistently committed to protecting the Green Belt and stated that the single issue of unmet housing demand is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt. Other sites in the Borough are more suitable for development. No robust and detailed appraisal of alternative sites has been carried out in a sequential test.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Christopher Hall [3220]			Q15/new	I personally know of one very suitable brown field site in Birmingham, similar in size to the proposed development, that has not been designated for housing on Birmingham's plan.
Mr David Lloyd [3278]			Q15/new	Suggest areas already blighted e.g. by motorway service area, should be subject to development.
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q15/new	suggested brownfield sites and alternatives -14 sites in Berkswell
Mr G Walters [2324]			Q15/new	The Government has consistently committed to protecting the Green Belt and stated that the single issue of unmet housing demand is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt. Other sites in the Borough are more suitable for development. No robust and detailed appraisal of alternative sites has been carried out in a sequential test.
Mr James Lupton [3554]			Q15/new	I believe the fields around Barratt's farm justify a conservation order in the same manner as that accorded to the fields to the south of Berkswell. That said, I would favour acceptance of the application of Berkswell Estate for development on one of the Berkswell fields behind Village Farm. My reasons are: a) development will be tucked away behind a short frontage b) I believe the village would benefit from the injection of a few new residents c) it could be adopted as the better of the two developments proposed by Berkswell Estate for the centre of the village.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q15/new	Hard to believe that surrounding authorities, particularly Birmingham, have insufficient sites, particularly brownfield sites, such that SMBC need to accept additional building within the Green Belt. Needs to be strongly challenged. Recent Housing White Paper states Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances when all other options exhausted.
Mr Liam Eccleston [4834]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr M Khan [4149]	Atief Ishaq	Planning Design & Build (Atief Ishaq) [4116]	Q15/new	proposed alternative site land r/o 32 Creynolds Lane
Mr Mark Roberts [2967]			Q15/new	16 - East of Solihull (between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton Lane). We should be regenerating existing areas especially on the outskirts of the town center, not destroying the few green belt sites which are so close to the over developed town center. This would help ease town center traffic and encourage residents to use public transport instead of adding more cars to the over populated town center roads. Once we lose these central green belts sites in the heart of Solihull they are gone for good.
Mr Neil Murphy [3544]	Michael Maguire	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	Q15/new	Land adj 157 Hampton Lane, Solihull offers a natural extension to the established housing on Hampton Lane. It is low performing in Green Belt terms. It is a smaller site that the Government's housing White Paper is promoting.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q15/new	The increased development on greenfield land, where there are other brown field and old commercial sites to the north of Balsall Common that could have been considered, including a previous proposal to develop a new settlement on the land north of the village adjacent to the old quarry workings, would make more efficient and effective use of the space around the village rather than continue to erode the rural nature of Balsall Common itself.
Mr R & Mrs B Collins [4729]			Q15/new	There is land outside Balsall Common area that is more suitable for new housing, and Knowle/Dorridge benefit from better shopping, schools and community facilities so has more suitable infrastructure for growth.
Mr R N Moll [3610]			Q15/new	There must be more land available that does not adjoin built up areas and would not impact on existing residents, for example Airport Way.
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q15/new	Local discussion on re-locating Light Hall school to Dog Kennel Lane and develop old school site for housing. Would allow easier access for the school runs as it links directly to the A34 and would take congestion away from Hathaway Road/Shakespeare Drive.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr. Andreas Welzel [3137]			Q15/new	<p>I would like to request that the land put forward under the call for sites scheme (SHELAA site ref. 84, Land South of Houndsfield Lane) be considered as a housing allocation site, in particular for self-build development. My supporting reasons are:</p> <p>Potential to enhance the existing street scene (as stated in SHELAA report)</p> <p>Therefore there is not much opposition to be expected from neighbours</p> <p>Visual variety achievable through small scale development / self-build</p> <p>Sustainability (just 1/2 mile from Whitocks End Station)</p> <p>Direct involvement through keen local owners / self-builders</p>
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q15/new	<p>Dunstan Farm within land allocated for Site 20.</p> <p>To be used for residential.</p> <p>Potential for ca. 700 dwellings.</p>
Mrs C A Preece [4744]			Q15/new	<p>Note there are no proposed planning schemes in Dorridge, which has infrastructure in place to accomodate a new estate, i.e. train station, adequate bus service, new supermarket.</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q15/new	<p>The selection of Greenfield sites while ignoring PDL sites and the opportunity for a new settlement north of Balsall Common are inexplicable.</p>
Mrs Christine Plant [4686]			Q15/new	<p>Little appears to be planned to the west of the A452 in Balsall Common</p> <p>Also brownfield land at Wooton Green Lane, The Fisheries, areas between Berkswell Station and Hallmeadow Road.</p>
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q15/new	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs DENISE HACKWORTH [2903]			Q15/new	<p>Support a standalone new village with all the infrastructure, close to or with good roads to access motorway.</p> <p>Could be built along the M42.</p> <p>Would have less significant impact on existing roads and facilities.</p> <p>Include sufficient space to extend new village if new housing required in the future.</p> <p>Lots of green belt in the Borough.</p> <p>Rather this than continual erosion of Green Belt that protects existing villages and their character.</p>
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q15/new	<p>It also would seem to make more sense in terms of ease of access to road and rail networks, as well as the health centre, for new developments in Balsall Common/Berkswell to be nearer to Hallmeadow Road, Truggist Lane, Riddings Hill, Lavender Hall Road etc.</p>
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q15/new	<p>land near Oakes Farm Shop off Balsall Street East would be a good location for some of the homes currently planned for Barrett's Farm because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * is less congested * serviced by a main road that could take the additional capacity * a farm shop/cafe and a pub within close proximity * space for the development of additional facilities, unlike in the town centre which is close to Barrett's Farm * Pressure taken off the town centre,
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q15/new	<p>I am sure that there are also other locations in Balsall Common and neighbouring villages/towns (e.g. Berkswell, which appears to have not been earmarked for any expansion) where the homes could be spread out in smaller numbers to make growth more manageable and easily absorbed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Faye Doble [4650]			Q15/new	Could Cheswick Green be increased to form a lovely Garden Village?
Mrs Hazel Reed [3279]			Q15/new	In relation to Site 4 Objection. Government Housing White Paper states that Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances, when all alternatives have been considered. Unreasonable to take 2000 homes of Birmingham's overspill. Numerous brownfield sites in Birmingham.
Mrs Jean Walters [2569]			Q15/new	The Government has consistently committed to protecting the Green Belt and stated that the single issue of unmet housing demand is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt. Other sites in the Borough are more suitable for development. No robust and detailed appraisal of alternative sites has been carried out in a sequential test.
Mrs Jill Collins [3784]			Q15/new	It would make so much more sense to build the houses where the jobs are going to be created, e.g. HS2, Birmingham Business Park, Jaguar Land Rover, Blythe Valley Business Park etc. These are going to be the booming areas of the borough and the people working there are going to need homes, so it would be logical to build them in those localities.
Mrs Joanna Holloway [3491]			Q15/new	Look at brownfield sites (across the borough) before using Shirley.
Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]			Q15/new	I firmly believe that Brownfield sites should be thoroughly investigated before looking at green belt land. The priority should be areas with good infrastructure and transport facilities. There is land between The George in Tree and the garage along the Kenilworth Road that already has some previous development (Brownfield) which would have a good road system and access to the railway station. I believe that a plan was submitted to Solihull but turned down.
Mrs Kirsty King [3592]			Q15/new	Balsall Common has 14 brownfield sites that were submitted and ignored by the council. Why?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Lorraine Horlor [3498]			Q15/new	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mrs M Stewart [4298]			Q15/new	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Parts of Earlswood have more space.</p> <p>Build some in Knowle and Dorridge they have bigger roads.</p>
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q15/new	<p>Better to put homes towards Catherine de Barnes or Hampton-in-Arden, than Balsall Common and south of Borough. These former settlements are closer to HS2 Interchange.</p>
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q15/new	<p>Proposals for a new village on a brown field site development to the north of the region have been ignored.</p>
Mrs P Nurse [1700]			Q15/new	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q15/new	<p>From the land available map plots 23,</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q15/new	From the land available map plots 128,
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q15/new	Move Lighthall school on to allocation 12, giving much better access. Leaving a brownfield site perfect for building houses.
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q15/new	Rather than concentrating growth in South Shirley, more should be focussed around HS2 as major draw for new housing and there are lower performing sites in Green Belt Assessment not proposed for allocation, on sites around Dorridge that are closer to HS2 and a better quality rail line with more trains per day and access to London, could be factored in to the rebuilding of Arden school and are lower performing in GBA than Sites 12 or 13, on sites in North Solihull that are lower/none performing in GBA, or by making more efficient use of NEC/Airport/International station car parks.
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Ms K Standley [1724]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
N Birtley [4453]			Q15/new	What possibility exists of redeveloping the HS2 construction sites for housing on it's completion?
N Birtley [4453]			Q15/new	I think that a new settlement or village to the north of Balsall Common should definitely be considered, with opportunity being taken to use the moving of existing roads for HS2 purposes as a springboard for such development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
N K Curtis Property Investments [4318]	Michael Lapworth	Michael Lapworth [4316]	Q15/new	<p>Proposed alternative site - New Holly Lane Farm, Holly Lane, Balsall Common.</p> <p>41.83 ha.</p> <p>Close to Balsall Common Village centre.</p> <p>Close to JLR site at Honiley Airfield.</p> <p>Part brownfield land.</p> <p>Development could be phased.</p> <p>Golf course planning application.</p>
Neil Sears [3923]			Q15/new	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.</p>
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q15/new	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider another freestanding village such as suggested by Berkswell PC at Cornets Lane End. - It would also be possible to continue to build on Blythe Valley Park to create a new village - westward expansion of Coventry, utilising the potential of T

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Ager [3055]			Q15/new	<p>In relation to Site 8 and 9 objection.</p> <p>No allocations proposed for Dorridge or Bentley Heath.</p> <p>Dorridge would be a much sensible solution for sustainable development with the rail connection.</p> <p>A dispersed pattern of development involving sites in Dorridge and Bentley Heath would be more appropriate for the area.</p>
Nick Brimble [4982]			Q15/new	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>
Nigel Barney [4583]			Q15/new	<p>Full consideration has not been given to Brownfield sites.</p> <p>More affordable areas of Borough to Shirley.</p> <p>Build on brownfield land near NEC.</p> <p>Land pockets between:</p> <p>A452/A45/M42</p> <p>A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42</p> <p>Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly Direction</p> <p>B4438/M42/A45</p> <p>Hampton Lane/A41/M42</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nikki Burns [4068]			Q15/new	<p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/new	<p>Illogical and unsound that no suitable land has been proposed for housing in Dorridge:</p> <p>Excellent transport links (bus and rail),</p> <p>New shopping centre,</p> <p>Excellent community facilities (park, wildlife areas, cricket club).</p>
P G Pittaway [4702]			Q15/new	<p>Alternative site land at Corner of Box Trees Road and Earlswood Road. Lilac Cottage.</p> <p>The site was once occupied by a cottage and planning permission has been granted for development in vicinity. Question why the site cannot be developed for a residential dwelling.</p>
P May [4988]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Paul Rylah [4994]			Q15/new	Site of the Knowle Football Club plus north of Dorridge near J4 of the M42.
Paul Woolman [4209]			Q15/new	<p>other pieces of land ripe for re-development such as old office buildings no longer being used, in prime locations with direct and easy access onto the road infrastructure</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q15/new	<p>Housing White Paper say Green Belt should only be built on as last resort. Number of alternatives have not been considered and complement proposed growth.</p> <p>Land Pockets between:</p> <p>A452/A45/M42</p> <p>A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42</p> <p>Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly direction</p> <p>B4438/M42/A45</p> <p>Hampton Lane/A41/M42</p> <p>Better to build closer to HS2, M42 and UK Central area.</p> <p>Should be certain that there are no possible brownfield sites or infill areas.</p> <p>Should have high density properties in town centres and around car parks.</p> <p>Siting and design of houses needs careful consideration to ensure problems are not created.</p>
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q15/new	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.</p>
Professor Derek Cassidy [3797]			Q15/new	<p>A new freestanding small-scale garden city that can have its own purpose-built community facilities;</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q15/new	Relocate Light Hall school to site 13 to include some playing fields and a formal park as well as some housing. Similar to the approach proposed for Arden Academy in Knowle. Use the existing school site for residential development. Sites also available at the Northern end of Balsall Common village.
Richard King [3340]			Q15/new	no site in particular suggested but 'What about the Green Belt opportunities around Catherine-de-barnes, Hampton-in-Arden, Knowle and Dorridge.'
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q15/new	There are alternative sites to the north of Balsall Common that would have good access to new employment sites and would not require road improvements.
Richard Onions [4280]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Robin Hill [4621]			Q15/new	across Solihull there are a number of large ground level car parks. These don't strike me as a very efficient use of space, especially when they are near to shops/services or travel connections. Has adequate consideration been given to reviewing these for re-development and incorporation of housing?
Roger Lock [4112]			Q15/new	An alternative plan to the scale of growth proposed for the green belt around Shirley would be to fill in the space between Solihull and Coventry along the A45 corridor, in and around the NEC and beyond.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/new	<p>Three Maypoles Farm Dickens Heath 13.3ha site.</p> <p>Greenfield site in Green Belt.</p> <p>Does not reflect character of area, functions as urban fringe.</p> <p>With careful design could accommodate ca. 175 dwellings or 100 dwellings plus open space.</p> <p>Lies immediately south of and partially within Site allocation 13.</p> <p>Would provide a logical & more robust & defensible GB boundary to Site 13.</p> <p>Would prevent coalescence with Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Would ensure conformity with Vision for Solihull Rural area.</p> <p>GBA score of 6 is equal or lower to allocations.</p> <p>Accessibility score is comparable with allocations.</p> <p>See documentation by Define.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q15/new	<p>Land off Grange Road Dorridge. 2 ha.</p> <p>Potential for 65-70 dwellings.</p> <p>Greenfield in Green Belt. Number of TPOs on and around site.</p> <p>Appears more urban than countryside in character.</p> <p>Dorridge should be included as settlement for growth as has many services and facilities.</p> <p>GBA score equal or lower to many allocated sites.</p> <p>Good accessibility (though not scored).</p> <p>Any wildlife constraints could be overcome by sensitive design.</p> <p>Suitable, deliverable and achievable.</p> <p>Could come forward early in plan period.</p>
Russell East [4330]			Q15/new	<p>The Government has consistently committed to protecting the Green Belt and stated that the single issue of unmet housing demand is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Other sites in the Borough are more suitable for development.</p> <p>No robust and detailed appraisal of alternative sites has been carried out in a sequential test.</p>
Ruth Brimble [4981]			Q15/new	<p>Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Ravenscroft [4478]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q15/new	Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated. Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.
Severn Trent Water Limited [502]	Chris Sinton	GL Hearn (Chris Sinton) [4639]	Q15/new	Severn Trent Water are currently in the process of upgrading Barston Sewage Treatment Works which will significantly reduce the overall land take of the works and will provide an opportunity to redevelop previously developed land for alternative uses. The site represents a good strategic development opportunity given its location adjacent to the M42. Subject to the proposed Motorway services to the west of the M42 gaining planning consent, there could be a potential opportunity to provide complimentary uses within STWL's land holding. The release of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for development could secure significant benefits.
Sheryl Chandler [4083]			Q15/new	Why not build on the Land Rover Sports field as a trade off with the company for Site 20, very few employees actually use the sports field. Also use larger houses and gardens in Solihull to develop small estates with mews or flats as opposed to the exclusive developments that are cropping up along Blossomfield Road. Other alternatives on land between A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42, Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly direction, B4438/M42/A45, Hampton Lane/A41/M42.
Sheryl Chandler [4179]			Q15/new	As alternative to South Shirley sites should build on the Land Rover Sports field as a trade off with the company for Site 20, very few employees actually use the sports field. Also use larger houses and gardens in Solihull to develop small estates with mews or flats as opposed to the exclusive developments that are cropping up along Blossomfield Road. Other alternatives on land between A452/Coleshill Heath Road/M42, Bickenhill Lane/B4438/Westerly direction, B4438/M42/A45, Hampton Lane/A41/M42.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q15/new	<p>Gross imbalance of housing in Shirley/Dickens Heath area compared to Dorridge, East of Solihull/Monkspath and west of Dorridge/Knowle.</p> <p>As an alternative, propose new homes built in M42 corridor and aligned to Dorridge/Bentley Heath.</p> <p>See proposed areas in Appendix A.</p> <p>Lower combined Green Belt score than sites 4 and 12.</p> <p>More balanced distribution of growth.</p> <p>Well placed for optimum usage of existing infrastructure; close to M42 and highways.</p> <p>Proposed sites do not have existing established use, e.g. golf course.</p>
Simon Standley [4985]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q15/new	<p>see supporting documents for Land North of Waste Lane BC.</p> <p>1.05ha site off Waste Lane.</p> <p>Considered suitable, available and achievable.</p>
Spitfire Property Group (Emma Evans) [2642]			Q15/new	land off Grange Road Knowle has the potential to deliver upto 30 units. Also a greater # of sites around the settlement boundary would ensure that traffic movements are more dispersed.
Stuart Drury [4983]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q15/new	<p>Land at Fulford Hall Farm, Tidbury Green.</p> <p>Submitted after 2015-2016 Call for Sites exercise.</p> <p>Viable land values.</p> <p>Potential to cater for full range of housing needs, particularly higher wealth families that the conurbation needs to retain and attract for its economic growth.</p> <p>Sustainable and accessible location close to main housing need from Birmingham.</p> <p>Capacity for 1000 dwellings up to 2033.</p> <p>Market support.</p> <p>WSP Transport Study concludes development of this site would be in line with transport policy and has potential for highway and sustainable transport benefits.</p> <p>WSP Infrastructure Study have confirmed advice from Western Power and Severn Trent.</p> <p>Sustainable location.</p>
Susan & Paul Knight [4235]			Q15/new	Have any brownfield sites been considered in Borough?
Terry Corns [4446]			Q15/new	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consider another freestanding village such as suggested by Berkswell PC at Cornets Lane End. - It would also be possible to continue to build on Blythe Valley Park to create a new village - westward expansion of Coventry, utilising the potential of T

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/new	Illogical and unsound that no suitable land has been proposed for housing in Dorridge: Excellent transport links (bus and rail), New shopping centre, Excellent community facilities (park, wildlife areas, cricket club).
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q15/new	Council rejected a self-contained new village near Berkswell, due to inadequate access. How inadequate was it for that opinion to be applicable? Is not the same situation going to arise in Knowle from these sites if they are developed?
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q15/new	Illogical and unsound that no suitable land has been proposed for housing in Dorridge: Excellent transport links (bus and rail), New shopping centre, Excellent community facilities (park, wildlife areas, cricket club).
V Hardwick [4835]			Q15/new	Object to Site 1 as sufficient brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common to fulfil housing requirement, no valid reason to take green belt land which contributes towards purpose of preventing settlements from merging, and brownfield sites would be better located for access to main areas of employment to north avoiding commuting through village.
Valerie Bennett [4600]			Q15/new	infill sites elsewhere, i.e. Dorridge.
Valerie Lynes [4054]			Q15/new	A more logical direction for development for Dickens Heath would be to take in the land on the other side of the Stratford on Avon Canal bound by Tanworth Lane, Braggs Farm Lane, Lady Lane and Dickens Heath Road, and then continue over the other side of Tanworth Lane to the land bound by Tanworth Lane, Blackford Road, Creynolds Lane and Stratford Road. This would make access to the considerable better roads and the motorway network much easier and would give a much better traffic flow.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Vivian Drury [4984]			Q15/new	There are brownfield sites to the north of Balsall Common village that are far more suitable.
Wendy Cairns [4226]			Q15/new	SMBC should look more to brownfield sites in BC to provide housing rather than on Greenfield
Yvonne Naylor [4456]			Q15/new	Understand that there are adequate brown field sites which could be used without using greenbelt land in order to fulfil the housing requirements. Brownfield sites to the north of the village would be far more suited to cope with the increase of traffic without adding strain to the village centre.
Zoe Speed [4472]			Q15/new	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Question 16 Infrastructure Requirements				
A & V Blake [4304]			Q16	Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection. Recent development in Cheswick Green and Dickens Heath already added to congestion. Blackford Road, Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane very busy at peak times. Stratford Road almost at a standstill in morning from Cranmore Road to Monkspath Hall Road. Proposed development of 2550 houses will increase strain on road infrastructure, including air and noise pollution. Loss of green space for community benefit and health.
A Andrews [4851]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with sports facilities that area accessible to public and public library with IT access.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
A G Douglas [4827]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Lack of parking in village. Hallmeadow Road used for Berkswell Station and medical centre.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctors surgery.</p> <p>Will increase traffic and congestion. Local roads unsuitable for expansion. Routes to exit the village to the east are restricted by low bridge at Station Road and narrow bridge on Lavender Hall Lane.</p> <p>Balsall Street East, to west of village, cannot cope with further traffic.</p> <p>Only 6% of commuters from Balsall Common use public transport.</p> <p>Bypass is really an access road to 900 proposed houses.</p>
A Naik [3995]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic - area already gridlocked at peak times. Been number of accidents at Streetsbrook Road/Sharmans Cross Road junction.</p> <p>Oversubscribed medical practice - At Northbrook need to book 3 weeks in advance.</p>
A Whitfield [4960]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with new sports centre.</p>
Adam Barlow [4853]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool, sauna/steam room, gym and squash/badminton courts.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Adam Welch [4417]			Q16	<p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Recent developments e.g. Parkgate have resulted in loss of green space.</p> <p>Road infrastructure unable to cope with 600 houses.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at Shirley and Whitlocks End train station.</p> <p>Schools and doctor surgeries oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital downgraded, more will need to travel to Heartlands.</p>
Adrian Cox [4295]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 12 and 13 Objections.</p> <p>Roads around Dog Kennel Lane and Blackford Road are already over contested (sic) by traffic accessing Dickens Heath village.</p> <p>Complete disregard of speed bumps on Blackford Road; hazardous to children.</p> <p>Local doctor surgeries are overrun.</p>
Alan Devoy [4596]			Q16	<p>Wish to highlight issues with capacity of boroughs schools, in particular St T&G in Knowle, whose catchment area alongside the proposed new development will result in loss of places for local children</p>
Alan Dick [3322]			Q16	<p>retail and parking needs to be addressed as additional infrastructure to what is identified in the DLP</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Alan La Touche [4339]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility:</p> <p>Land deemed to be for sport use only in 2013.</p> <p>Developer has overcharged for grounds and prevented use of land for sport.</p> <p>Not well maintained.</p> <p>Tennis club is well used. Others are very busy.</p> <p>Shortage of sports facilities in area.</p> <p>Traffic:</p> <p>Increased traffic will exacerbate existing congestion and parking issues. Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road junction very busy at peak hours.</p> <p>Impact of construction traffic.</p> <p>Alternative roads, Winterbourne and Beaminster, are not suitable for volume of traffic.</p>
<p>Alastair McCulloch [3624]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>There ought to be more explicit references to infrastructure including schools, medical facilities, shopping and leisure facilities all being accessible from the development sites, in line with sustainable travel objectives.</p>
<p>Alex King [4942]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, indoor football pitch, gym, games facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alison Leah [3517]			Q16	The infrastructure in Knowle and Dorridge, with regard to parking, buses, doctor's surgeries and railway station parking in particular, is already under strain. The large developments proposed for Knowle will see a total collapse. There is nothing within the plan which guarantees an effective solution to this problem. If the Council continues along this path, it will turn the Solihull area from a desirable one to one which is to be avoided.
Amanda C Ball [4342]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Council said they would not sell freehold in 2013.</p> <p>Increased volume of traffic in congested area. Often gridlocked around Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Impact on pedestrians, e.g. schoolchildren, and cyclists.</p> <p>Pressure on local schools, doctors etc.</p>
Amanda Carroll [3442]			Q16	Regarding site 13 - Our doctors and local schools are already filled to capacity, access to these are already tight, how on earth would they be able to cope with a massive influx of people you are proposing to bring to the area? It would only outstretch services even more than what they are currently, which would surely drop standards of care all round.
Amrit Teja [4784]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Ana & Mark Spittle McGuire [4693]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrea Baker [3471]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Andrew & Fiona Gilyead [4402]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Inappropriate land use/loss of sporting facilities. According to Sport England, Solihull is in the third quartile nationally for adult participation in sport. Council has a legal duty to address the existing shortage of facilities. Land covenanted for sports use.</p> <p>Increased traffic volumes, particularly during morning and afternoon peaks. Junction of Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road/Dorchester Road/Stonor Park Road an existing source of congestion.</p> <p>Council is planning to put parking restriction on Woodlea Drive due to existing school drop off/pick up issues around Junior School. Increased traffic will exacerbate further.</p> <p>Capacity of local services, e.g. schools already oversubscribed.</p>
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q16	<p>I have seen nothing about the need to invest in community facilities as additional households are created. Locally, for example, there are waiting lists for Scouts that mean that some young people are denied the opportunity to join - the constraint is often buildings and other facilities. The whole plan appears to be focused on profit and meeting targets - not on meeting the needs of existing and new communities.</p>
Andrew Foulkes [4906]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports hall, astro-turf pitch, theatre space.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Andrew Hinsley [4918]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Arts theatre, swimming pool / sports centre, 4G Floodlit pitches/ Multi-use games area, day nursery. The facilities are in short supply in Knowle and should support the local community as well as providing excellent schools for primary and secondary aged children in the local area.</p>
Andrew Hodge [3103]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
Andy & Rachel Bennett [4580]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13.</p> <p>Scale of development in Shirley fail to consider impact on infrastructure, including:</p> <p>road, rail and other public transport, public services, educational facilities and loss of community recreational and sporting facilities.</p> <p>Local GP surgeries, community healthcare and acute hospital care already under pressure, will be unable to cope with additional demand.</p> <p>Local ecosystem acts as flood storage.</p> <p>High levels of congestion on Stratford Road to J4 of M42. All surrounding roads and routes out of Dickens Heath also congested.</p> <p>More development will increase use of rat runs, risks to road safety.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Andy Talliss [4415]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Site 18 is one for five sports grounds at risk in DLP.</p> <p>Sport England has found that Solihull is in the 3rd quartile nationally for over-16 participation in sport three times per week and continues to fall in the national league tables.</p> <p>Local sporting facilities have vast number of social, physiological and health benefits.</p>
<p>Andy Wilson [3394]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
<p>Angela Chandler [3319]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
<p>Angela Lane [4769]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Angela Miller [3453]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Angela Perrett [4548]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Site 1 Objection and Bypass.</p> <p>Does not require a bypass.</p> <p>Real reason for bypass it to fulfil future road links for HS2 expansion.</p> <p>Current proposal is not a bypass but an access road for Site 1.</p> <p>Lack of parking spaces in the village.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Added pressure to congestion.</p> <p>Poor public transport access.</p> <p>Average 1.6 cars per household with 2.5% of households having 4+ cars/vans.</p> <p>Only 6% of residents take public transport to work.</p> <p>Development will generate 1500+ additional cars.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation.</p> <p>Already have disruption of flight path and HS2.</p>
<p>Ann & Craig Plant [3945]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>In relation to Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Infrastructure of roads, drainage etc will not be able to cope with further traffic, houses.</p> <p>Insufficient shops, doctors, schools. Hospital not big enough, A&E closing and not open to children.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Panaser [4390]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Further increase to traffic pollution and congestion at both ends of Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Congestion at peak hours. I have to turn left out of my drive on Streetsbrook Road and make a detour as such delay when attempt to drive right onto Streetsbrook.</p> <p>Black soot on plants and shrubs in front garden from traffic pollution.</p> <p>Will result in environmental and noise pollution, parking problems etc.</p> <p>Oversubscribed GPs.</p> <p>How will local amenities cope with added population?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ann Parker [4362]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Development should be close to HS2.</p> <p>Heavy congestion already, affects Stratford Road from M42 and all arterial routes.</p> <p>New development will compound congestion and traffic.</p> <p>Local railway stations are not fit for purpose; inadequate parking.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed. Will require new schools or expansions.</p> <p>Doctor surgeries overstretched.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded. Trip to Heartlands is a nightmare.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation.</p> <p>Green space safeguarded for local residents by Layca.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>
Ann Ward [4831]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.</p>
Anna Belcher [4357]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. Already hazardous at times for schoolchildren.</p> <p>Consider impact on residents as well as commuters.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Anne Hazlewood [4775]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Anne Hewitt [4324]			Q16	In relation to Site 8 and 9 Objection. Support submission by KDBH Neighbourhood Forum. Development at Arden School site will cause gridlock and add to existing traffic problems in Knowle.
Antoinette Morgan [4954]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with new community centre, with investment in existing centres such as Widney Road, and youth club facility.
Anup & Minal Sodha [3987]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Existing road congestion, especially around Junior School. Development will worsen traffic and safety issues. Rugby ground is essential to sporting aspiration of local children. Should not lose this facility.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q16	concerned that an IDP has not been prepared for this stage of the plan preparation but note the likely infrastructure for sites has been identified. Would like to continue the dialogue with the council on infrastructure for the site.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q16	<p>Insufficient attention to necessary infrastructure provision and enhancements within the Borough to facilitate the scale of development being planned for by the Council. This represents a deficiency in Plan and its evidence base.</p> <p>There are many related and complementary transport strategy documents and plans that are relevant to the LPR in terms of infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Given the scale of planned investment in major transport infrastructure improvements and other planned interventions, it is concerning that the Draft LPR and its evidence base gives limited attention to the subject of infrastructure investment or its benefits for releasing major growth within the Borough.</p>
Arul & Lye Quen Hon Kanagarajah [4288]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Will not provide sufficient basic amenities and lead to oversubscription of schooling, healthcare and recreational facilities. Unsustainable.</p> <p>Loss of existing sporting grounds which will not be replaced.</p> <p>Thought land was under covenant for sporting uses only.</p> <p>Higher risk of flooding within local area.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and lack of parking will affect local school and pre-existing residents. Direct impact on safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
Ashdone Khan [4947]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>More sixth form space, theatre / music space.</p>
Ayaz Mahmood [4485]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
B G Cheshire [4355]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic congestion. Existing infrastructure under huge strain, especially at peak times.</p> <p>Jams on all surrounding roads.</p> <p>Safety concerns for road users and pedestrians. Causes frustration, loss of productivity and pollution.</p> <p>Existing adverse impact of on-street parking by commuters to avoid car park charges or using public transport.</p> <p>Is there up to date traffic modelling and traffic impact study.</p> <p>What are the proposed access and egress routes?</p> <p>What are proposed mitigation measures?</p> <p>What are measures to consider side road parking and effect upon existing and future traffic flows?</p>
B Swales [5000]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports facilities for local classes and teams to use, youth centre.</p> <p>Current infrastructure - roads, schools, Drs surgeries, hospitals etc can't cope now, but appreciate that new housing is needed.</p> <p>The school and its needs both current and future need to be paramount. The site is small so only build things for which there is likely to be a need. E.g. there are at least 2 day nurseries already in Knowle and Dorridge and 1 on Blythe Valley Park.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Balsall and Berkswell Football Club (Mr James Aspinall) [3643]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Understand need for housing in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Want to ensure appropriate sports facilities available to families and children.</p> <p>Balsall and Berkswell Football Club lease land from the Council on Lavender Hall Lane and rent pitches in Lavender Park.</p> <p>Sites 1 & 2 would result in 2-4 football pitches being lost to village.</p> <p>Proposed sports facility will not provide external pitch or outdoor facilities.</p> <p>Football Club and Council could develop facilities at grounds and Lavender Hall Park:</p> <p>E.g. Improve playing surface, drainage, car parking, install floodlights, provide integrated sports facility at Lavender Hall, all weather surface for hockey, netball.</p>
<p>Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>The 25% increase in housing stock in Balsall Common and Berkswell by the proposed developments proposed will result in a substantial population growth. The existing infrastructure is struggling to cope with the present population, and is certainly inadequate to meet the needs of the proposed increased population.</p> <p>Improvements are essential; including more primary school places, additional village centre and train station parking, improved bus and rail services, updating existing drainage system, and better more modern sports and leisure facilities for all ages.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q16	<p>Generally support. New housing in Balsall Common must be built in a location where new facilities such as a school, shops, parking and recreation space can be accommodated. Site 1 could do this.</p> <p>Support for a bypass which is a piece of critical infrastructure for Balsall Common.</p> <p>Support for building a new school.</p> <p>Resulting congestion on the A452 from site 3 cannot be accommodated with minor improvements. Green space with play equipment will be required. The existing primary school is at capacity.</p>
Barbara Hall [4361]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic will exacerbate existing issues and congestion. Sharmans Cross Road is too narrow to cope. Traffic already reduced to single file when vehicles are parked on the road.</p> <p>Impact of traffic and pollution on pedestrians and cyclists. Particularly children walking to Sharmans Cross Junior School. Congestion severe at school times.</p> <p>High demand for sporting facilities in area. Sports ground should not be lost.</p> <p>Should be encouraging sport participation from an early age.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Barbara Haste [3969]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Solihull has a shortage of pitches; under-represented nationally for over-16s. Continue to fall in national league tables.</p> <p>Area very congested.</p> <p>Added safety problem for pupils and parents going to school.</p> <p>Designated cycle route; cyclists would be more at risk from extra traffic.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p>
Barry & Jenny Jennings [4300]			Q16	<p>Site 4, 11, 12 and 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development increased traffic on Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Haslucks Green Road.</p> <p>Roads could not cope with more traffic.</p> <p>Need to keep green spaces for wellbeing.</p>
Barry Jackson [3957]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on local infrastructure would be too much.</p> <p>Traffic in area has steadily increased over the years; gridlock during peak times; not mentioned any improvements to make roads safer.</p> <p>New houses around Dickens Heath putting massive strain on local services, doctors, schools and transport.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
BC BARRAGE (BC Barrage) [3479]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Beckie Johnson [4936]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>More green spaces for activities, nursery, gardens to grow fresh vegetables, school.</p>
Ben Merrell [4875]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with 4G playing pitch.</p>
Benjamin Hill [3966]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Parking already very disruptive on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Traffic already gridlocked at peak times.</p> <p>Will affect highway and pedestrian safety and increase congestion.</p> <p>Too few sporting facilities in Solihull. Solihull has poor position in rankings.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding issues.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q16	<p>No need for a bypass. Would harm the vitality of the village centre, the openness of the Green Belt and the character of the landscape.</p> <p>More limited development would not require major new infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Bypass should not be seen as a justification for unacceptable and inappropriate large scale housing development.</p> <p>Car parking capacity at the station should be increased.</p> <p>For site allocations 1 and 3 green infrastructure and play areas should be provided, hedgerows and other important features should be retained.</p> <p>Further suggestions for the concept masterplans are included.</p>
Bernadette Pekins [4975]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with indoor/outdoor sports facilities including pool, youth club and nursery.
Bernadette Pruden [4978]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool, indoor sports facilities, community facilities and evening classes.
Bethan Jackson Baker [4495]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.
Bill Lord [4952]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with sports hall and gym as well as other infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Bonita Lewis [4372]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic on Sharmans Cross Road gridlocked, particularly in the morning.</p> <p>Drivers go at excessive speed, and use Woodside Way as a cut-through.</p> <p>Will increase traffic problem tenfold.</p> <p>Put schoolchildren at greater risk. Parents reluctant to walk children to school.</p> <p>Need to build more schools, or increase funding to current schools. Already oversubscribed. Cannot let the current high education standards suffer.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>
Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 4, 12 and 13.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the trip movements associated with Sites 4, 12 and 13 potentially amounting to over 2000 dwellings in close proximity to Bromsgrove district and impacts on wider transport network.</p> <p>Relevant sections of Solihull Connected Infrastructure Strategy would be interventions 28, 32 and 34.</p>
Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]			Q16	<p>doubt whether the road infrastructure will cope with the cumulative impact of housing developments. congestion will be considerable, undermining the village status.</p> <p>consider that the major road to the A452 should be identified as a matter of urgency and that the difficulties in Hob Lane and Waste Lane should be resolved.</p>
C Blakey [4866]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with concert hall/space and swimming pool.</p>
C Rose [4993]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Good sports facilities, a swimming pool if possible, good science facilities, common room for the children.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Canal & River Trust (Anne Denby) [3983]			Q16	The potential for improvements to the canal towpath, towpath access and canal bridge crossings (including those on the vicinity of sites) and other works that may be required should also be included within the infrastructure requirements for sites 4, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16 and 17.
Carol Bird [3991]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Cause far too much congestion.</p> <p>Already a huge problem with traffic and very busy.</p> <p>Could result in a dangerous walk home from school for many children.</p>
Carol Finchen [3494]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Flooding issues in nearby back gardens, water table is very high. New development would exacerbate surface water run-off.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues and pollution. 100 households could generate 300-400 new cars.</p> <p>Risk to pedestrians accessing Sharmans Cross Junior School from traffic and fumes.</p> <p>Local services, such as doctor's surgeries and schools are already overstretched.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Carolyn Ostler [4428]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Increased traffic and road safety issues for vehicle users and pedestrians.</p> <p>Impact of increased traffic at school entrance.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross/Streebsbrook Road junction is already congested and dangerous.</p> <p>Additional pressure for local amenities, including schools, medical centres, waste collection.</p> <p>Loss of parking at Arden Tennis Club and more cars on the road will exacerbate existing parking issues.</p> <p>Can local bus services cope?</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>
<p>Catesby Property Group [3038]</p>	<p>Miss Sarah Butterfield</p>	<p>WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]</p>	<p>Q16</p>	<p>The infrastructure matters identified are commonplace for new housing developments and are not objected to in principle. Definitive infrastructure requirements will need to be established through the planning application process.</p>
<p>Catherine Langton [3384]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Catherine Lawrence [4356]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic already impossible in local area, e.g. Dog Kennel Lane at peak times.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Is the Council planning to widen all the roads in this area?</p> <p>Are pedestrian crossings going to be put in?</p> <p>How is the sewage system going to cope?</p> <p>What about drainage?</p>
Catrina Fahy [4582]			Q16	<p>Note need for education provision in Solihull, but confused why no mention of Catholic provision as St George and St Teresa school, Knowle is oversubscribed with Catholic families denied a place, especially when school willing to grow and options exist.</p>
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>
Charles Harrison [4927]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, theatre, IT suite / hub, art studio</p>
Charlie Smith [4999]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, better sports facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Charlotte Floate [4844]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire:Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Business school,</p> <p>Technology suite,</p> <p>Outdoor sports facilities.</p> <p>Current school already has lots of facilites.</p> <p>Investment already made would be wasted.</p> <p>Size of current school is large enough.</p> <p>Disagree with taking children in from outside the area.</p> <p>Village already changing into size of a town and infrastructure already struggling.</p>
Charlotte Street [4615]			Q16	<p>Traffic and congestion in and around Dickens Heath, particularly Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Entire road network in Dickens Heath in a poor state; road surface and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Current infrastructure inadequate. Concerns about school and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severe lack in the village currently and at Whitlocks End station. Cannot see how this can be remedied by proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cheryl & Philip Buck [4317]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 8 and 9 Objection.</p> <p>Support KDBH Forum's response to DLP.</p> <p>Roads in Knowle and Dorridge cannot cope.</p> <p>Knowle High Street will be constant pinchpoint.</p>
Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]			Q16	worried about the impact of development on infrastructure - schools, medical provision, traffic flow and congestion on Dog Kennel Lane.
Children Families and Communities (Mrs A Barnes) [3527]			Q16	<p>Site 4 may impact pupil intake to Woodrush High School in Worcestershire. Dickens Heath Primary school is a named feeder school.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council wish to be included in consultations at appropriate time that may impact education provision within authority area.</p>
Chiltern Railways (Mr David Heathfield) [2998]			Q16	<p>Support new housing in locations with access to railway stations.</p> <p>In areas where large new housing allocations are provided we support the provision of bus links, cycle paths and pedestrian access from houses to stations.</p> <p>Recommend use of developer funding to improve amenities to Chiltern railway stations. Happy to help with specifications.</p> <p>Where residential development is planned next to the railway, we would caution that there will inevitably be noise and vibration from passing trains. Although Chiltern Railways cease operation during the night, it is likely that freight trains and maintenance vehicles will continue to run. Needs to be mitigated.</p>
Chris Hughes [4857]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported by full sized swimming pool to attract funding, Olympic training and swimming clubs.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Isaacs [4450]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>2500 houses in Shirley area is disproportionate.</p> <p>Agree some housing should be here, but not to this degree.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues will be exacerbated, e.g. Stratford Road congestion. Very difficult to turn left, right or cross it from junctions.</p>
Chris Kirk [4862]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with a sports centre.
Chris Smith [4411]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Loss of opportunity for children's play.</p>
Christina Hyde [4925]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>swimming pool, sports facilities.</p> <p>If a new primary school is to be incorporated I feel strongly that this should be a non-faith school that is open to all.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Christine Greig [3975]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in noise, traffic and pollution on existing busy local residential streets.</p> <p>Increased danger to pedestrians, cyclists and road users.</p> <p>Parking chaos.</p> <p>Local amenities would not adequately support size of development.</p> <p>Need more sporting grounds not less.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding issues.</p>
Christine Street [4315]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <p>Traffic and congestion in and around Dickens Heath, particularly Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Entire road network in Dickens Heath in a poor state; road surface and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Current infrastructure inadequate. Concerns about school and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severe lack in the village currently and at Whitlocks End station. Cannot see how this can be remedied by proposal.</p>
Christopher Kershaw [4986]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.</p>
Christopher Mansbridge [3603]			Q16	<p>Highway, schools and medical facilities in Shirley will be unable to cope with extra housing demand.</p>
Claire & Nathan Parkins [4605]			Q16	<p>WISH TO HIGHLIGHT CAPACITY ISSUES WITH THE LOCAL SCHOOL (ST T&G), AS WELL AS ACROSS TH BOROUGH</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Claire Mitchell [4965]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool, which should be hired to local swimming clubs, youth centre, adult learning zone and sports facilities.
Claire Perkins [4979]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with theatre, swimming pool, sports ground and play area.
Clare Hope [4921]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, sports facilities for all including disabilities and an aging population, stage / theatre / arts, market place / car boot facilities / large open space for events, good transport drop-offs for parents / buses / coaches. All facilities to consider accessibility for all so lifts/ walkways are included to support more who are disabled / elderly / young children / families. Children cannot cycle safely anymore.
Cliff Topham Steele [4956]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with community facilities including swimming pool, sports facilities and improved village hall.
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q16	We believe that the infrastructure required has been identified. It is considered that the Balsall Common by-pass (ref. Solihull UDP 2006), which would be of significant local (and regional) benefit, and a first phase of which, could also be delivered as part of the Concept Masterplan for land south of Station Road (see also Section 6: Transport and Access).
Colin Davis [3352]			Q16	New sites will need to be found for the waste tip at Bickenhill, the Moat Lane depot and Solihull Moors football club. Plus new junctions are proposed in Bickenhill area for the M42 which will gobble land. General need for more places at schools, GP surgeries. General pressure on roads and parking. A better bus network would be an improvement, but given sites are distant from the town centre it is unlikely bus services will be a viable proposition.
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q16	I have to say no. There is insufficient detail provided at present regarding the infrastructure implications of the proposed sites. These sites will have a significant infrastructural impact and there no detail about how this would be accommodated. Clearer information on the impact on healthcare and schools should also be included.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q16	improvements to infrastructure needed . better parking required now for the shops and station . the primary school is full . JLR traffic has added to congestion and HS2 construction traffic will make it worse. two southern sites poorly located for access (specifically referring to Balsall Common).
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q16	<p>I cannot support proposed housing that is accepted as being remote from most facilities.i can only support large scale housing if it is conditional on providing infrastructure such as new schools,sports facilities , new parks better parking in the centre and at the station and a promise of relief for the already strained Kenilworth Road..We deserve much more than just housing.</p> <p>The objectives are commendable but we need to ensure that each site produces infrastructure for the settlement. Schools, all weather pitches, better parking and where possible roads that bypass the centre and moves the traffic past.</p>
Councillor K Meeson [2178]			Q16	parking provision needs to be considered at suburban rail stations and the creation of Park and Ride schemes.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q16	<p>In short, no. I am talking in relation to the sites mentioned above, as I can see them placing significant infrastructural pressure and don't see how that would be accommodated. Clearer information on the impact on healthcare and schools would also be appreciated. There are many residents who already feel the constraints of the NHS, but there are limits to how much GPs can expand by, especially in the area around Shirley.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 15.</p> <p>Since closure of Bosworth Wood Primary School, local children have to go out of area as Smith Wood Primary Academy is full. Added bus travel cost to families. 100 additional families will exacerbate issue.</p> <p>Limited recreational facilities in area. Field on Auckland Drive is one of largest in area and well used for local community events, e.g. Big Local.</p> <p>Loss of open space for sports, children's play and recreation. No alternatives available nearby. Lanchester Park too far for young children. Local football teams would have to disband.</p> <p>Existing parking issues, many houses don't have frontages.</p>
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q16	<p>It should be a requirement that major development provides adequate supporting infrastructure and is not viewed in isolation from the impact on their surroundings.</p>
Councillor T Hodgson [2532]			Q16	<p>Provision of new facilities, including medical practices, schools and transport infrastructure required to facilitate development on the scale proposed needs to be planned for well in advance of sites being built out.</p> <p>Any sports pitches removed as a result of site allocations need to be replaced in other locations.</p>
Coventry City Council (Planning Policy Officers) [2112]			Q16	<p>In addition to the proposed developments at the HS2 interchange, we note that the plan proposes around 1150 new homes over 3 allocations in Balsall Common. Whilst we support the overall provision of new homes in order to accommodate the Objectively Assessed Needs in the GBHMA, we are keen to ensure that sufficient infrastructure, in particular highway infrastructure, is in place to support the additional growth. In doing so, we would highlight the importance of considering transport infrastructure, in particular, cumulatively, having regard to planned developments, which are well advanced in both Coventry and Warwick District.</p>
Craig Vincent [4957]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with leisure centre, swimming pool, theatre and better science laboratories.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cromwell & Duggins Lane Residents Association (Mr P McDonald) [2265]			Q16	Additional housing in Balsall Common will increase traffic heading east into Coventry towards Warwick University, A46 and business parks, and exacerbate already congested roads.
D Enticott [4902]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, tennis courts, mum/baby buildings/ cinema.
D Le Saint [4894]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: IT lab for international connecting classrooms (Skype/facetime), music rooms/recording rooms/studios, amphitheatre/stage, media/software development.
D Pick [3481]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q16	Roads and railway stations support proposed allocations and further allocations and reserve sites in Solihull. Utilities and service providers will have to accommodate increased need. New facilities will be required, e.g. schools and community centres.
Dan Sullivan [3958]			Q16	In relation to Site 13 Objection. Would remove vitally important green space to the local community. 2550 new homes will add to existing congestion at Stretton Rd, Tanworth Lane, Dickens Heath Rd, Dog Kennel Lane. Services and infrastructure insufficient.
Daniel Walker [4958]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with 4G playing pitch, gym and swimming pool.
Darion Walters [4884]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with a theatre and grass sports pitches, with school extending after school and holiday provision.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Darren Abreu [4794]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
David Langton [3382]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development</p>
David Munton [3378]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development</p>
David Paice [3985]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Object to additional access to proposal from Winterbourne Road. Would increase traffic on Beaminster Road and Winterbourne Road. Narrow roads unsuitable for construction vehicles and large amounts of traffic. Hazardous to cars leaving driveways.</p> <p>Main drainage system may not cope with extra load. Expensive pumping station was installed at Beaminster/Dorchester Road junction to prevent houses in Arley Road being flooded with sewage.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David & Patricia Vincent [3896]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Concern about extra traffic and increased pollution. Extra parking around school.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility.</p>
David Harvey [3379]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development</p>
David Holtom [3685]			Q16	<p>Any significant housing increase in Balsall Common will have a considerable impact on already overcrowded parking facilities, centre, schools and health facilities. The A452 through the centre is a bottle neck during peak times due to the short cut between the A46 and motorway networks. (supposed to have been the reason for the partial bypass constructed several years ago!). Frequent local transport is needed between housing areas, station and surrounding towns for commuters and elderly community. There needs to be infrastructure for the young and youth of Balsall Common included in the plan as there is already a chronic shortage.</p>
David Johnson [4746]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 8 and 9.</p> <p>Land around Knowle cannot cope with new housing.</p> <p>Schools and doctors are full.</p> <p>Parking an existing problem.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Miller [3454]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development</p>
David Paddock [3988]			Q16	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Blackford Lane has structural issues.</p> <p>Main route of Dickens Heath to Miller & Carter is like a racetrack.</p> <p>1000s new homes will compound congestion and traffic flow.</p> <p>35 mins to travel 1 mile.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose. Inadequate parking.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded. Access to Heartlands is nightmare in traffic.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Public open space very popular recreation and amenity area. Shirley Park too small and only restricted dog area.</p> <p>Boggy areas with poor drainage and risk of flooding.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Shaw [4772]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
David Smith [4043]			Q16	<p>Additional school and nursery places and health facilities will be required. No announcement, to my knowledge of such facilities.</p>
David Tait [5003]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports, astro turf, 5 a side / large sports hall, place where local groups can come. Recreational sports facilities, dance academy, drama. A place that is open 7 days a week to support the community. A good swimming pool.</p>
Deborah King [3437]			Q16	<p>Regarding site 18 - Would increase traffic within the surrounding area.</p> <p>Would impact on schools and doctors where there is lack of capacity.</p> <p>Lack of sports ground facilities for football and Rugby in the local area.</p>
Deniz Barczak [4826]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire:</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Swimming pool,</p> <p>Gymnasium,</p> <p>Tennis court,</p> <p>Bigger library.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Derek Forsythe [4121]			Q16	<p>Both SMBC and Bromsgrove site allocations result in nearly 3800 new properties that border Wythall Parish. Plus any expansion to Whitlocks End Station.</p> <p>The already busy arterial route through the Majors Green and Tidbury Green will become even more heavily congested.</p> <p>30 traffic accidents on a 300 metre stretch of Haslucks Green Road/Tilehouse Lane in Majors Green during the past 18 months, including one pedestrian badly injured on pavement.</p> <p>WCC made some improvements but need a longterm practical solution.</p> <p>Consider impact on health care provisions, primary and secondary school capacity checks, ecological assessments, recreational considerations, road transport management, etc.</p>
Derek Forsythe [4121]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4 and 13.</p> <p>Support constructing cycle/walking lanes in and around proposed sites, in particular, those leading to Whitlocks End Railway Station.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to carrying out road traffic flow measurements and analyses of all roads affected and come up with a solution that will link the proposed development sites with the A435 and A3400 roads, therefore preventing excessive traffic congestion in the Dickens Heath, Tidbury Green and Wythall Parish areas. Looking at the roads in and around Dickens Heath.</p>
Diane Langton [3380]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Diane & Andrew Cunningham [2975]			Q16	<p>need to have amenities built (but not clear for which site)</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Diane Mahmood [4490]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q16	<p>Objection to Sites 4 and 13:</p> <p>Not aware that infrastructure requirements have been examined.</p> <p>New distributor road may be necessary.</p> <p>Additional retail provision may be required.</p> <p>Parking already inadequate.</p> <p>Possible sites will create substantial car traffic.</p> <p>Rail service at Whitlocks End station does not go to Solihull TC.</p> <p>Only a slow and indirect bus service across the Borough to UK Central.</p> <p>Cycle and pedestrian access to Dickens Heath village could require improvement.</p>
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
dominic Chapman [3836]			Q16	<p>Sites, in particular south of Shirley.</p> <p>Lack of plans for infrastructure to accommodate new development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dominique McGarry [4414]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Donald Berrow [4370]			Q16	<p>Loss of sports facilities. Well-used.</p> <p>Increase volume of traffic onto Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road.</p> <p>Surrounding roads will be gridlocked.</p> <p>Extra demand on oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Other access routes will be danger to residents and children walking, cycling and skateboarding.</p>
Donald Haste [3588]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion, noise and air pollution</p> <p>Insufficient local amenities - schools and surgeries.</p> <p>Long walk from train station.</p>
Donald Lowe [4783]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Donna Bunce-Burke [3438]			Q16	<p>Regarding site 13 - Development will put a strain on roads that are already full and put a strain on the schools which are up to maximum over subscribed!</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Donna Ponsoyby [4345]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Overdevelopment of site. Out of character with surrounding area.</p> <p>Severe traffic problems at Sharmans Cross Road, especially during morning rush hour and school run.</p> <p>Will cause traffic chaos.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrians, especially schoolchildren. Dangerous to cross at Sharmans Cross Road/Streebsbrook Road junction.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Council must seek to safeguard them.</p> <p>Should investigate why requests to use pitches by local clubs are being ignored.</p>
Dr Andrea Collins [4511]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Parking facilities at Berkswell Station already insufficient; results in parking on side roads e.g. Hallmeadow Road.</p> <p>Additional housing would result in need for further parking provision.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Deborah Hope [3133]			Q16	<p>Site 9 - Transport and infrastructure are essential to reduce the car dependency and pollution. Should be frequent shuttle buses to Dorridge Station at least, plus Solihull, and probably HS2, Blythe Valley, and maybe Warwick.</p> <p>There is already insufficient parking at Dorridge Station.</p> <p>Incorporate dedicated cycle routes throughout the whole development.</p>
Dr I G Beasley [4055]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Dr Jonathon Chard [4380]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Accessibility of development does not comply with Policy P7.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. Severe congestion on Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road at peak times. Upgrade to junction will not alleviate the problem.</p> <p>Risk to safety of schoolchildren, other pedestrians and cyclists. Proposed access to the development will force pedestrians and cyclists (on designated cycle route) to cross busy traffic.</p> <p>Increase in parking issues. Particularly acute for school run.</p> <p>Increased flood risk.</p> <p>Insufficient local services, e.g. schools and primary healthcare.</p>
Dr Nadya Polunin [4634]			Q16	<p>The schools and medical clinics are currently over subscribed. Increasing the population in this way will put an unsustainable strain on the local GP surgery and schools.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Nigel Williams [4367]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Access to sport important for children to ensure good immediate and long term health.</p> <p>Misleading to state that playing fields are derelict. Playing surfaces in immediately playable condition. Current leaseholders failing to cooperate with interested parties.</p> <p>Distance to station and other facilities is beyond limits for accessibility.</p> <p>Development will put pressure on parking in area.</p>
Dr P Johnson [2408]			Q16	<p>Allocation 9, 750 homes south of Knowle completely underestimates how much highways work is required. Before starting any more development work new roads and access from Warwick Road and Grove Road are required. If any further development is planned using access via Middlefield Avenue and Hertford Way it will make the current disaster there even worse.</p>
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q16	<p>Residents and business' concerns are very clear that there is too much pressure on local infrastructure now and the scale of development proposed must be reduced. These concerns over infrastructure impacts have not been addressed. It is unreasonable to expect residents to accept any substantial further development in KDBH without any indication as to how the wider infrastructure impacts would be overcome.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Dr Phillipa Ann Roberts [3993]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of playing fields. SMBC should enforce use of land for community sports.</p> <p>Increase traffic volume and exacerbate existing congestion.</p> <p>Likely accidents and potential fatalities. Lots of schoolchildren walk, bike and use scooters.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists on cycle route.</p> <p>Increased pollution.</p> <p>Increase in on-street parking and consequent dangers to pedestrians, cyclists and residents.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Insufficient local school places or GP vacancies.</p>
Dr Rebecca Kitson [3980]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists and pedestrians, especially to Junior School.</p> <p>Extra congestion and parking.</p> <p>Already feel impacts several roads away from Sharmans Cross.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Dr Richard Anderson [3552]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>Current infrastructure inadequacies cause major traffic problems in the village centre. New dwellings WILL USE THEIR CARS for work/access to the village shops.</p> <p>With the proposed almost doubling in village size:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *there will be GRIDLOCK in the village centre *parking will be impossible. *station cars already park for 200 yards up the "bypass". This will double. <p>Proposed infrastructure changes WILL IN NO WAY BE SUFFICIENT TO MITIGATE AGAINST THIS.</p> <p>Education - the secondary school has low relative academic standards and capacity must expand BEFORE the massive influx to correct this. This won't happen, and I despair for the children.</p>
<p>Dr Sarah King [4348]</p>			<p>Q16</p>	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic. Roads cannot currently cope. Congestion and danger to pedestrians, especially school children. Both construction traffic and from new residents. Witnessed accidents at Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Arden Tennis Club well used. View that facilities should not be relocated, but whole site kept for local recreation.</p> <p>Understand several groups have tried to use sports pitch, but not succeeded.</p> <p>Increased pressure on local services and amenities, such as schools, GP.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Sue Houghton [3802]			Q16	<p>There is little detail as to how the 'highway capacity' is to be improved to accommodate the inevitable extra traffic associated with new housing in Knowle, without losing the character of the neighbourhood, or how widening will be possible in residential roads eg Station Rd where traffic is already heavy at peak times. How is pressure on parking to be addressed?</p> <p>Also need detail re increase in healthcare facilities to match the extra needs - no discussion has taken place with existing providers.</p>
Dr Tony Payne [3999]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Retain use of ground for sporting and recreational purposes. Club was accessible to all. Many local football teams need more pitches. Council need to support sporting use.</p> <p>Local traffic infrastructure already at gridlock at peak times. Slow traffic increases pollution. Increase delays to buses.</p> <p>Adverse impact on road safety. Main pedestrian and cyclist route; increase in cars will result in increase in accidents.</p> <p>Pressure on community infrastructure. Local infant schools are oversubscribed and cannot be extended. Nearest GP surgery 1 mile away. All add to parking and traffic problems.</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q16	<p>In Balsall Common further housing development is impossible without consideration of traffic congestion and parking in centre and significantly increased parking at station to avoid dangerous parking on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Public transport is poor with only two trains an hour (in one direction) and no buses in the late evening. Only a few of the surrounding towns and cities are accessible by bus or train, and towns south of the village do not have this access.</p> <p>People will for the foreseeable future use the car for travel to places of work.</p>
Duncan Powell [4603]			Q16	<p>WISH TO HIGHLIGHT CAPACITY ISSUES WITH THE LOCAL SCHOOL (ST T&G), AS WELL AS ACROSS TH BOROUGH</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
E Atkins [4846]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported by provision of swimming pool and sports facilities, with provision for roads, road safety, parking and medical facilities as well as school.
E Bennett [4822]			Q16	In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire: Would like to see following community facilities at new school: Would like to see following community facilities built: Swimming pool leisure centre/gym outdoor pitches/astro turf for hire, with flood lights. Youth club.
Earlswood & Forshaw Heath Residents Association (Jennifer Buckley) [4439]			Q16	In objection to sites 4, 11, 12, 13. Not considered impact of traffic from these sites going south through our parish and Stratford District Council. Traffic increased dramatically in recent years due to developments in South Solihull and no recompense been made from Solihull Council for wear and tear of our roads.
Education Funding Agency (John Pilgrim) [3977]			Q16	Need to ensure that education contributions made by developers through the Community Infrastructure Levy are sufficient to cover the increase in demand for school places that is likely to be generated by a development. When new schools are developed, local authorities should also seek to safeguard land for any future expansion where demand indicates this might be necessary. Ensuring there is an adequate supply school sites is essential and will ensure that Solihull MBC can swiftly and flexibly respond to the existing and future need for school places to meet the needs of the borough over the plan period.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Elaine Kell [4771]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Elizabeth & Gregg Harley [4512]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Elizabeth Adam [4845]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should include provision of swimming pool and fitness centre.</p>
Elizabeth Rand [3623]			Q16	<p>With school capacity already at limits and no A&E unit at Solihull, where are the support services needed to support all this development? although the area has plenty of shops, there are not the basic services required and council support is already stretched so further capacity would need to be proven within the council to ensure the success of this growth.</p>
Ella McGarry [4246]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ellie Hill [3974]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Need more sporting facilities, not less. Solihull in very poor position in the rankings.</p> <p>Traffic and parking cause chaos already and dangerous for pedestrians at peak times. Proposed development will make it worse.</p>
Ellie Rylah [4991]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, tennis / badminton courts, gym.</p>
Elta Estates (Helen Lavery) [3169]			Q16	<p>Highway infrastructure in Holly Lane and Gipsy Lane and surrounding roads cannot handle extra traffic associated with housing site 2</p>
Emma Chee [4890]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with youth centre facilities, swimming pool and sports facilities made available for community use in evenings and weekend.</p>
Emma Durant [3942]			Q16	<p>In relation to objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Road safety issues near schools. Proposed development would be adjacent to a single carriageway.</p> <p>Serious congestion concerns caused by increased usage of the surrounding roads and insufficient infrastructure to deal with the increased volume.</p> <p>Reduction of amenity to existing residents for medical and educational services (doctors, schools etc)</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Emma Hayward [4612]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18:</p> <p>Existing traffic issues, particularly at peak times and school run. Queues extend from Streetsbrook Road junction to Sharmans Cross Pub, with knock on effect on Prospect Lane and Solihull Road.</p> <p>Been several collisions on road.</p> <p>100 extra homes and 200+ cars will be intolerable.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues, and high water table. E.g have drowned trees in our garden (see attached pictures).</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Headlights from tennis club shine directly into our living room.</p> <p>Our drive used by other drivers to turn in to avoid queues.</p>
Emma Johnson [4941]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports centre, swimming pool, youth club.</p>
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>
Emma Sibbing [4995]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Performing arts centre with dance studios and theatre, swimming pool, multi-purpose community rooms, skate park.</p>
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q16	<p>Residents and business' concerns are very clear that there is too much pressure on local infrastructure now and the scale of development proposed must be reduced. These concerns over infrastructure impacts have not been addressed. It is unreasonable to expect residents to accept any substantial further development in KDBH without any indication as to how the wider infrastructure impacts would be overcome.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q16	<p>Lack of strategic, comprehensive Infrastructure Plan to support Local Plan Review.</p> <p>SMBC have expressed support of Junction 6 Option 1 in Cabinet Report (passed 12/01/17).</p> <p>Last IDP was published in 2012. Much has changed since then.</p> <p>No Transport Assessment been carried out to assess impacts of the additional housing growth and HS2 against planned highways improvements to Junction 6 of M42.</p> <p>Essential that preferred option for Junction 6 is stated.</p> <p>Essential to remove land from Green Belt to accommodate Junction 6 improvements in Local Plan Review.</p>
F Gerard [4907]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Youth community centre, Sports Centre.</p> <p>Access roads and parking availability are critical.</p>
Fal Naik [3996]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased demand on schools. Expansion of Oak Cottage will change character of lovely small school.</p> <p>Difficult to get into local secondary school.</p> <p>Increased traffic. Already gridlocked in mornings at Sharmans Cross Road/Streebsbrook Road junctions.</p> <p>More dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>Oversubscribed medical practice - 3 weeks to get an appointment at Northbrook Group Practice.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Father Peter Thomas [2991]			Q16	<p>Improved infrastructure is only 'suggested'.</p> <p>New 2 form entry primary school is necessary. The secondary school site would struggle to find space to expand to take the extra pupils.</p> <p>Inadequate congested commercial centre in Balsall Common with restricted parking. Need to improve the centre substantially.</p> <p>No assurance that public transport is to be improved eg more frequent services and more parking at the rail station.</p> <p>No condition that any improvement/benefits for the community to come from the developments will be in place before, or even concurrent with any construction.</p>
Fazle Chowdhury [4887]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with a community auditorium and gym, public library, swimming pool and hi-tech multimedia centre.</p>
Fordbridge Town Council (Mr N Millard) [1887]			Q16	<p>Site 5 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green and open space. Already lost a lot in Fordbridge.</p> <p>Would reduce size of Meriden Park.</p>
Frances Bate [4872]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with provision of sports centre, stadium with spectator areas, theatre and multi-purpose community hall.</p>
G Cantone [4892]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Youth Zone and eateries.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
G S Oliver [4773]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Gavin Perkins [4972]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported by theatre with community use.</p>
Gemma Blanco [4349]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 2 and 3 Objection.</p> <p>Proposal does not include provision of infrastructure. Would put pressure on school places, both primary and secondary. Balsall Common Primary is already at full capacity. Pressure to add further reception class.</p> <p>Congestion.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and doctors.</p> <p>Loss of local recreational land.</p> <p>Too far from railway station, shops.</p> <p>Will increase congestion around primary and secondary school. Danger to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>One large development could provide shops, gym, community centre etc.</p>
Gemma Small [4996]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Gym with swimming pool, theatre, library for the whole community, health centre for students.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gemma Welch [4413]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Recent developments e.g. Parkgate have resulted in loss of green space.</p> <p>Road infrastructure unable to cope with 600 houses.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at Shirley and Whitlocks End train station.</p> <p>Schools and doctor surgeries oversubscribed.</p> <p>Solihull hospital downgraded, more will need to travel to Heartlands.</p>
Geoff Hickman [3515]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development already negatively impacted traffic in the area due to insufficient road infrastructure.</p> <p>Continuous stream of traffic between Dickens Heath, Dog Kennel Lane and junction 4 on Stratford Road to M42 in peak hours.</p> <p>Better to build closer to M6, M40, Birmingham International and proposed HS2 station.</p> <p>Access to junction 3 of M42 is still via poor country lanes.</p> <p>Need joined up thinking about road infrastructure with adjacent counties.</p>
Georgina & Fergal O'Gara [4576]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Georgina Joyce [4627]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Geraldine Evans [4363]			Q16	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space and enjoyment for local people.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing congestion and traffic issues.</p>
Gill Corns [4448]			Q16	<p>Residents and business' concerns are very clear that there is too much pressure on local infrastructure now and the scale of development proposed must be reduced. These concerns over infrastructure impacts have not been addressed. It is unreasonable to expect residents to accept any substantial further development in KDBH without any indication as to how the wider infrastructure impacts would be overcome.</p>
Gill Jennings [3877]			Q16	<p>concerns on road infrastructure , schools & medical facilities</p>
Gillian Golder [4352]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Solihull needs more sporting facilities, not less.</p> <p>Streetsbrook Road is already gridlocked at peak times. Sharmans Croos Road a very busy road.</p> <p>Danger to cyclists on cycle route.</p> <p>Danger of increased traffic to pedestrians, particularly schoolchildren.</p> <p>Local schools and medical centres already oversubscribed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Glyn Jones [4354]			Q16	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for residents' enjoyment, recreation, health and wildlife.</p> <p>Seems more logical to consider housing areas with good access to the motorway network and the proposed HS2 route.</p> <p>South Shirley has lack of road infrastructure, social and health provision.</p> <p>No longer any A&E at Solihull hospital.</p> <p>New developments should be close to major health care centres.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion on Bill's Lane or Haslucks Green Road at peak hours. Highway safety issues.</p>
Godfrey Frith [3510]			Q16	<p>Site 18:</p> <p>Traffic - junction between Streetsbrook Rd, Sharmans Cross Rd, Dorchester Rd and Stonor Park Rd is already severely congested in the rush hour.</p> <p>Dangerous junction for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists, particularly in winter and bad weather.</p> <p>Parking on Sharmans Cross Rd already causing difficulties at school times.</p> <p>Playing fields - Permanent loss of sporting facilities in the Borough. Council formally minuted in 2013 the grounds would be for sporting purposes only.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Lack of schools and doctors in area. Flooding on Sharmans Cross Rd. Water table on Streetsbrook Rd is very high.</p>
Graham Law [3875]			Q16	<p>local amenities and infrastructure will be under pressure.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Graham Gilbert [4437]			Q16	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Concerned with loss of sports pitches at Site 4.</p> <p>Grounds are very well-used.</p> <p>Consider current football pitches are kept and upgraded if necessary, and Green Belt released elsewhere.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q16	<p>Appendix 1 identifies only the proposed infrastructure improvements very local to the new developments. It is essential that in addition it addresses the wider transport needs including the need for ambitious new public transport schemes and measures to deal with the restricted road infrastructure outside the immediate area of the development. Appendix 1 should therefore be expanded to show the wider infrastructure needs across Solihull.</p>
Graham Wilson [3940]			Q16	<p>In relation to objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground.</p> <p>Inadequate facilities such as schools and doctor surgeries</p> <p>Existing high traffic density on Sharmans Cross Road and surrounds. New development will exacerbate this.</p>
Greg Doust [3756]			Q16	<p>Basic infrastructure such as doctors, roads and schools will be in short supply based on past projects as all under massive pressure already.</p> <p>Lack of green spaces for people new and old for their health and enjoyment (Shirley Park space has already been reduced).</p> <p>As you probably know the traffic is unbelievably bad coming from Dickens Heath already plus the pollution that comes with that.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gregory Kirby [3489]			Q16	<p>High street in Knowle and Station Road to Dorridge would be unable to cope with traffic impact of new housing development at Site 9, Arden Triangle.</p> <p>Large volume of traffic commuter traffic already towards Birmingham City Centre and motorway.</p> <p>If solution is to build more major roads and bridges then LA should be transparent.</p> <p>Where will Â£30M come from for new Arden School? Already been enhanced and refurbished in recent years.</p> <p>Current school could be opened up to more community use, e.g. Knowle F.C.</p>
Hampton-in-Arden Surgery (Dr Ryan Prince) [3215]			Q16	<p>There is no clear mention of primary care provision. Our surgery is very small and has a 1.5 full time doctor equivalent. Our practice area covers much of the proposed sites. We have 3000 patients between the 1.5 doctors, which is already above the national average. Any significant increase on this would seriously undermine our ability to provide safe and timely healthcare to the new residents unless we could procure funding to increase the staff (both medical and administrative) at the surgery to cope with the huge increase in demand for appointments and care.</p>
Hardeep Sunner [4433]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution. Risk to safety of road users, pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Risk of flooding.</p> <p>More pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical facilities.</p> <p>Loss of parking at Arden Club.</p> <p>Unsustainable distance from other amenities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Harriet Endley [4899]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, gym, nursery, nature reserve. However, need to maintain some greenery in the area.
Harry Street [3905]			Q16	Objection to Site 4: Traffic and congestion in and around Dickens Heath, particularly Tythe Barn Lane. Entire road network in Dickens Heath in a poor state; road surface and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Current infrastructure inadequate. Concerns about school and medical facilities. Parking - severe lack in the village currently and at Whitlocks End station. Cannot see how this can be remedied by proposal.
Harvey Jagpal [4929]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Youth centre, public library, gym, caf��.
Haydn Rees [3136]			Q16	Concerned that sufficient places are made available at Arden School for all the new houses. Better to overprovide because any excess spaces will be snapped up by pupils from very nearby Warwickshire villages like Lapworth, who have long journeys to secondary schools at present. Underprovision on the other hand would be disastrous for all. Less critical for Junior Schools as Lapworth has an excellent J+I School, which could at present take more pupils from Solihull if necessary.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hazel Truman [4368]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green open space, should be used for recreation.</p> <p>Absorbs rainfall and reduces flooding.</p> <p>Poor drainage in area.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sports ground.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues. Sharmans Cross Road is already very busy. Particularly hazardous at times of school run. Danger to children. Will increase congestion.</p> <p>Will cause increase in pollution, and impact on health.</p> <p>Insufficient parking for club at peak times. Will cause greater parking issues on surrounding roads.</p>
HC, JR, CJ, J, N Easton, O'Brien, Shaw [4307]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Transport issues, congestion and highways safety along Bills Lane.</p> <p>1,500 homes means 2000 more cars. Cause disruption and chaos on already busy roads.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Heart of England School (Mrs Anne Lycett) [3805]		Q16	<p>Case for improvements at Heart of England School -</p> <p>School buildings old and tired.</p> <p>30% of KS3&4 pupils from beyond catchment boundary.</p> <p>Sixth form oversubscribed; capacity for 100 students but cater for 210-240 in different buildings.</p> <p>Proposed allocations will augment pressures and need to increase capacity.</p> <p>Replacement school would be highly desirable but cost may well be prohibitive</p> <p>Identified key infrastructure improvements:</p> <p>Sports facilities upgrade;</p> <p>All weather pitch provision;</p> <p>New Sports Hall;</p> <p>Gym renovation;</p> <p>Performing Arts facilities improvements;</p> <p>Specialist classrooms for food technology, product design and technology;</p> <p>New purpose-built Sixth Form block;</p> <p>Dining and kitchen facilities extension and improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school, and any new school must be provided in good time to accommodate children from the new homes. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p>
Heidi Williams [4382]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Existing traffic and road safety issues on busy Bills Lane, Hasluck Green Road etc. Especially for children walking to school.</p> <p>Local park been reduced and not suitable for walking a dog off the lead.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools, GPs and hospitals.</p> <p>Schools poorly funded.</p>
Helen Blyth [3350]			Q16	<p>hospital provision will need to be increased.</p>
Helen Young [3390]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Highways England (Mr A Slack) [2007]			Q16	We will require further detail to be provided in relation to the proposed allocations and the transport related policies put forward in the Local Plan Review. This is necessary to consider the implications of the levels of planned growth upon the SRN so as to ensure the potential transport implications of developments are considered and necessary infrastructure is planned accordingly.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q16	As Hockley Heath is not identified for development there are no details of proposed improvements to infrastructure. At a recent community event there was significant concern about the lack of transport infrastructure and facilities and the likely impact of developments within Hockley Heath and neighbouring developments, in particular Blythe Valley, and the lack of policy references to the impact of growth on education provision across Solihull, and specifically the Rural Area surrounding Hockley Heath. Poor quality roads, regularly affected by traffic congestion on local motorways (M42/M40) would be further affected with additional developments resulting in an increase in traffic.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q16	<p>Concern over the current lack of transport infrastructure and facilities and the likely impact upon them from developments in Hockley Heath, Blythe Valley park, and across the Warwickshire border.</p> <p>Also of concern is the lack of policy references relating to the impact of the Local Plan on education provision across Solihull, and specifically in the Rural Area surrounding Hockley Heath (e.g. mitigating the impact of BVP).</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
I Black [4824]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Lack of parking in village. Hallmeadow Road used for Berkswell Station and medical centre.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctors surgery.</p> <p>Will increase traffic and congestion. Local roads unsuitable for expansion. Routes to exit the village to the east are restricted by low bridge at Station Road and narrow bridge on Lavender Hall Lane.</p> <p>Balsall Street East, to west of village, cannot cope with further traffic.</p> <p>Only 6% of commuters from Balsall Common use public transport.</p> <p>Bypass is really an access road to 900 proposed houses.</p>
Iain Jackson [4932]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, tennis court, 5-a-side football astroturf / all weather pitch.</p>
Ian Harper [4913]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Gym / sports facilities, theatre.</p>
Ian Leach [3982]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 objection.</p> <p>Bring yet more congestion on already busy roads.</p> <p>Schools, doctors and hospitals oversubscribed.</p> <p>Flooding in bad weather.</p>
Ian Moseley [4966]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported by green space improvements with community features, planted verges and off street parking, quiet/sensory areas with sufficient parking for new residents, visitors and school.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q16	<p>Solihull plays an important role in realising the growth objectives of the WMCA with the planned infrastructure investment through HS2, in particular representing a fundamentally different context for attracting investment and business expansion.</p> <p>However, DLP fails to adequately consider the wider infrastructure implications of the full potential of investment being realised. Needs a more pro-active response to planning for growth.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q16	<p>Solihull plays an important role in realising the growth objectives of the WMCA with the planned infrastructure investment through HS2, in particular representing a fundamentally different context for attracting investment and business expansion.</p> <p>However, DLP fails to adequately consider the wider infrastructure implications of the full potential of investment being realised. Needs a more pro-active response to planning for growth.</p>
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q16	<p>While Doctor and Schooling infrastructure is mentioned, no mention is made of shopping, banking etc Banks are withdrawing from Berkswell / Balsall Common and a lack of action on the site to the rear of the Co-op shop allowing it to be isolated from other retail outlets, preventing a cohesive village centre.</p>
J Maddocks & family [4340]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q16	<p>Range of roads and railway stations that support both the allocations and the need for further allocations and reserve sites.</p> <p>Utilities and service providers will have to accommodate this further need.</p> <p>Will be need for new schools, community centres and other facilities.</p>
J & A Creba [4753]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
J Griggs [4755]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
J Hughes [4915]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Gym.</p>
J Plain Jones [4931]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Dance studio, sports hall, youth club, computer lab.</p> <p>Hope that the school will not become supersized i.e. 800 - 2500 pupils.</p>
Jack Macey [4961]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with improved school facilities and services, such as student councillor, new computer suite, first aid centre, toilet upgrades and better (illegible).</p>
Jack Street [3906]			Q16	<p>Traffic and congestion in and around Dickens Heath, particularly Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Entire road network in Dickens Heath in a poor state; road surface and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Current infrastructure inadequate. Concerns about school and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severe lack in the village currently and at Whitlocks End station. Cannot see how this can be remedied by proposal.</p>
Jackie Howson [4856]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported by infrastructure including swimming pool (submission incomplete).</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Jacqueline Edinburgh [3768]		Q16	Site 13: Loss of green space. Bus services inadequate. Takes several days to get a doctors appointment at Tanworth Lane surgery. No A&E or maternity services at Solihull hospital. Schools at capacity. Loss of countryside. What is the percentage of affordable housing, and who qualifies? Need to cater for elderly and young people to get on property market.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Jacqueline Harris [4320]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Heavy congestion on Stratford Road, M42 and surrounding roads will get worse. E.g. always congestion around junctions where Burman Road and Shakespeare Drive meet Bills Lane. Ask traffic surveys carried out at peak times.</p> <p>Poor public transport links. Unreliable bus service.</p> <p>Insufficient parking at railway stations.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrian safety. Narrow roads. One footpath only in places.</p> <p>Local schools, nurseries, doctor surgeries and hospital already unable to cope. Will need new school and surgery. Heartlands hospital already overstretched.</p> <p>Loss of vital green space for recreation.</p>
Jacquie Knott [4158]		Q16	<p>With the amount of houses being proposed in South Shirley there will be a need to be serious consideration of how school places are to be provided, or existing residents will struggle to get their children places.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q16	<p>EMPLOYMENT (not housing).</p> <p>Industrial Strategy Green Paper (Jan 2017) identifies significant role the automotive sector plays in UK economic growth, and challenges posed by lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Appendix C of DLP does not include a strategic infrastructure plan.</p> <p>Transport Assessment of new allocations and HS2 impact on the Borough should be a priority.</p> <p>No mention of potential Highways England M42 J6 options in DLP; needs to be included.</p> <p>Link road from M42 and/or branch line from East (sic) Coast Mainline would be beneficial to UKC Hub.</p> <p>Strategic Infrastructure planning for transport, energy resilience and digital communications need to be addressed.</p>
James Langton [3383]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
James Rogers [4223]			Q16	<p>infrastructure highlighted as a concern is not identified in the DLP for this stie</p>
Jane & Alan Horton [4443]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Traffic volume on Haslucks Green Road is major hazard.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jane Frith [3509]			Q16	<p>Site 18:</p> <p>Further housing would increase traffic.</p> <p>Crossroads of Streetsbrook Road, Sharmans Cross Road, Stonor Park Road & Dorchester Road is gridlock between 8am to 9.15am.</p> <p>Touchwood Phase 2 will make it worse.</p> <p>Additional 100-200 cars on the route will be worse and potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Pulling out into traffic is dangerous.</p>
Janet Holden [4403]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Existing high levels of congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Council should retain sporting use on site.</p> <p>Understand that current freeholders are proposing unreasonable rent rates.</p> <p>Loss of open space.</p> <p>Oversubscribed medical services.</p>
Janice Murphy [4967]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with floodlit all weather pitch, arts centre, better community facilities and school dining facilities.</p>
Janice Whittlesey [4640]			Q16	<p>public transport links are insufficient which will necessitate a huge increase in the use of cars in and around the village</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jason Edwards [4655]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Jayne Craven [4889]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with gym and sports facilities, theatre, swimming pool and adult learning.</p>
Jean Fleming [3444]			Q16	<p>The central village does not have the parking facilities or general capacity to deal with further growth.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Jean Gibbs [3405]			Q16	<p>Would require extra schools and health facilities.</p>
Jean Hobbs [2983]			Q16	<p>Concerns about traffic and infrastructure, roads and pathways near Majors Green as a result of new housing development in Solihull.</p>
Jean Moon [4963]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with sports/leisure, teenage and younger children and drama facilities.</p>
Jeanette McGarry [4247]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jeevan Bhurra [4867]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with gym and swimming pool.
Jen Hickman [3522]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Dickens Heath development already negatively impacted traffic in the area due to insufficient road infrastructure.</p> <p>Continuous stream of traffic between Dickens Heath, Dog Kennel Lane and junction 4 on Stratford Road to M42 in peak hours.</p> <p>Better to build closer to M6, M40, Birmingham International and proposed HS2 station.</p> <p>Access to junction 3 of M42 is still via poor country lanes.</p> <p>Need joined up thinking about road infrastructure with adjacent counties.</p>
Jennifer Archer [4016]			Q16	<p>Road network cannot cope with the existing traffic and no details of what upgrades are planned.</p> <p>What flood prevention measures will be put in place?</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q16	As per the response to question 15, it is not clear whether the impact on surface water drainage has been taken into account.
Jessica Hill [3973]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Too few sporting facilities. Will be further loss. Solihull very poor position in the rankings.</p> <p>Traffic and parking already a huge problem. Will result in negative impact on highway safety and cause more congestion.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jill Hubbleday [4462]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Jill Hutchinson [4924]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports facilities / fitness suite</p>
Jo Hayes [3874]			Q16	road, schools and sports pitch concerns
Jo McGrory [4577]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joanna Hill [3961]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion at peak hours on Streetsbrook Road and adjoining roads.</p> <p>Will increase gridlock and frustration.</p> <p>Added pollution and pothole damage.</p> <p>Concern for pedestrian safety, particularly schoolchildren.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground.</p> <p>SMBC policy to retain grounds for sport use and not to sell freehold.</p> <p>Add to existing parking issues on road and loss of spaces at Arden Club.</p> <p>Existing flood issues on Sharmans Cross Road will be exacerbated by increased hard surfaces.</p>
Joanne Hale [4400]			Q16	<p>2550 houses in such a small congested area is excessive.</p> <p>Consider highways impact.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Impact on walking and recreation.</p> <p>Already lost part of Shirley Park.</p>
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>
Joanne Liddiard-McGann [3407]			Q16	<p>Additional development would result in more traffic in an area where congestion is already an issue.</p> <p>Impact on schools places and healthcare provision.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joanne Talliss [3941]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 objection.</p> <p>Lack of local amenities to service an increased population, i.e. school and college places, doctor, hospitals etc.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road. Drainage systems couldn't cope with 100 extra houses.</p> <p>Additional traffic, congestion and parking issues. Safety of pedestrians, particularly children walking to school.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p>
Joe Craven [4839]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire:</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Theatre,</p> <p>Gym.</p>
Joe Stanway [4997]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Public gym, swimming pool, 4G astroturf with floodlights, youth club. Also there should be new green space there.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q16	<p>Sites 4,11,12,13.</p> <p>Huge increase in traffic. Need clear proposals on road infrastructure and transport. Blackford Road has history of structural problems, been repaired 4 times in 6 years. Roundabout at the end of Dickens Heath Road would disperse traffic across several routes.</p> <p>Sites 12 and 13 are not well served by public transport and too far from railway stations.</p> <p>Preferable to use Monkspath Hall route to take additional traffic than B4102. If train station is moved, can create a transport hub.</p> <p>Put dedicated cycle route into Solihull from development sites, e.g. off the Stratford Rd into Hillfield Park.</p>
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q16	<p>Make any road infrastructure changes before the development commences, do not leave it to developers.</p> <p>Council needs to incentivise people to leave cars at home/lift share.</p> <p>Introduce parking permits in congested areas, e.g. Dickens Heath, Solihull town centre.</p>
Johanne Boles [3719]			Q16	<p>New school at Arden should include modern spacious classrooms and studios, dining rooms, sports halls and swimming pool.</p>
John & Janet Taylor [4595]			Q16	<p>What proposals does the the Council have for improving the infrastructure for Balsall Common to cater for the people living in these new homes in terms of schools, medical centres, shops and other basic infrastructure requirements?</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
John & Linda Cawley [4449]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath not worked.</p> <p>Local amenities under pressure.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure will not be able to cope, e.g. schools, hospitals, doctor surgeries, drainage sewers.</p> <p>Massive increase in traffic.</p> <p>Associated noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Planning gain from development needs to be shared.</p>
John & Sue McMahon [3408]		Q16	<p>The plan recognises that facilities such as schooling, doctors and health services will need to be increased. Schools and health services are overloaded and the plan does not offer any guarantees to overcome this problem.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Dancer [4303]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Recognise urgent need for housing.</p> <p>DLP not consider impacts on local infrastructure and ability to develop roads, hospitals etc for increased local population.</p> <p>Parking insufficient at railway stations. Roads at capacity at peak times.</p> <p>3000+ cars will increase air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Loss of trees to absorb pollution.</p> <p>Reducing recreational and public amenity space.</p> <p>Loss of 9 sports pitches.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Journey to HS2 terminal area already a nightmare.</p> <p>Junctions 4 to 6 of M42 already at capacity.</p>
John Rawlins [4232]			Q16	<p>The vast majority of existing schools in the borough are currently oversubscribed as it is. Will you be building new schools? Will you be extending the existing schools? There isn't much evidence of any proposed improvements. What about the GP surgeries as well? It is already difficult to get an appointment without having to wait 4 days beforehand. In addition, we have all seen the recent news headlines about a crisis in the A&E departments across the region. How are Solihull Council proposing to accommodate the owners of an extra 2,500 homes, circa 10 THOUSAND people?</p>
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p>
JT & DA Cleland [4891]			Q16	<p>Detailed considerations must be given to the provision of services - doctors, schools etc. before any houses are built and this must include car parking.</p>
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common centre needs masterplanning to indicate how additional housing can be serviced.</p> <p>The Riddings Hill site or site 1 should provide station carparking.</p> <p>Meeting House Lane is unique and should be closed to vehicular traffic at the Catholic Church point. This pedestrian link connects the existing footpath network on Barretts Farm with the footpath from Meeting House Lane to Kenilworth Road and the secondary school.</p> <p>Village has a slow, infrequent, daytime only bus service to Solihull unsuitable for work purposes or for young people wanting to access town centre facilities in the evening for example.</p>
Julia Carter [4870]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with floodlit pitches, theatre/auditorium and sufficient parking for public use.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julia Smith [4419]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sports use.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Increase in traffic in already congested area. Sharmans Cross Road is a main route into town centre. Traffic is stationary for an hour every morning. Junction with Streetsbrook Road does not cope well with volume of traffic. Often accidents here.</p> <p>Pressure on oversubscribed schools and doctor surgeries.</p>
Julian Crook [4311]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 16.</p> <p>Damson Parkway, Lugtrout lane and Hampton Lane already in heavy use from commuter traffic.</p> <p>Considerable traffic at shift change from and to JLR factory.</p> <p>Further expansion of JLR won't help.</p> <p>Road widening won't be sufficient.</p> <p>Highway Services not agreed to widen footway on Lugtrout Lane on environmental grounds.</p> <p>Schools and doctor surgeries in Solihull oversubscribed.</p> <p>Bus services inadequate; unlikely to improve.</p>
Julie Betts [3173]			Q16	<p>Road infrastructure south of Shirley is inadequate to cope with development proposed on top of traffic from the existing Dickens Heath village plus new developments, Dickens Manor, The Paddocks and Cheswick Place which has definitely increased. Schools in the area bursting at the seams already, with no space for expansion at Dickens Heath or Woodlands.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julie Trevis [4377]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Infrastructure will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Well-used by locals for recreation and children's play.</p>
K G & H E Bushell & Cooke [4752]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13:</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p> <p>Infrastructure could not cope:</p> <p>Existing heavy congestion on surrounding roads, Bills Lane is used as thoroughfare for traffic from Wythall and other Birmingham areas to access Stratford Road. Queues on Shakespeare Drive onto Stratford Road in both directions.</p> <p>Impact on doctors and schools.</p>
K M Davis [3598]			Q16	<p>Understand more housing required but question whether sufficient capacity at doctors surgeries, schools and other local services to support growth at Site 18 Sharmans Cross Road.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
K Sunner [4351]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site Objection 16.</p> <p>Schools and local surgeries oversubscribed.</p> <p>No guarantee that schools, public transport and health services will be increased.</p> <p>Loss of accessible recreational sports facilities. Already limited in area.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing traffic issues in area. Expansion of JLR also resulting in increased traffic. Widening roads will not help. Further congestion when any problems on the motorway. Hampton Lane and Damson Parkway at a standstill at peak times.</p> <p>Can meet housing need without using this site.</p>
Karen Munton [3377]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Karen Bell [4586]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common does not have adequate medical/welfare facilities, school places, shops, parking facilities at the library, rear of Tesco or at the station, reliable and practical public transport or road infrastructure to cope with the additional population from 1150 more houses.</p>
Karen Spriggs [3963]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Negative impact on local community to lose this green space. Regularly used.</p> <p>Supporting infrastructure will have added negative effect in terms of traffic, schools and doctors.</p>
Karin Chessell [4284]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kate Edwards [3285]			Q16	infrastructure identified in the response as being under pressure has been highlighted in the DLP for this site.
Kate Fleming [4904]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Sports Centre, 4G pitches, arts/performing space, swimming pool.
Kate Routledge [4335]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Already extremely busy road. Increased traffic will worsen congestion and cause pollution. Harm to pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p> <p>Gridlock at junction with Streetsbrook Road at peak hours.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities. Already a shortage of pitches in Solihull.</p> <p>Increased parking on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Schools and surgeries already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Not comply with NPPF accessibility criteria. 1000m from Solihull Station and 1700m from town centre.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sports use by Council.</p>
Kathryn Green [4911]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Auditorium / theatre, more sixth form space.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kathy Jones [3513]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 3.</p> <p>Balsall Common cannot accommodate 1150 additional homes.</p> <p>Services overstretched as well as schools.</p> <p>Traffic a problem near the 2 schools.</p> <p>Houses on Frog Lane would add to peak hour congestion on Balsall Street East and Alder Lane.</p> <p>Jaguar Land Rover site to south of village will also increase traffic.</p> <p>Disruption of HS2 and associated construction traffic.</p>
Katie Davie [4897]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Theatre, swimming pool, gym. It isn't essential to have too many wonderful facilities, keep costs as low as possible.</p>
Katrina & John Parkin [4623]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle will require consideration of another GP surgery due to the numbers of extra patients, and as a local GP myself aware that the GP services are already straining under the load, particularly given the ageing population. School should include gym, pool, theatre and skate park facilities for use by wider community.</p> <p>Would like safe cycle routes to the new Arden school incorporated into the development of Site 9.</p> <p>Would object to through route on Milverton Road to school.</p> <p>Keep MIND garden, possibly with social prescribing option.</p> <p>Allotments would be good.</p>
Kay Agostinho [3266]			Q16	<p>concerns expressed about impact on infrastructure from new development is identified in the DLP through the likely infrastructure needed for this site.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Kay Wilkes [4000]		Q16	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Already congestion affecting whole of Stratford Rd from M42 junction and all arterial routes.</p> <p>Blackford Lane has structural issues.</p> <p>Main route of Dickens Heath to Miller & Carter is like a racetrack.</p> <p>1000s new homes will compound congestion and traffic flow.</p> <p>35 mins to travel 1 mile.</p> <p>Local railway stations not fit for purpose. Inadequate parking.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded. Access to Heartlands is nightmare in traffic.</p> <p>Secondary schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Public open space very popular recreation and amenity area. Shirley Park too small and only restricted dog area.</p> <p>Boggy areas with poor drainage and risk of flooding.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Keith Dennis [4346]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>No reference in constraints to TPO No. 174.</p> <p>Seek assurances that TPOs will be retained and protected during construction.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Council agreed to retain freehold for sporting use.</p> <p>Seems that owners of sports pitch have not encouraged sports use.</p> <p>Solihull falling in league tables. In lower 3rd quartile nationally for adult sports participation 3 times/week.</p> <p>Arden Tennis Club very popular.</p> <p>Reduced parking due to loss of Arden Tennis Club.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>
Kelly Maskell [3954]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Existing high levels of traffic in area. Safety concerns for children on foot on way to Lighthall School.</p> <p>Increased housing will exacerbate traffic volume and have highway safety implications.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ken Hazlewood [4774]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Kim Cowie [4399]			Q16	<p>In relation to objections to 2550 houses south of Shirley (4,11,12,13 all coming forward).</p> <p>Existing traffic issues, especially Tanworth Lane and Dog Kennel Lane junctions.</p> <p>Loss of well-used green space, for recreation and leisure.</p> <p>Need for more opportunities to exercise. Shirley Park too far.</p> <p>Impact on highway infrastructure, medical facilities, doctors surgeries, Solihull hospitals.</p>
Kiri Monksfield [4386]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Extra traffic from developments will add to existing congestion. E.g. Dog Kennel Lane and Tanworth Lane during rush hour.</p> <p>Any through roads would cause major disruption to residents, e.g. on Shotteswell Road or Woodloes Road.</p> <p>Schools and hospital already overstretched.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q16	<p>Believe that the infrastructure identified to support the proposed allocations are correct- funding from CIL or S106 contributions will assist the council in providing the right infrastructure to meet the needs resulting from new development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q16	Residents and business' concerns are very clear that there is too much pressure on local infrastructure now and the scale of development proposed must be reduced. These concerns over infrastructure impacts have not been addressed. It is unreasonable to expect residents to accept any substantial further development in KDBH without any indication as to how the wider infrastructure impacts would be overcome.
L J Crumpton [4987]			Q16	Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.
Laura Davies [4547]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Laura Manton [4525]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Laura Townsend [4216]			Q16	Infrastructure highlighted in the representation has been identified in the DLP
Lauren Reilly [4980]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool, 3G/4G floodlit pitches, theatre and tennis courts.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Laurie Neal [3981]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Existing traffic problems, particularly on Streetsbrook Road, Blossomfield Road and surrounds. Incessant queueing.</p> <p>New development will adversely affect:</p> <p>Schools and colleges in the area, cycle route users, pedestrians using these amenities and Touchwood.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Applications to use this land for sport have been blocked by current owner.</p> <p>Additional pressure on schools and medical centres.</p> <p>More hard surfacing will exacerbate existing flooding and drainage issues. High clay content of soil.</p>
LAYCA - Lighthall Area Community Centre (John Shaw) [4678]			Q16	600 homes at site 13 will increase the demand for community services provided by LAYCA.
Lee Durant [3495]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure inadequate.</p> <p>Development will add to traffic congestion on Stratford Road.</p> <p>3.5 mile journey in rush hour along Stratford Road takes 45 minutes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Leighton Jones [3252]			Q16	There are no sensible alternatives for the large proportion of new residents of the Knowle developments who will need to access Solihull by car. The proposal for a 30 minute bus service is pathetic. This is what we are supposed to have now and it does not cope with peak times at all. Any service MUST respond to the variation in demand. Infrastructure provision needs to be provided at the beginning of development, not afterwards. An additional 3500 residents is a 30% increase in size, which will wreck existing services of ALL sorts, not just transport.
Lesley Murtagh [4553]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Liam Sawyer [4768]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Liam Swan [4360]			Q16	Site 18 Objection. Increased traffic. Existing congestion, parking on side streets and highway safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. Particularly for school pick up and drop off times. Increased demand on already oversubscribed schools and doctor surgeries.
Linda Burroughs [4829]			Q16	In relation to Site 9. 500 homes will potentially result in 1000 more cars. Knowle can barely cope currently, no one will be able to get in or out, especially at peak times.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Moore [3488]			Q16	<p>Local infrastructure already stretched around Site 13:</p> <p>Tanworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane, Blackford Road all struggle to deal with traffic at peak times.</p> <p>Schools, doctor surgeries and local hospital also struggle to cope.</p>
Linda Page [4974]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with pub, gym, swimming pool and theatre with improvements to school laboratory provision.</p>
Linda Parker [3965]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 objection.</p> <p>Traffic congestion at peak times already high.</p> <p>Right turn from development onto Sharmans Cross Road and right turn onto Streetsbrook Rd will cause major traffic congestion.</p> <p>Will add to increasing parking issues on roads, including those park then walk/cycle into Solihull for work.</p> <p>Need additional parking restrictions, e.g. red double lines. Would need extra enforcement.</p> <p>Severn Trent will need to provide additional infrastructure.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues, e.g. drains outside school</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Local schools and medical facilities are oversubscribed. My grandson was told to look for school placement outside of Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p>
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>
Liz Cantone [4869]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle to be supported with swimming pool, youth club facilities, gym and sports facilities.</p>
Liz Moloney [4564]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, and Hockley Heath as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Lizzie Fenton [4905]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, theatre.</p>
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p>
Lorna Whitaker [4373]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sports fields.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lorraine Winn [4510]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Louis Burns [4069]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development. Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."
Louise Fallon [3950]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Considerable volume of existing traffic in this area, particularly at peak times and due to shoppers for Touchwood on weekend. Long queues of traffic along Streetsbrook Road - hazardous junction with Sharmans Cross Road/Dorchester Road/Stonor Park Road. Danger to cyclists if traffic increases further.
Louise Smith [5006]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: New computers building, first aid centres/ areas, better / cleaner toilets, better canteen areas.
Lucy Slaney [5005]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: New computers building, first aid centres/ areas, better / cleaner toilets, better canteen areas.
Lynette Donohoe [3439]			Q16	Regarding site 13 - Additional residents would need access to already overstretched resources - doctors, dentists, school places, emergency services and hospitals.
Lynn Mullard [4401]			Q16	In relation to Site 13 Objection. Loss of green space.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Lynne & Gordon Ramsay [4992]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports hall, theatre, flood lit, multi activity 4G sports pitch, gym.</p> <p>Significant development would require major investment in the area's infrastructure including, but not limited to school places, school premises and health care provision.</p> <p>Whilst a swimming pool may seem attractive, I would suggest a feasibility study be carried out before taking this forward.</p>
M A Reohorn [4378]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Increase existing traffic issues and congestion. Risk to road safety for vehicle users, pedestrians and cyclist. Road network in poor state.</p> <p>Parking inadequate in Dickens Heath for shops and facilities.</p> <p>Pressure on schools and medical centres.</p>
M Biggs [4859]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with community multi-sports facilities, community hall, library and theatre subject to resolving safeguarding issues with school being open to public.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
M Black [4823]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Lack of parking in village. Hallmeadow Road used for Berkswell Station and medical centre.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctors surgery.</p> <p>Will increase traffic and congestion. Local roads unsuitable for expansion. Routes to exit the village to the east are restricted by low bridge at Station Road and narrow bridge on Lavender Hall Lane.</p> <p>Balsall Street East, to west of village, cannot cope with further traffic.</p> <p>Only 6% of commuters from Balsall Common use public transport.</p> <p>Bypass is really an access road to 900 proposed houses.</p>
M E Tregellas [4747]			Q16	<p>Understand the old rugby ground is designated land for sport. Losing another facility would leave us very short of green open spaces.</p> <p>Will increase risk of flooding.</p> <p>Increase in traffic will be catastrophic. Regular accidents and gridlocking at peak times.</p> <p>Significant increase in danger for school children.</p> <p>Local amenities, e.g. schools, are unlikely to cope with added population.</p> <p>Council will have to provide additional schools, medical and sporting facilities.</p> <p>Access from Winterbourne Road is not supported; would destroy quiet and safe environment and create significant increase in traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
M Haroon [4916]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Gym, arts / drama studio, computer room with newer computers, bigger sixth form common room.
M Holden [4914]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Events hall, swimming pool, sports facility.
M J Beasley [4051]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
M J G Smith [3436]			Q16	Concerns about increased traffic, road capacity and the capacity of sewage pumping station in Tythe Barn Lane.
Mairead, Kelvin & Harry James [3986]			Q16	In relation to Site 13 Objection. Public open space is valuable amenity to local residents for walking, keepign healthy and wildlife. No access to large parks in Shirley. Will impact on schools, doctor surgeries, traffic and pollution.
Malcolm Edgington [3885]			Q16	infrastructure that is highlighted in the response has been identified in the DLP.
Mandy Gaffney [4850]			Q16	In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire: Arden Academy is already very successful, and received significant investment in recent years. State of the art facilities do not equal results.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mantisson Limited (Mr Malcolm Priest) [3760]		Q16	<p>Site 9:</p> <p>Oppose the use of the bridleway as a pedestrian route into the proposed Academy for reasons of health and safety and nuisance.</p> <p>In past years, the bridleway was used as an access for Arden School Pupils to enter school grounds via the playing field. Large numbers of children traversed the bridleway at times of peak vehicle traffic arriving for work.</p> <p>Temporary repairs been insufficient.</p> <p>Oppose large number of proposed homes as will create further pressure on existing transport, education and medical facilities and necessitate even more development.</p> <p>Surprised that Arden Academy have not contacted us about proposals.</p>
Margaret Burling [3984]		Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Rugby club ground not being used as Oakmoor refuses to speak to interested parties.</p> <p>Provision of sports pitches and facilities in Solihull is already poor compared to other parts of the country.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road already congested.</p> <p>Further traffic add to danger of pedestrians to Junior School.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing parking issues. Will be compounded by loss of spaces at Arden Tennis Club.</p> <p>Moving Tennis Club would contravene NPPF.</p> <p>Site better suited for improved sports uses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Margaret Chadderton [4743]			Q16	In relation to Sites 11, 12 and 13. Will only exacerbate existing problems with traffic. Pressure on schools and medical facilities.
Margaret Murphy [4970]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with sports, swimming pool, library and theatre facilities.
Maria Williams [4365]			Q16	Site 13 Objection. Loss of public amenity area will be loss for residents for recreation, health and wellbeing. Insufficient open space and parkland in Shirley. Further strain on local infrastructure. Will increase travel delays, congestion and standing traffic at peak times. Increase in carbon emissions. Drainage issues - high clay component in soil.
Marianne Fogarty [4395]			Q16	In relation to Site Objections 4,11,12,13. Traffic increased significantly since last development in Dickens Heath were built out. Lots of road closures on Haslucks Green Road, this is what the future will be like if houses go ahead.
Marie Kilgallen [4142]			Q16	The proposals for South Shirley will require new schools and medical facilities and will impact on recreation areas.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Bartlett [4305]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Potential access road into or near Winterbourne Road will cause traffic congestion and noise.</p> <p>Loss of open space and sporting facilities.</p> <p>Huge loss in Solihull over last 30 years.</p> <p>Majority of site is covenanted for sporting use. SMBC said they would not sell freehold.</p> <p>Increase in traffic; busy junctions already overloaded. Increased queue length and gridlock at Rush hour at Solihull Road/Sharman Cross Road junction and Prospect Lane island.</p> <p>Highway safety risk to pedestrians, especially children on way to school.</p> <p>Inadequate parking. Exacerbated by loss of Arden Tennis Club.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p>
Mark Cadwallader [4312]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space and opportunities for recreation and sport. Impact on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Shirley already heavily built up area with little green space.</p> <p>Add to existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Services won't be able to cope.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark Davies [4459]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objections.</p> <p>Fails to take into account impact on local services, infrastructure and the local community.</p> <p>Impact on existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools and GPs.</p> <p>Road and rail network at or near capacity. Will be unable to access A34 or M42.</p> <p>Will create further transport problems on A34 corridor, Haslucks Green Road, Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive, Tanworth Lane, Blackford Road, Tilehouse Lane and roads inbetween.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities at Site 4.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation at Site 13.</p>
Mark Hathaway [3330]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Over last 10 years traffic worsened due to Dickens Heath development.</p> <p>More congestion.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>
Mark Hathaway [3330]			Q16	<p>Green areas on the other side of Dickens Heath and Earlswood.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mark McCarron [3480]			Q16	<p>Road infrastructure around Dickens Heath currently overloaded at peak times.</p> <p>Road surfaces and footways in disrepair.</p> <p>Pavements on approach roads to Whitlocks End Station inadequate</p> <p>School bus blocks the clock roundabout every morning.</p> <p>Gridlock in Dickens Heath last Halloween.</p> <p>Doctor and Dentist oversubscribed.</p>
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>South of Balsall Common is traffic hotspot for congestion and dangerous parking by primary school.</p>
Mark Taft [3595]			Q16	<p>Residents are upset at losing green belt buffer between, Shirley, Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green (Sites 4, 11, 12 and 13) but solution could be provision of T-shaped community park with amenity land, sports fields and wild areas to form permanent buffer zone between existing community and proposed development, with central facilities hub by the canal and house building around the edge.</p>
Mark Thompson [3446]			Q16	<p>Would be increase pressure on the road network and other local services such as GPs and schools which are already at capacity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Martin & Debbie Doyle [4412]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation.</p> <p>Increase in air pollution, further exacerbate transport issues, put strain on existing services.</p> <p>Should development not be closer to HS2 to prevent additional congestion on M42.</p>
Martin & Sharon Rabbitte [4435]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Increase in traffic congestion. Road network under significant pressure; will add traffic to congested roads between the site and Stratford Road.</p> <p>Increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Loss of green space and green corridors for recreation.</p>
Martin Dediccoat [4896]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>swimming pool, sports centre, community hall.</p>
Martin Green [3108]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common - Lack of supporting infrastructure. Traffic issues, lack of parking, poor police representation. Schools above capacity. There must be a parallel plan for infrastructure improvement including a bypass.</p>
Mary Ing [4949]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Community centre, swimming pool, theatre / arts centre, nursery school facilities.</p>
Marylyn Trowsdale [4214]			Q16	<p>Infrastructure identified in the representation has been highlighted as required in the DLP.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Matt Stephens [4998]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, gym, auditorium, sports pitches. Also adequate parking for students.</p>
Matthew Becker [3402]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Matthew Quinn [4344]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Matthew Quinn [4344]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1 and 2 Objection.</p> <p>20% of new housing development in Balsall Common, but settlement does not meet Council's own criteria on accessibility.</p> <p>Limited employment opportunities, which encourages car travel. This adds pressure to road network and increases carbon. No proposals for SPRINT in this area.</p> <p>No safe access via Meeting House Lane. Highway safety risk to children walking to school or cricket/tennis club.</p> <p>Cul-de-sacs should not become through-routes.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Maureen Bartlett [4306]			Q16	<p>In relation to te 18 Objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Potential access road that might be introduced into or near by Winterbourne Road from the new development and the traffic congestion and noise this will create. * Loss of open space and sporting facilities * Access and traffic issues * Complete lack of adequate parking * Drainage and Flooding
Meg Purvey [4364]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Will add pressure to oversubscribed amenities, such as schools, health care, parking and more traffic congestion.</p> <p>Growing problem around Solihull.</p>
Mel Starling [4325]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 8 and 9 objection.</p> <p>The closest station to the Hampton Road site is Hampton-in Arden. It is not possible to walk to this station safely as there are no pavements or lighting. The parking facilities are at capacity, likewise at Dorridge and Widney Manor stations.</p> <p>Need evidence that Arden School needs demolishing to improve and expand.</p>
Melanie Hughes [4657]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Melissa Bradburn [4563]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority, and for improvements to road infrastructure including Knowle High Street as currently inadequate for proposal.
Melvyn Broadhurst [4749]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18:</p> <p>Traffic, congestion, pollution.</p> <p>Add pressure to local resources.</p> <p>Sports area is unique feature and should be kept for sport.</p>
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q16	<p>Infrastructure issues remain: transport, schools, GP access, Post Office, banks. Access to social amenities within the community is a requirement, for example, we would suggest that additional facilities such as dementia friendly communities with the growing older population be considered as a priority.</p> <p>Any new development should have a percentage of open space that is accessible to all residents and the wider community.</p> <p>No matter what is agreed, stronger systems need to be put in place for developers to comply.</p>
Merrill Flood [3878]			Q16	concerns about the capacity of schools, roads and health services.
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q16	<p>Whilst Doctors and schooling infrastructure is mentioned, no mention is made of shopping, banking etc and banks are currently withdrawing from Balsall Common.</p> <p>A lack of action on the site to the rear of the Co-op shop has caused it to be isolated from other retail outlets and has exacerbated the lack of any sense of a cohesive village centre.</p> <p>Car parking facilities in the Village are very limited and in some areas dangerous.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q16	<p>Completeness of Required Supporting Infrastructure to complement proposed Draft Development?</p> <p>Whilst the need for doctors and schooling is mentioned; shopping, banking, parking, etc. is not. Banks are currently withdrawing from Balsall Common and a lack of action on the site to the rear of the Co-op shop, allowing it to be isolated from other retail outlets, has exacerbated the lack of any sense of a cohesive village centre.</p> <p>The new reduced parking in the village is already a major issue.</p>
Michael Doble [3296]			Q16	<p>Present infrastructure will not support this number of homes. New or improved schooling will be needed as well as additional car parking, improvement to access roads and additional medical care. Careful planning of the Arden Triangle could provide new Schooling, new Car park and medical centre. There would still be adequate space for the proposed development of up to 750 new homes. If accepted it should be the limit to development within Knowle itself. Use of the money derived from sale of the Council owned land, and any Section 106 agreement would cover the cost of rebuilding the necessary infrastructure.</p>
Michael Hannon [4429]			Q16	<p>Loss of sports pitches. Lack of sporting facilities in Solihull.</p> <p>Significant strain on infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion and road safety issues.</p> <p>Schools and GPs already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and capturing air pollution.</p>
Michael Sims [4748]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Land should continue as community use for recreation and children.</p> <p>Young families need this facility.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Michael Swann [4880]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool and gym for community use.
Michael Watkinson [3576]			Q16	The plan does not make adequate proposals for the centre of Balsall Common, given the increase in population. There will need to be a better flow of traffic, improved parking, improved pedestrian area, retention of banks (two closed/closing in the last year), larger Post Office facility etc etc. The plan should propose that a dual carriageway bypass is built as a continuation of Hallmeadow Road south to the junction of Meer End Road and the A452. Traffic access from site 3 onto Meeting House Lane would not be safe.
Michelle Bourke [3952]			Q16	In relation to Site 12 objection. Stratford Road near Audi Garage already very congested. Shirley area already very built up. Very concerned about impact of extra traffic on Shirley.
Miss Charlotte Drysdale [3834]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Miss Elizabeth Adams [3492]			Q16	The housing proposal for the Shirley area will have huge implications with green spaces, traffic congestion (already a problem in the area) and demand on schooling.
Miss Elizabeth Brace [3102]			Q16	In relation to Site 9 Objection. Enough has been said about the impact on the local infrastructure, but is the capacity of the sewage treatment facility in Norton Green Lane capable of servicing another possible 1000 homes? The additional houses on the Middlefield site will be connected soon, and there is already impact in the vicinity from emissions, which can be quite offensive if there's a south easterly, have existing pollution levels been measured, how will this be addressed in the future?

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Miss Emma Maybury [3416]		Q16	<p>Objection to Site 13</p> <p>We do not need more houses, we need the green spaces, schools, GP surgeries and better roads</p> <p>On a floodplain</p> <p>Sewer stream running through it</p> <p>Is land saturated?</p> <p>Countless wildlife</p> <p>Strain on schools, doctors, roads, car parks</p>
Miss Emma Voogd [4385]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Street parking already unacceptable to pedestrians and road users alike.</p> <p>Roads used as overspill car park for commuters using Solihull train station.</p> <p>Reducing parking facilities at Arden Club will add pressure.</p> <p>Proposed entrance is unsuitable; it's on a hill and at a narrow gauge.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility in accessible location.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Hannah Voogd [4384]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Street parking already unacceptable to pedestrians and road users alike.</p> <p>Roads used as overspill car park for commuters using Solihull train station.</p> <p>Reducing parking facilities at Arden Club will add pressure.</p> <p>Proposed entrance is unsuitable; it's on a hill and at a narrow gauge.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility in accessible location.</p>
Miss Katie Mitchell [2932]			Q16	<p>Concerns about expanding class sizes in Meriden schools.</p>
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q16	<p>Site 16.</p> <p>Staggered junctions at Yew Tree Lane, Hampton Lane, Marsh Land and Solihull bypass cause significant traffic congestion (plus noise and air pollution and traffic delays).</p> <p>Traffic congestion along Damson Parkway/Yew Tree Lane will probably be exacerbated by opening of JLR Logistics operation.</p> <p>Flow through Hampton Lane likely to increase with development of UK Central.</p> <p>Access to housing development off these roads will make matters worse.</p> <p>Loss of land used for children's sport and football pitches.</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q16	<p>You have stated the infrastructure is to follow. I know that right now the roads around Shirley and Solihull are a nightmare to travel on in rush hour. In the last 6 months this has declined further.</p>
Miss Nicola Jefferies [3705]			Q16	<p>infrastructure listed in objection has been identified in the DLP</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Sally Simpson [3074]			Q16	In relation to Site 5. Loss of open space for recreation and leisure.
miss Stephanie Archer [3793]			Q16	Improvements are needed to roads as areas in Solihull already get congested due to pinch points where over developed without consideration to traffic, and improvements to park and ride on rail line into Birmingham as currently most car parks fill up early, with Widney Manor being full before 8am. Schools don't have funding for improvements so should include a new school on one of the sites, Light Hall is good location for a replacement, possibly on a different site as a land swop like Arden, to provide school places for the additional housing developments.
miss susan turner [2965]			Q16	schools and doctors identified as infrastructure under pressure from the new development is identified in the DLP.
Miss Tessa Hartles [4404]			Q16	Site 13. Loss of green space for recreation and children's play. Add to existing congestion.
Mr & Mrs Biddlecombe [4503]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mr & Mrs Bird [5004]			Q16	Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.
Mr & Mrs Brad & Eleanor Lee [2974]			Q16	Amenities - Balsall Common is a village. The amenities we have are built to cope with a village population. From the local schools to the facilities for parking at the local shops, we will not be able to cope with this increase in population. It will cause extensive congestion as well as increased pollution.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs D Green [4909]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Sports pitches and courts, running track, sports hall for external bookings, as well as school use, theatre venue (for school and community productions). A swimming pool would be great, but concern about whether commercially viable and a drain on resources.
Mr & Mrs David hull [3876]			Q16	infrastructure (schools, health)listed in the response has been identified in the DLP.
Mr & Mrs . Jogi [4930]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool
Mr & Mrs . Taylor [4990]			Q16	Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.
Mr & Mrs Batty [3397]			Q16	Increased pressure on infrastructure such as health services, schools, road and rail.
Mr & Mrs D & K Tomkins [4757]			Q16	Concerned about parking at Dorridge station. Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities. Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.
Mr & Mrs D & L Davies [3260]			Q16	recognise that additional social infrastructure would be needed to support the development
Mr & Mrs G P & M P Troth [3398]			Q16	Response in relation to infrastructure highlights that which has been identified in the DLP eg.road infrastructure is insufficient. Rural character of minor roads should be retained

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Guy Fathers [4843]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire:</p> <p>Knowle is a small village, close to Solihull and Birmingham that have fantastic facilities.</p> <p>Knowle already a busy, bustling village. Concerned about added traffic and demand on services and space.</p>
Mr & Mrs Jagger [4299]			Q16	<p>I have attended several meetings concerning the building of 1350 homes in the area of Balsall Common and have concluded that no building should take place especially at the Barratt's Farm and Windmill Lane sites as no improvement of the infrastructure is being considered.</p> <p>The centre of Balsall Common, the school, surgery and the surrounding roads are already at full capacity and by adding further housing is going to make the problems even worse. It will create an area of overcrowding and therefore make the quality of life for people in the area poorer not better.</p>
Mr & Mrs Jewitt [4394]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Will add to existing traffic congestion. Impact of construction traffic. Sharmans Cross Road very busy.</p> <p>Will exacerbate existing parking issues.</p> <p>Flood risk and drainage issues.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools, doctors, dentists and hospitals.</p> <p>NPPF requires development to have access to local amenities within 800m/10 mins walk. Development not meet these criteria.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Existing shortage. Solihull have statutory duty to replace lost pitches with facilities of equivalent quality and accessibility.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Ken Herbert [3360]			Q16	<p>Concerns on traffic volumes around Majors Green, South Shirley, Shirley Station & Whitlocks End Station.</p> <p>It is dangerous for pedestrians and the existing situation will be exacerbated by additional development in the area.</p>
Mr & Mrs M Mladenovic [4754]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
Mr & Mrs Mark & Susan Fitton [3062]			Q16	<p>Over-development of housing in small communities increases demand and pressures on local facilities. Development in Balsall Common will reduce and over stretch capacity to provide medical and dental services as well as primary and secondary schooling. Parking and traffic is already chaotic in the village centre and combined with the development of HS2 there will be a detrimental impact on traffic flow and the environment over sustained period.</p>
Mr & Mrs Martin & Claire Calkeld [3217]			Q16	<p>recognise that development will have an impact on physical and social infrastructure.</p>
Mr & Mrs N & L Treadwell [4764]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
Mr & Mrs Phipps [4604]			Q16	<p>WISH TO HIGHLIGHT CAPACITY ISSUES WITH THE LOCAL SCHOOL (ST T&G), AS WELL AS ACROSS TH BOROUGH</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs R & B Ethell [4763]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
Mr & Mrs R A & SC Hardcastle [3434]			Q16	<p>Schools and GP surgeries are at capacity.</p> <p>Will exacerbate traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road.</p>
Mr & Mrs T & L Baines [4760]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
Mr & Mrs Wells [4461]			Q16	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play. No other green spaces within 0.5 mile of Bills Lane.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing congestion on local roads during rush hour. Affects Dickens Heath up to Miller and Carter; Bills Lane leading to Tanworth Lane and Shakespeare Drive; through Majors Green leading to Norton Lane; A435 leading to J3 of M42.</p> <p>Schools, doctors and hospitals oversubscribed.</p>
Mr . King [4989]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.</p>
Mr Adam Hunter [3332]			Q16	<p>The local infrastructure also concerns me schools, doctors, dentists are struggling with the current demands . these are identified in the DLP</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Adam Hunter [3332]			Q16	<p>In the dickens Heath area I do not believe you have considered the impact of 700+ new homes and the vehicles this will bring on roads which are typically small narrow lanes already over crowded. I do not believe planning has been put in place for the current expansion of dickens heath and the consideration of multi car households is not considered or realistic in an affluent area with residents that can afford two or more cars per household.</p>
Mr Adam Weber [3072]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4:</p> <p>Council has not fully examined the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Existing congestion through Dickens heath and surrounding roads. Used as rat runs.</p> <p>Parking shortage in Village.</p> <p>Would create substantial car traffic, along with other proposals.</p> <p>Major road improvements would be necessary - not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Rail service from Whitlocks End only goes to Birmingham and Stratford upon Avon; not Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Town centre poorly accessible on bus.</p> <p>No direct road/cycleway to village centre. Cycle and pedestrian access to the village centre was a core principle of original masterplan. Proposal would be too large for that.</p>
Mr Alan Chandler [3374]			Q16	<p>Facilities at site 9 should include:</p> <p>Sporting facilities, NHS services, evening classes, flood lit areas to ensure maximum utilisation of the site.</p> <p>We must consider infrastructure and insist sufficient car parking spaces in the Knowle and Dorridge area, plus road systems that provide smooth passage around the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Alex Lukeman [3387]			Q16	Difficult to comment on road infrastructure. It is under pressure and will need detailed consideration in the area of Bills Lane, Haslucks green Road, Shakespeare Drive and Stratford Road.
Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]			Q16	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q16	<p>I support the provision of green infrastructure and planning concepts in paragraph 224 of the draft plan. Concept master plans are critical particularly for sites in multiple ownership.</p> <p>Missing from the listings of proposed infrastructure for Balsall Common includes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional parking at the Berkswell Station. Between 20 and 40 cars regularly park on Hallmeadow Road for the station every weekday. 2. Parking in central Balsall Common which is already at capacity. SMBC has the statistics. 3. Safe cycle connectivity with any employment centre 4. Parks to replace the loss of public footpaths and wildlife habitat.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Dean [3073]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common - An additional new primary school and extended or additional campus for the secondary school is a must.</p> <p>Also need:</p> <p>Improved pedestrian and cyclist provision, improved policing and emergency services.</p> <p>Increased retail provision, health-care provision, health and leisure provision, social and pleasure provision.</p> <p>Improved public transport, traffic flow (including a bypass), car parking in village centre, railway passenger and car parking provision, access to high speed broadband and mobile phone signal, provision for industry / commercial sites to provide local jobs.</p>
Mr Andrew Hardwick [3636]			Q16	<p>There is no valid reason to take green belt to build houses and the bypass which will simply serve to provide an access to the houses and nothing else.</p>
Mr Andrew Rusher [3532]			Q16	<p>with houses & jobs come families & children , Solihull schools are already oversubscribed, GP surgeries and hospitals beds full , how do the council propose finding places for the additional populus ?</p>
Mr B Bohanna [2056]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with school hall for drama and music, gym, youth club and parking with community use when not being used for education.</p>
Mr C Edwards [4622]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr C Gledhill [4812]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Mr C J Voogd [4388]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Pressure on roads, schools, hospitals and clinics. Increase to street parking which is already an inconvenience, and danger to children, infirm and cyclists. Loss of sporting facilities.
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q16	More detail is needed in what infrastructure is suggested. You also need to explain why you are ignoring existing major infrastructure (eg a high capacity dual carriageway north of Balsall Common), this would speed up development and dramatically reduce costs, so that "softer" development can be made (parks, woodland etc).
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q16	Yes
Mr Chris Batiste [4821]			Q16	In relation to Site 9. Will cause increase in traffic through Knowle. Medical services oversubscribed. Added pollution from extra 500 cars.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Chris Jones [4939]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports facilities.</p> <p>We need a Knowle bypass. There is not enough parking spaces at present. Can the GP practices cope with up to 1000 new houses?</p>
Mr Christopher Allen [3031]			Q16	<p>The present roads are unable to cope with the volume of traffic at certain times of the day, especially at school starting and finishing times. To add another 100 houses could potentially mean another 200 cars trying to access the road system which the present infrastructure would be unable to sustain.</p> <p>There would be a considerable increase in the demand for school places which will be difficult to meet.</p> <p>Solihull Arden Club and grounds are well used. The Rugby pitches at Sharmans Cross Road could be used for some sort of sporting facilities which would be less costly than re-provision.</p>
Mr Cliff Dobson [3740]			Q16	<p>Site 16 development should not be permitted without additional infrastructure and social amenities, eg cycle, pedestrian and vehicle routes, schools, medical centre and a design that encourages and supports the provision and use of public transport.</p> <p>No development should be approved in detail unless and until existing problems with traffic volumes on Hampton Lane, Lugtrout Lane and Damson Parkway are resolved.</p> <p>Field Lane is not a suitable access road for the development, and widening would involve the permanent loss of a valuable rural byway including ancient hedgerow. If development is approved Field Lane should be closed to vehicular through traffic</p>
Mr Craig Armstrong [3190]			Q16	<p>DLP has not identified parking as being of an inadequate level in the centre of DH.</p>
Mr D Bell [2230]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common does not have adequate medical/welfare facilities, school places, shops, parking facilities at the library, rear of Tesco or at the station, reliable and practical public transport or road infrastructure to cope with the additional population from 1150 more houses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q16	<p>The current primary school is overcrowded. Two two-form entry primary schools should be a priority at east and west ends of the village.</p> <p>Seems to be adequate provision in terms of medical services. The current health centre should meet carefully thought through new development with ease. Parking in the central area is poorly designed and inadequate for current needs. A solution would be for Solihull Council to purchase and demolish the office block adjacent to Co-op. This would not be cheap, but if Solihull Council continues the costs could be covered by CIL funds from the housing to be provided.</p>
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q16	there is urgent need for 2 two-form entry primary schools, the current one is over crowded
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q16	the primary school in Balsall Common is over crowded - need for a new school - one east. one west would be a solution. parking is a major problem - should be solved by a thought through process. 2 large sites available.- only one chosen
Mr D Edmonds [4808]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr D Eustace [4791]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Perks [3399]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr Daniel Fowler [3460]			Q16	<p>1: The large car park on Monkspath Hall Road is used by traffic from the M42. A large scale car park is required that avoids clogging the road past St. Alphege, e.g. expand Mell Square car park across the Morrisons car park. 2: Sort the traffic in/out of Solihull School at peak times. 3: Sort out the roundabout by the train station.</p> <p>There is no talk of future autonomous transport and more ideas needed on safer cycling.</p>
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q16	<p>Proposed developments for Balsall Common leads to a substantial increase in its populous. Existing infrastructure insufficient to meet increased demand. Following improvements are needed; additional car park provision in village centre; additional rail station parking(Hall Meadow Road used as overflow(would be part of proposed bypass); improved bus service- including service centre village -medical centre; and train service; additional primary school as current schools are full; improved drainage system- current one cant cope at times of heavy downpours; community sports centre/facilities will all weather pitch and last but not least an accessible cemetry</p>
mr david moore [3419]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 13.</p> <p>Stratford Rd to M42, and roads around Tanworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane etc congested at peak hours.</p> <p>Local services: schools, hospital, doctors, emergency services are stretched.</p>
Mr David Pickering [3400]			Q16	<p>Re Hampton Road and South of Knowle, the resulting additional traffic will lead to huge congestion problems on Warwick Road, Knowle High Street and Station Road which could not be relieved without significantly harming the historic centre of Knowle. New primary school(s) would be required. Sewage and water supplies may be inadequate without very large additional works. Provision of new health centres, new green spaces and new community centres would all be required to prevent the developments being just soul-less housing estates.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q16	<p>The infrastructure is badly ignored in all your plans! This I firmly believe and I have a BIG Ask list that needs a wider discussion than this questionnaire affords .</p> <p>Suggests a bypass for Knowle.</p>
Mr David Smith [3130]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Lack of playing pitches in Solihull.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sporting use.</p>
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q16	<p>No A defined route and by-pass is required. Room for multimodal transport developments and terminus is required. We have a Doctor's surgery but probably need more Doctor's for the growing size of population. A further affordable care home and day care facilities in the Barratt's farm area is probably needed. Car parking and village centre development (elsewhere) is required.</p>
Mr Derrick Walker [4780]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q16	<p>The infrastructure required has not been adequately addressed regarding the sites in Shirley South. The current infrastructure cannot support this amount of development. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no alternative routes that could be built to relieve the situation. Additional development will funnel more traffic into an already overburdened system that cannot be effectively improved.</p> <p>The NHS is also under severe strain and there are limits to how much GPs can expand, around Shirley. Solihull hospital has been downgraded over the years resulting in Shirley residents having to utilise Heartlands hospital. This will only exacerbate the problem.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q16	concerns over stretching of infrastructure (schools, medical, public transport)
Mr G Wilkinson [4788]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr G E Leighton [3320]			Q16	concerned about impact on infrastructure, road, Doctors, schools
Mr G Frost [4809]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr G Walters [2324]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4:</p> <p>Council has not fully examined the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Existing congestion through Dickens heath and surrounding roads. Used as rat runs.</p> <p>Parking shortage in Village.</p> <p>Would create substantial car traffic, along with other proposals.</p> <p>Major road improvements would be necessary - not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Rail service from Whitlocks End only goes to Birmingham and Stratford upon Avon; not Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Town centre poorly accessible on bus.</p> <p>No direct road/cycleway to village centre. Cycle and pedestrian access to the village centre was a core principle of original masterplan. Proposal would be too large for that.</p>
Mr Gary Hickin [3097]			Q16	<p>The area around Yew Tree Lane, Damson Parkway and the Solihull By-Pass is already heavily contested especially around Land Rover shift times. Building a further 600plus houses on the land by Lugtrout Lane will only increase the problem.</p>
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q16	<p>Public leisure facilities should be provided in Balsall Common both to allow young people to have outlets for their energy and to reduce car travel across the Borough. In addition the centre of Balsall Common requires updating to provide easier access to the shops and to reduce congestion.</p>
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q16	<p>The infrastructure requirements are grossly underestimated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Gerard O'Regan [3012]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 2.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed loss of the playing fields located in the Frog Lane site, Balsall Common. Playing fields are a rare and precious facility that should be preserved for the community.</p>
Mr Gibbons [4910]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Youth hub / club, community cafe / enterprise, leisure facilities. Would like to see facilities that support the community effectively.</p>
MR GRAHAM PARRY [3865]			Q16	<p>Improving the infrastructure around the areas being developed, i.e. shops, schools, drainage, transport - must be done BEFORE the implementation of building projects, not after. For Balsall Common this includes the Station Road shops, bus services re-instated and traffic calming measures.</p>
Mr Graham Roderick [3521]			Q16	<p>infrastructure identified in response has been included in the DLP for this site.</p>
Mr H Keene [4806]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr Harpreet Atwal [4848]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with provision of gym, swimming pool, conference facilities and library.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr J Davies [2104]			Q16	<p>Regarding the Shirley sites - Doctors, Schools and road systems are already heavily overloaded or over-subscribed and there can be a great deal of doubt over whether the local road systems would cope.</p> <p>It can already take 30 minutes to drive from the Bills Lane area to the M42 junction because of the existing levels of traffic - and the Shirley/Cheswick Green roads would become impossible - and unsafe - if these developments were to go ahead.</p>
Mr J Stanley [4786]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr Jason Millar [3036]			Q16	<p>Site 5.</p> <p>HS2 development 2 miles away will result in increased traffic past the location and resultant noise, vibration and pollution, a poor location for housing.</p> <p>As a local resident I have already been affected by increased traffic delays from the recent single lane running downgrading of the adjoining A452 past the Chelmunds Cross development. Any junction modelling must take account of future road expansion and not further constrict it exacerbating traffic issues. Once developed it will be difficult to re-develop as required by increased traffic flow.</p>
Mr John Addy [3308]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr John Cooper [3014]			Q16	Parking provision within the Arden triangle
Mr John Southall [2995]			Q16	<p>Site 18:</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion will be exacerbated, increasing noise, pollution and impacting on highway safety.</p> <p>Likely to be insufficient parking, resulting in more on-street parking.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. SMBC said that the land would be used for sport use only.</p> <p>Pressure on existing schools and GPs which are already stretched.</p> <p>Not compliant with NPPF accessibility criteria.</p>
Mr John Thornhill [3372]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, there is no extra provision for parking in the village centre.</p> <p>How will the roads cope with the increase in pupil numbers at the local schools. Drop off and pick up time is terrible now.</p>
Mr John Wilson [3890]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]			Q16	MPs office - Ensure that any local developments are sustainable and the impact on wider infrastructure is considered.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr K Millican [4779]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q16	<p>Congestion in Shirley an existing problem, and worsening.</p> <p>Affects Stratford Road from the M42 junction, Dog Kennel Lane, Tanworth Lane, Shakespeare Drive, Blackford Lane, Haslucks Green Road and Bills Lane.</p> <p>No. of fatalities on Bills Lane.</p> <p>Nearby roads used as rat runs. Cause pollution, highway and pedestrian safety issues.</p> <p>Sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 would cause major traffic issues in this area.</p> <p>Local railway services already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Overspill parking on side roads will worsen.</p> <p>Local infrastructure, e.g. GPs and Schools, is insufficient.</p> <p>Solihull hospital has been downgraded. Heartlands hospital is distant from Shirley; parking is limited and expensive.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q16	<p>The existing infrastructure around the settlement of Balsall Common is struggling to cope with the present population, and is certainly inadequate to meet the needs of the proposed increased population.</p> <p>Improvements are essential; including more primary school places, additional village centre and train station parking, improved bus and rail services, updating existing drainage system, and better more modern sports and leisure facilities for all ages.</p> <p>These must be in place before the proposed 25% increase in population takes effect.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common already faces a wide range of infrastructure challenges resulting from previous development. The scale of the proposals can only worsen this situation and a holistic impact assessment and strategic approach to infrastructure development is required.</p> <p>Areas to be addressed include village centre, school and medical provision, car parking and local road system.</p> <p>Green spaces and buffer zones should be used to mitigate the impact of new build development.</p> <p>There should be no access onto Meeting House Lane or surrounding roads as the rural nature of the lane and the junction of MHL and Kelsey Lane cannot accommodate more</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr L Hatfield [4761]			Q16	<p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications. Unreasonable to get a road link via Barratts Lane or Meeting House Lane due to narrow sections.</p> <p>Possible access at or near 111 MHL is unreasonable. Need adequate pedestrian pathways.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed. Otherwise impact of heavy HGVs in the area.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>
Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]			Q16	<p>Adding more housing in greenbelt areas detracts from the vision. Building the proposed additional housing on the existing country side will not solve the traffic and schooling issues specifically in the Balsall Common area. Both the school and local facilities are currently over capacity, without the additional of 1600 plus cars and kids. Nothing in the proposal caters for this increase and a considerable lack of consideration to this.</p>
Mr Leslie Noble [3503]			Q16	<p>All these plans for Balsall do not give sufficient consideration for the infrastructure of Balsall Common; the impact on the local primary school, GP surgery and village centre etc. I would support a plan where one housing site catering for all the housing needs and incorporating a school and shops is built. I understand that land is available to the north of the village for such a proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mr M A Bardsley [4540]		Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Unlikely to provide adequate parking, will exacerbate existing parking issues.</p> <p>Loss of 75 spaces at Arden Club is unacceptable.</p> <p>Existing drainage issues during heavy rain.</p> <p>Development will increase hard surfacing.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Will create hazards for cyclists on designated cycle route.</p> <p>Not comply with NPPF accessibility criteria.</p> <p>Land should be safeguarded for sporting use as per freehold.</p>
Mr M Glithero [4908]		Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, sports facilities including all weather facilities, facilities to support local youth groups including scouts and guides, a large library.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr M Hatfield [4759]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications. Unreasonable to get a road link via Barratts Lane or Meeting House Lane due to narrow sections.</p> <p>Possible access at or near 111 MHL is unreasonable. Need adequate pedestrian pathways.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed. Otherwise impact of heavy HGVs in the area.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q16	<p>In addition to what you have put in, better car parking as increased housing numbers will make this even more important. As I understand it the Council owns the Arden Academy site, so should make provision for new 3 storey 200 car park (basement/ground/first floor) in the corner nearest to the village centre, with access from Milverton Road and Station Road, and consider a free-flowing one-way system to alleviate congestion, plus lights control of the 3 pedestrian crossings in the High Street, which cause much of the problem. Further community facilities suggested are swimming pool and arts centre.</p>
Mr Mark Roberts [2967]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 16</p> <p>650 new homes is far too large a number for the supporting roads into and around Solihull.</p> <p>I am more than willing to take time to show the necessary decision makers how the roads already struggle to cope during peak hours.</p>
Mr Mark Sutton [3007]			Q16	<p>It is difficult to see how placing greater burdens on the local roads and schools in Knowle while also providing spaces for travellers really helps to maintain quality.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Marshall Moses [3348]			Q16	<p>The impact of existing developments on local road systems which have had no road improvements to compensate for additional growth is significant.</p> <p>Whitlocks End railway station is on the boundary with Bromsgrove District Council and is the main public transport facility for Dickens Heath. Whitlocks End station car park is heavily used and consequently this has led to an increase in traffic on local roads, again without any improvement in infrastructure.</p>
Mr Martin Murphy [3070]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with floodlit sports pitch, indoor sports facilities and youth facilities.</p>
Mr Matthew Bragg [3069]			Q16	<p>The current roads struggle to cope with the existing vehicle demand and car parking is insufficient to meet the requirement blocking the side roads around Knowle and Dorridge.</p>
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q16	<p>More infrastructure would be required in all areas</p>
Mr Michael Hunter [3086]			Q16	<p>infrastructure inadequate around Dickens Heath</p>
Mr Michael Scott [3291]			Q16	<p>The traffic on Kenilworth Road is already significant. 1150 more houses will worsen this problem significantly.</p> <p>The high street and amenities are small and are not even adequate for the current population (compare Knowle high street to Balsall Common high street). To add 1150 could effectively bring in another 3000 people, depending on housing type. For that, the village would need an entirely new central hub, of which there simply is no space.</p> <p>I fear you are turning a small village into a town, without any consideration of what a town sized population actually needs.</p> <p>No housing without a bypass.</p>
Mr Morris Arnold [3722]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9.</p> <p>Infrastructure needs to be sorted first, car parking, primary schools, doctor surgeries.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Nick Houghton [3528]			Q16	The majority of work for the 750 new homes in area 9 the Arden Triangle will be to the North / West aof Knowle and will require journeys through the village centre for some 1500 people and cars (on the basis of two cars per household). The implications of this volume of traffic do not seem to have been considered.
Mr Nick Houghton [3528]			Q16	The current Arden site is described as constrained, however the new site will distance the activities further from the centre of Knowle and potentially damage trade on Knowle High Street which requires support - ie staff and pupils will have poor access to the shops and cafe facilities because they are further away and unable to walk there easily. A better alternative would be to continue to use the very new buildings at either side of the site and rebuild the central block.
Mr P Phillips [4798]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Mr P Greasley [4813]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q16	With the exception of the heath centre there are no future proofed infrastructure developments in Balsall Common. The issue of parking at the railway station, parking in the village, schools and transport all appear to have been paid lip service in the plan

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Paul Southall [3776]			Q16	Road infrastructure in Dickens Heath and South Shirley area is inadequate for additional 2000 plus houses as current housing levels already challenging existing infrastructure. Whilst public transport provision important, majority of people in rural areas use cars, road network south of A34 generally narrow, access in and out of Dickens Heath is very poor, many households having grown children at home will have more than 2 cars. Housing levels should be reduced and infrastructure improved, it is not sufficient to suggest that cycling and buses will solve all the problems. Increased car parking at railway stations will be required.
Mr R Vernon [4801]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr R A Smith [4782]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr R E Green [4789]			Q16	<p>Object to Site 3. Site 240 should be allocated as an alternative. It outperforms Site 3 in terms of SMBC criteria.</p> <p>Balsall Common does not have good accessibility and there are limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Due consideration not given to the 14 Previously Developed Land (PDL) sites in Balsall Common. "Very special circumstances" to justify inappropriate development in the greenbelt have not been demonstrated.</p> <p>Should be a re-assessment of the appropriateness of significantly expanding Balsall Common. Consideration should be given to the re-use of all PDL falling within or adjacent to Balsall Common and these should be consulted on.</p>
Mr R E Green [4789]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr R Hatfield [4758]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications. Unreasonable to get a road link via Barratts Lane or Meeting House Lane due to narrow sections.</p> <p>Possible access at or near 111 MHL is unreasonable. Need adequate pedestrian pathways.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed. Otherwise impact of heavy HGVs in the area.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>
Mr R N Moll [3610]			Q16	<p>There is insufficient road, school and medical practice infrastructure in the south Shirley area to cope with the massive influx of new residents proposed.</p>
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q16	<p>In Balsall Common parking is very limited both in the village centre and the station (with Hallmeadow Road acting as an overflow. Existing leisure facilities are already inadequate</p>
MR Robert James [3013]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 8 and 9.</p> <p>There is no provision for increased car parking in Knowle. 1050 new homes will surely lead to at least 1000 extra cars driving on local roads and needing to park near to local shops. Current parking arrangements are inadequate for today's needs, with inappropriate parking on pavements and grass verges, and this can only get worse. While bus services and cycle lanes are a good thing the reality is that the majority of journeys will be by car for the convenience, speed and ability to convey heavy shopping loads.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Robert Spencer [3745]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Local facilities already under pressure; seems no provision to increase these.</p> <p>Exacerbate already severe traffic problems caused by increased development at JLR. Upgrading local roads won't be enough.</p> <p>Council's own policy to not support developments that will increase delay to vehicles.</p>
Mr Robert Wardle [3455]			Q16	<p>Development of Site 13 will add to existing congestion and traffic issues.</p> <p>Takes 10-15mins to get off Sainsbury's car park and across the island on weekends.</p> <p>Already development on Powergen, Woolmans Garden Centre and elsewhere.</p> <p>Need to allow 45-60mins to get from Shirley to M42 between 07:30 and 9:00 weekdays.</p> <p>Dog Kennel Lane, Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Haslucks Green very congested at peak hours.</p> <p>Doctor's oversubscribed.</p> <p>Fear for future of Solihull hospital.</p>
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q16	<p>Current infrastructure inadequate and cannot see any identification or consideration of future infrastructure requirements in the future.</p>
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q16	<p>It is imperative that both secondary and primary schools in Balsall Common are extended as part of the infrastructure plans. There is a definite need for a bypass to take traffic away from the centre and there must be master plan for the centre taking into account extra car parking.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Savio Dsouza [3022]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 15.</p> <p>There is a shortage of school spaces, parking spaces and open spaces for kids to play.</p> <p>Loss of opportunity for recreational and leisure activities.</p> <p>Loss of community asset.</p>
Mr Stanley Silverman [3021]			Q16	<p>the statements made about increasing the provision of schooling in Balsall Common lack rigour and clarity. The schools in the village are already oversubscribed. It must be made absolutely clear what extra school provision will be provided.</p> <p>Merely improving waiting room provision at Berkswell station is wholly inadequate. There are only 2 trains per hour from Berkswell towards Birmingham and the same towards Coventry. At peak times these are packed...even getting on the train to stand is problematic. Increased public transport capacity is urgently required and the steps to be taken clarified not some wishy washy jam tomorrow policy statement</p>
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q16	<p>Insufficient thought or provision has been made to public services including dental and medical care, playgrounds and youth centres, capacity of roads bearing in mind the severe traffic jams occurring daily</p>
Mr Stephen Carter [2941]			Q16	<p>Dog Kennel lane is inappropriate for use for residential areas because of its use as a link road between the A34 & Dickens Heath</p> <p>School places are oversubscribed</p>
Mr Stephen Hill [3208]			Q16	<p>No, the locations for Allocated Housing Sites identify the loss of too many existing Football Clubs/Pitches, contrary to Policy P18/P20, without identifying any compensatory arrangements for their replacement (i.e. Sites 4, 8, 13, 16, 20).</p> <p>In Appendix C Schedule of Allocated Housing Sites Site Constraints, there is a an inconsistency in terms of the text for existing Football Clubs/Pitches, whilst some are not even referenced.</p> <p>Where the allocation of Housing Sites is identified, a clearer statement is required on how existing Football Clubs/Pitches will be protected/any loss compensated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Steven Rushton [3211]			Q16	The existing road infrastructure around Dickens Heath is not sufficient for current traffic levels (there are long queues in and out at rush hour), new developments at Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green will add to the problem as they do not bring any road improvements. Developing land south of Dog Kennel Lane will massively add to this problem (850 new properties) and compromise the existing road system further by adding new junctions, lights and roundabouts. Further additional development in this area must therefore be accompanied by the required infrastructure improvements.
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q16	The site between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton lane , based on the car ownership figures given in the document mean there are additional 1200 cars owned by people living off Damson Parkway. How is this to be dealt with as the road junctions at the end of Parkway already cause problems for existing residents. I am also concerned that not details of entrance and exist points is given, where would they be.
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q16	<p>Site 16:</p> <p>Area already suffering from terrible traffic problems. Also this area is having to contend to extensions to the JLR plant and ever increasing noise from the airport. The motorway service station is also being considered which is not to far away.</p> <p>The traffic on Damson Parkway, Hampton Lane and the A41 already causes locals no end of issues. We have to contend with the rush hour traffic and JLR traffic flow. How houses could be built in the fields and the transport links be improved has not been clarified.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space and amenity areas.</p> <p>Road infrastructure cannot cope with existing high volumes of traffic and congestion. Traffic pinch point at Burman Road/Shakespeare Drive junctions result in constant queues at peak times.</p> <p>Tanworth land is also gridlock from early morning with few options to widen or improve traffic flow as traffic calming already in place.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing parking issues, e.g. at railway stations.</p> <p>Increased flood risk due to poor drainage.</p>
Mr Surinder Teja [3298]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr T N Walton [4817]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mr T Pritchard [4977]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with gym, swimming pool, youth club and nursery, provision for new medical facilities, and a large car park for school site to avoid parking on roads.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr W A Wood [3664]			Q16	Development on housing site 16 will require major infrastructure improvements, including major changes to Solihull Bypass, Hampton Lane and Yew Tree Lane junction, improvements to Damson Parkway, widening and traffic control at Lugtrout Lane and Field Lane, increased capacity at schools and medical facilities, and upgrading or replacement of sewage treatment pumping station in Lugtrout Lane.
Mr Wayne Morbey [3423]			Q16	<p>With these extra houses how will the schools and other infrastructure cope. Dickens Heath is already over run the schools can barely cope as it is. The areas are a natural beauty and are used a lot by walkers cyclists dog walkers.</p> <p>Solihull is a beautiful place but it's just being urbanised and losing its beauty. if the space has to be used why not a sports center for locals and schools to use and not use up so much land or create recreational areas for kids to be kids. And get outdoors another dog park like in Shirley park maybe</p>
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q16	With a 30% expansion in Balsall Common there is little in the proposals that address the need for a new school, present medical facilities appear to be stretched - again not considered. A452 through traffic continues to increase and building a large development on Barretts Farm could create a rat run for cars trying to avoid the congestion. A large development exiting onto Meeting House Lane, Oxhayes Close and Barretts/Sunnyside Lanes would direct unacceptable traffic flows towards the existing residential areas and village centre. Traffic should be diverted away while still retaining walking and cycle access.
Mr. Ronald Handfield [3028]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs D Hull [4922]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Leisure facilities - gymnasium / swimming pool, community centre, youth centre, nursery.</p> <p>Knowle and surrounding areas deserve some new facilities that the whole community can enjoy, the school desperately needs more space and better facilities that can be used by the local community as well. It would benefit everyone. This would be an opportunity to offer the very best facilities for our young people.</p>
Mrs E A Seal [4814]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs G Elson [4816]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Helen Houghton [3239]			Q16	comment and questions on infrastructure / roads around Dickens Heath and impact on Majors Green residents.
Mrs J Bliss [4803]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q16	Support
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q16	Traffic congestion, and parking have not been considered properly for Knowle/Dorridge
Mrs Angela Stuart-Smith [3749]			Q16	The infrastructure of the area surrounding Solihull is totally inadequate to support large housing developments. New primary and secondary schools needed. Parking a huge problem now - where are 1000 plus more cars going to park? Kenilworth Road now gridlocked at rush hour plus new JLR distribution plant taking huge automotive lorries up and down this road every day - nightmare. Sports facilities inadequate doctors surgery also inadequate and lack of parking and suitable shops. Station car park full every day and parking now on residential roads unacceptable.
Mrs Anna Walters [4777]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Mrs Ashley Wilson [3255]			Q16	infrastructure which is mentioned as a concern is identified in the DLP as being required to support development for these sites.
Mrs B Stanley [4785]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs B Thomas [4397]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution.</p> <p>Pressure on local services such as schools and healthcare.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p>
Mrs Beverley Willacy [4442]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common centre is small and facilities are limited. The Local Plan would have to include development of the centre.</p> <p>Bus links from Balsall Common are poor and very infrequent. More frequent bus links would be required.</p> <p>The local school has already become a 4 form school and there is no capacity to expand further. A new school would be required.</p>
Mrs C Cavigan [4810]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 1 and 3.</p> <p>Very concerned about increased traffic on Hall Meadow Road, as this is only access of Riddings Hill.</p>
Mrs C A Preece [4744]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of green open space for recreation.</p> <p>Will create significant traffic problems.</p> <p>Significant investment will be required for additional schools and medical centres.</p>
Mrs C M Arnold [4820]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9.</p> <p>Present infrastructure unable to cope.</p>
Mrs C Spelman MP [2073]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 16 -</p> <p>Consider impact of new M42 junction on any development at Catherine de Barnes.</p>
Mrs C Watt [4959]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with outdoor sports pitches, youth facilities and larger dining hall, dedicated sixth form facilities and lockers for new school.</p>
Mrs Carla Hughes [3228]			Q16	<p>With regard to proposed allocations around Shirley - Objection with regards to existing road infrastructure being able to accommodate the number of new residents as it is already unable to cope with the existing volume.</p> <p>Objection to the pressure on facilities infrastructure that is already pressurised</p> <p>Objection to loss of so many local amenities and no plans to relocate them</p> <p>Objection to the vast loss of usable outdoor space and the impact from a health perspective of local residents</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4, 11, 12, 13 Objection.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues.</p> <p>Whitlocks End railway station full.</p> <p>Overflow of vehicles from Shirley station car park onto neighbouring estates.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Health services under pressure.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Parkgate development resulted in loss of part of Shirley Park.</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q16	The centre of Balsall Common, local roads and parking in the village centre and at the station will not cope with 100 new homes
Mrs Catherine Kent [3473]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Cecilia O'Brien [3825]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mrs Christine Baker [3080]			Q16	Better footpaths to the schools must be considered

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs D Baynham [4855]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with leisure centre including 50m swimming pool, and sports/events hall.
Mrs Daphne Morgan [3871]			Q16	Aware of need for housing but with 3,000 new houses proposed in the catchment of St George and St Teresa school which is already oversubscribed so not all siblings get a place denying children a Catholic education and increasing need to travel. There is a need for expanded 2 form entry school, either on same site or in Arden triangle and this should be afforded high priority in addressing needs of development.
Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]			Q16	Sites 4,11,12,13 Objection. Will add to construction traffic from HS2. Lack of sufficient school places and public transport.
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.
Mrs Denise Delahunty [3156]			Q16	I agree with principle of concentrated development so that infrastructure can be built in BUT to have MORE concentrated development in the Shirley/Dickens Heath would put too much pressure on existing infrastructure. Due to Dickens Heath, local 2ndary schools are already at capacity (all schools have porta-cabins already), roads are full to capacity & parking space is at a premium. There are other suburbs of Solihull on the edge of the urban area that have not had this amount of development imposed.
Mrs Denise Delahunty [3156]			Q16	As far as I am aware, no plans for infrastructure have been proposed? Any new concentrated development should ensure exemplary examples of cycle paths, walkways & bus routes (note Dickens Heath is still poorly served by public transport). Don't assume existing 2ndary schools can be gifted more money & expect them to absorb extra students in temporary teaching environments. New homes should have a min of 2 car parking spaces to ensure cars are kept off the roads & footpaths. Underground parking should be considered where necessary.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs DENISE HACKWORTH [2903]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4.</p> <p>Roads already full with traffic.</p> <p>Site 4 would not provide easy access to village amenities, therefore more traffic.</p> <p>Most homes have 2 cars, not everyone works in Birmingham, and most people would head to M42.</p> <p>Facilities in Dickens Heath cannot cope with further housing.</p>
Mrs Denise Horton [3158]			Q16	<p>Concern for the infrastructure to support this amount of development: the roads around the area are currently at saturation point, along with school, hospital and health facilities. This development would also be destroying significant pockets of green belt which support varied wildlife and provide green spaces for the current residents.</p>
Mrs E Hedley [3516]			Q16	<p>Site 8:</p> <p>Impact on local services and infrastructure.</p> <p>Proposed site over 1km from public transport.</p> <p>Car parking inappropriate use of Green Belt</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Foster [3943]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>More housing will exacerbate existing traffic volumes.</p> <p>Highway safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians due to increased traffic.</p> <p>Pollution from traffic will increase.</p> <p>Existing parking issues will be increased.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road will get worse.</p> <p>Permanent loss of a sports facility.</p> <p>Schools and medical centres already oversubscribed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q16	<p>A number of infrastructure items are listed as necessary to support development in the BS. These include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Traffic calming measures (town centre, Station Road, Kenilworth Road and Meeting House Lane - More green spaces [examples provided]. - Extension of the by-pass (Hallmeadow Road) - Extension of the Kenilworth Greenway and with bike access from Balsall Common - More frequent and later night rail services from Berkswell - additional bust routes, more frequent services - supermarket (off by-pass) - Additional shop, bar and restaurant premises (but not all in the current town centre)
Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [3326]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q16	<p>Transport infrastructure, health facilities, schools etc... need to be addressed.</p>
Mrs faye sharp [3845]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q16	<p>Sites 1/2/3.</p> <p>Accessibility to the Barratts Lane site is virtually non-existent.</p> <p>Public transport is poor and new housing will result in even more traffic within the village.</p> <p>Additional secondary school places will be needed and at least one new primary school. All of which need addressing prior to any more housing. No mention is made of drainage/sewage requirements.</p> <p>Developers should also commit to providing green space and adequate parking in any development. When new housing might abut existing properties it would be sensible to insist on a green space corridor to protect residents from the new development.</p>
Mrs Gillian Dale [3490]			Q16	<p>I understand that when large developments are being proposed the infrastructure of the area needs to be considered, schools, access, health,etc.</p> <p>I am interested to hear where the children of primary school age will be accessing their schooling given that BC Primary School tends to run at full capacity most years (I was a school governor in the past) following the proposed development in BC.</p>
Mrs Gillian Tonkys [4787]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs H Brookes [4795]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Hazel Reed [3279]			Q16	<p>Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of leisure facilities used by community.</p> <p>Development will put additional pressure on facilities in neighbouring Council areas.</p> <p>Majors Green already taken a significant amount of additional traffic and parking from Whitlocks End railway station. Planned expansion of car park is based on current usage, which will mean more traffic through the village.</p> <p>High volume of traffic on Haslucks Green Road. Dangerous bend in Majors Green had over 30 accidents in 18 months.</p> <p>Roads not designed as rat runs.</p> <p>Road surfaces already damaged.</p> <p>Should encourage more cycling and walking.</p> <p>Overstretched schools and doctor surgeries.</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Ioanne Burnell [3445]			Q16	<p>Regarding site 18 - Would increase traffic within the surrounding area.</p> <p>Would impact on schools and doctors where there is lack of capacity.</p> <p>Lack of sports ground facilities for football and Rugby in the local area.</p>
Mrs J A Leighton [3321]			Q16	<p>concerned about impact on traffic, doctors, and schools</p>
Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs J Campbell [4322]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Existing congestion at peak hours.</p> <p>Constant stream of traffic from Dickens Heath to Tanworth Lane.</p> <p>Roads cannot cope with additional traffic.</p> <p>Already overstretched health care system. Why A&E is flooded.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and health benefits.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Carpenter [4796]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs J E Smith [4781]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs J Litchfield [4762]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications. Unreasonable to get a road link via Barratts Lane or Meeting House Lane due to narrow sections.</p> <p>Possible access at or near 111 MHL is unreasonable. Need adequate pedestrian pathways.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed. Otherwise impact of heavy HGVs in the area.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Vernon [4797]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs J Watson [4765]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 1.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Lack of trust in volunteers to deliver infrastructure commitments.</p> <p>Concerns about access to site and traffic and road safety implications. Unreasonable to get a road link via Barratts Lane or Meeting House Lane due to narrow sections.</p> <p>Possible access at or near 111 MHL is unreasonable. Need adequate pedestrian pathways.</p> <p>Bypass needs to connect from Evesons Fuels to Berkswell Station.</p> <p>Development could not commence until HS2 works were completed. Otherwise impact of heavy HGVs in the area.</p> <p>Need for new primary school and shops. Pressure on secondary school places.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs J Wort [4418]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Description of site in Appendix C is misleading. Large area of allocation is Arden Tennis Club which is not unused.</p> <p>Loss of tennis club would be detrimental to local community. Other facilities are well-used.</p> <p>No other similar facility locally.</p> <p>Loss of accessible sports pitches in a residential area.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools.</p>
mrs jacqui gardner [3687]			Q16	<p>Whilst I have no objection to new homes being built in Balsall Common, I don't think the infrastructure can support or facilitate this growth. If these new homes are built you need to build a "2nd" town centre (a bit like Kenilworth did years ago), it has it's old high street and then the current main one. In addition the primary schools are already fully subscribed.</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q16	<p>No mention is made of the new and improved road and highways infrastructure that would be required to support the proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley, south of Dog Kennel Lane and TRW/The Green Shirley to avoid severe traffic congestion in the morning peak time along Dickens Heath Road and Stratford Road.</p>
Mrs Jane Starling [3207]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Football pitches / netball courts, running track, theatre.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jean Walters [2569]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4:</p> <p>Council has not fully examined the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Existing congestion through Dickens heath and surrounding roads. Used as rat runs.</p> <p>Parking shortage in Village.</p> <p>Would create substantial car traffic, along with other proposals.</p> <p>Major road improvements would be necessary - not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Rail service from Whitlocks End only goes to Birmingham and Stratford upon Avon; not Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Town centre poorly accessible on bus.</p> <p>No direct road/cycleway to village centre. Cycle and pedestrian access to the village centre was a core principle of original masterplan. Proposal would be too large for that.</p>
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q16	<p>The plan is silent on infrastructure improvements to support approved developments in Hockley Heath, including current lack of transport infrastructure and facilities and the likely impact upon them from existing and proposed developments and growth near to village, and the impact on educational facilities, which is not satisfactorily addressed given the forecast household growth in the plan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jill Collins [3784]			Q16	<p>In relation Site 8 and 9 Objection.</p> <p>Parking extremely difficult in Knowle.</p> <p>Few employment opportunities.</p> <p>Parking at Dorridge station is full.</p> <p>Encourages more car journeys.</p> <p>Added pressure to M42.</p> <p>Principal of Arden Academy has given assurance there will be sufficient secondary school places for new residents in Knowle.</p> <p>Concerned about sufficient primary school places if new development not provide additional capacity, when St George's and St Theresa's is replaced.</p>
Mrs Joanna Holloway [3491]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase pressure on services (doctors) - traffic and congestion on high street and other local roads
Mrs Judith Chivers [3803]			Q16	<p>Housing Site 4 will require expansion of car park at Whitlocks End station as is currently at capacity and residents unlikely to walk, a pedestrian crossing, improvements to the frequency of the one bus route that services the area, and improvements to Tilehouse Lane as buses force pedestrians off pavement and to Haslucks Green Road between Bills Lane and Drawbridge Road with bus laybys provided or there will be an increase in the risk of accidents.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q16	Balsall Common already faces a wide range of infrastructure challenges resulting from previous development and scale of proposals can only worsen this situation. An holistic impact assessment and strategic approach to infrastructure development is required to address village centre, school and medical provision, car parking and local road system, with green spaces and buffer zones used to mitigate the impact of new development. There should be no access onto Meeting House Lane or surrounding roads as the rural nature of the lane and the junction of MHL and Kelsey Lane cannot accommodate more.
Mrs Judy Hill [3463]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4 and 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of 9 football pitches and 2 rugby pitches.</p> <p>Where will football clubs re-locate?</p> <p>Loss of areas for children's play and recreation.</p> <p>Will increase strain on local services, schools, doctors.</p> <p>Already congested roads.</p>
Mrs Julie Cooper [3800]			Q16	Do not believe that the infrastructure identified for Balsall Common can be demonstrated to be sufficient given the changes to the area with the impact of HS2 and the 1150 houses identified to a village which currently has circa 7100 residents with what could be a further 3000 plus residents in the new housing, which will change the landscape of the village completely whilst the village centre can not sustain such a growth without it having a detrimental impact to the village as a whole.
Mrs K A Voogd [4391]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase danger to residents from on-street parking on Sharmans Cross Road and surrounds.</p> <p>Will increase flood risk in area.</p> <p>Increase in cars.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs K Drakes [4793]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs K Phillips [3938]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Need for sports pitches will rise with increased population due to housing allocations. Should be considered.</p>
Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]			Q16	<p>Balsall Common not a suitable 'town centre'. Improving the centre has to be a priority before any new housing.</p> <p>Settlement does not meet Council's own accessibility criteria.</p> <p>More cars will increase carbon footprint.</p> <p>Existing congestion and poor road network, e.g. roads around Barratt's Farm.</p>
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q16	<p>The traffic congestion in the Shirley and Dickens Heath area has increased rapidly over recent years and the roads, pavements and traffic calming measures make it unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. Bills Lane junction with Haslucks Green Road, Tythebarn Lane junction with Tilehouse Lane and the stretch of Haslucks Green Road between these two junctions is very busy and have narrow and poor street lighting. The country Lanes of Bichy Leasowes and Cleobry Lane are also becoming very busy. Maintaining a healthy lifestyle for walkers and cyclists has not been considered. Congestion on the A34.</p>
Mrs Kirsty King [3592]			Q16	<p>Object to Sites 1, 2, and 3, as schools and amenities within the village are already struggling, the village centre is too small, the roads cannot cope with the traffic as it is and 1150 additional homes will put too much strain on the village.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs L J Bull [4440]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>School and medical centre already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Increase in traffic, pollution.</p> <p>Impact on highway safety, danger to pedestrians, cyclists.</p> <p>Existing parking issues.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Further parking issues if Solihull Arden Club remains.</p>
Mrs L Keene [4800]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Laura Dunne [3806]			Q16	<p>Inadequate infrastructure in Knowle to support over 1000 new homes - a likely increase in village population of around 30% (assuming an average of 3 people per new house). Insufficient capacity within local schools to accommodate children from this number of new houses. If a whole new school were to be required it would split the village in two as the school is the focal point for families. Inadequate parking provision for the current population - how will the increase be catered for?</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q16	<p>Current infrastructure not adequate to support amount of development proposed in Shirley South, as the roads are inadequate and there are no alternative routes that could be built to relieve the situation. Additional development will funnel more traffic into an already overburdened system that cannot be effectively improved.</p> <p>The NHS is also under severe strain and there are limits to how much GPs can expand, around Shirley. Solihull hospital has been downgraded over the years resulting in Shirley residents having to utilise Heartlands hospital.</p> <p>This will only exacerbate the problem.</p>
Mrs Lion [4350]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Already suffering from massive increase in traffic and transport.</p> <p>Doctor surgery on Stratford Road is overstretched.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed.</p> <p>Will be difficult to access new HS2 station.</p> <p>Congestion on A34 and M42 will worsen until station opens.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Lorraine Horlor [3498]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q16	<p>Sites 8 & 9 Knowle will be largely car dependent because far from the centres of Knowle and Dorridge, which means a potential increase in car numbers in Knowle of 1,700 cars which has significant implications for air quality, land take, traffic volumes, car parking and living conditions. Rail capacity needs increases and additional car parking is needed near the station. Significant impact on the Dorridge centre's conservation area. A by pass for Knowle would divide the village and damage local businesses. Indoor sports facility, theatre and evening classes at Arden required.</p>
Mrs Lynda Moore [4233]			Q16	<p>the existing facilities in Balsall Common are already inadequate for the present village size. During any future development, it is essential that the infrastructure be in place first. Schools, shops, medical facilities, leisure facilities and parking are all overstretched. Balsall Common cannot sustain the proposed developments. Surely there are other villages in the borough with better facilities already, which can share the burden, if greenfield sites have to be used. However, I stress again that Previously Developed Land should be used first.</p>
Mrs M A Highfield [3162]			Q16	<p>Inadequate provision available for infrastructure to support increased population and necessitates movement for employment in other areas resulting in higher volume of traffic.</p>
Mrs M Edmonds [4804]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs M Stewart [4298]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Dickens Heath traffic already causing traffic jams from Bills Lane to Shakespeare Drive and Tamworth Lane.</p> <p>Emergency vehicles can't get through Shirley as too congested.</p> <p>Need to build homes where they can widen roads.</p>
Mrs Manjit Kaur-badial [3748]			Q16	<p>Sites 1, 2:</p> <p>Do not support bypass as plans are not detailed or clear enough.</p> <p>Balsall Common Primary school is oversubscribed. Should reduce catchment to just Balsall Common.</p> <p>Sports pitches would be sufficient if Council did not dispose of recreation ground at Site 2.</p> <p>Local amenities and services would not be able to cope, e.g. doctors, shops, buses.</p> <p>Site 1 is preferred to Site 2 as it is close to the train station. Would reduce traffic coming through the village.</p>
Mrs Maria Morris [3534]			Q16	<p>I am very concerned regarding the infrastructure for the development in Balsall Common. The school is already one of the biggest in the region and has no room for expansion. There are no local sports facilities eg astro turf / swimming pool. There are limited shops other than food meaning that cars have to be used frequently. The public transport is poor from Balsall Common</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Mary Hitchcock [4671]			Q16	For Balsall Common: New GP surgery Bus services Schools A new centre for the community Support for the Jubilee Centre - a Cinema would be a good option
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q16	Local schools in Balsall Common would not be able to cope with additional need and would have to expand resulting in more land being taken up for development. Medical practices will be unable to cope with the demand put on them. Berkswell Station car park cannot cope with the number of cars on a daily basis. Local roads used for additional parking daily.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q16	<p>Sites 1,2,3.</p> <p>No mention is made of shopping, banking etc, as banks are withdrawing from Balsall Common.</p> <p>Car parking facilities are limited in the village. Dangerous in some areas.</p> <p>Impact on local amenities and services. No mention is made of shopping, banking etc, as banks are withdrawing from Balsall Common.</p> <p>Car parking facilities are limited in the village, dangerous in some areas.</p> <p>Drainage issues.</p> <p>Noise from HS2.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion.</p> <p>Poor existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Poor public sector connectivity with the local economic centres which are primarily to the East and South; this is the way traffic flows at peak times.</p>
Mrs N Walton [4818]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]			Q16	<p>Infrastructure inadequate for housing site 13 as the roads are very congested at peak times especially Bills Lane, Shakespeare Drive and Tanworth Lane causing problems for people crossing Bills Lane, were not designed for this amount of traffic, have remained unaltered except for traffic calming despite Shirley having grown gently over the years, and parking at Shirley and Whitlocks End railway stations is over capacity now.</p>
Mrs P Goodban [4405]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Loss of open space.</p> <p>Should retain historical covenant on land for sport use.</p> <p>Increase flood risk, due to increased hard surfacing.</p> <p>Increase traffic on busy roads. Increase hazards to road users, particularly walking children to school.</p> <p>Many road accidents at Sharman Cross/Strettsbrook Road junction.</p> <p>Local infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic, sewage, flooding, hazards.</p>
Mrs P Green [4790]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs P Phillips [4799]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Pam Marsden [4802]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 11, 12, 13:</p> <p>Increased traffic would reduce accessibility - Bills Lane has high levels of congestion and used as a regular access to A34. Fatal accident in recent times;</p> <p>Increased population would add pressure on local services;</p> <p>Increased flooding;</p> <p>New housing in Shirley area will not benefit HS2;</p>
Mrs Pamela Frost [4807]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Pamela Martin [3182]			Q16	<p>Concerns about impact of housing increase in Blythe and Shirley wards due to SLP allocations, Tidbury Green appeals and proposals in Draft Local Plan on traffic on roads connecting to Majors Green, in particular Haslucks Green Road.</p> <p>Seek confirmation of traffic flow analysis of existing and future proposals.</p> <p>Houndsfield Lane used a short cut from Shirley to Dickens Heath; Ford floods during heavy rain. Potential for bridge.</p> <p>Consultation required with Worcestershire County Council Highways Authority.</p> <p>Roads in Worcestershire unable to cope; traffic flows to motorways.</p> <p>Trains and station car park oversubscribed.</p> <p>Seek confirmation that infrastructure needs of Majors Green considered.</p>
Mrs Rebecca Reade [3449]			Q16	<p>New homes would cause immense stress on the local area roads, schools and amenities. We moved to the area last year and were unable to get our son into the local school we chose due to over subscription.</p>
Mrs Rita Perks [4805]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Ruth Neal [4301]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and wellbeing.</p> <p>Dickens Heath growing at tremendous rate, no longer a village.</p> <p>Roads around Tidbury Green and Earlswood are in a bad state. Will only get worse.</p>
Mrs S Butcher Jones [4861]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with community group meeting provision, gym and swimming pool.</p>
Mrs S Larkin [4948]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, multi-purpose community space that can be used as a theatre, group exercise facility etc., sports facilities including tennis court, football fields.</p> <p>The new school should become a community hub that could link with the large number of developments for older people within the area to support community cohesion and help combat social isolation and loneliness (particularly the elderly).</p>
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13:</p> <p>Not enough parking at Shirley and Whitlock's End railway stations, cars parked on residential roads.</p> <p>Loss of open space and amenity land.</p> <p>Increased pressure on infrastructure.</p> <p>Future flood risk.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Samantha Setchell [3741]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4 Objection.</p> <p>Significant increase in traffic volume and hazardous driving behaviour in Majors Green in last 15 years.</p> <p>Drivers lost control and entered gardens on Peterbrook Road.</p> <p>Unsafe to cross road.</p> <p>Expanding Dickens Heath will make traffic worse as residents commute to Birmingham and elsewhere.</p> <p>Loss of football pitches. Impact on local children and opportunities for sport and recreation.</p>
Mrs Sandra Stephens [4347]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing traffic issues. Near a school and cycle route. Danger to children.</p> <p>Parking already bad at peak times and sports matches.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical centres.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sport use.</p>
Mrs Sarah Houghton [3424]			Q16	<p>The area is not going to cope with all the traffic and also what about the wildlife that is there.</p>
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q16	<p>Roads in South Shirley inadequate and already suffering as a result of new Dickens Heath development, which needs addressing before any further development takes place. Insufficient primary and secondary schools so provision for new schools required and/or means of getting additional pupils to/from existing schools as road access already insufficient. Flooding risks from building over boggy fields. No provision for new nurseries. No youth provision. Train infrastructure insufficient in Shirley - better to develop on better Solihull line. Cycling and walking more dangerous and more pollution. Access to HS2 impossible due to gridlocked traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Shimi Kaur [4644]			Q16	bypass is not a 'bypass' but will service the new development,
Mrs Una Cole [3840]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Mrs Valerie Young [3410]			Q16	Local services of schooling and medical which are already under pressure would only suffer further with such a development.
Mrs Victoria Moses [3121]			Q16	The impact of existing developments on local road systems which have had no road improvements to compensate for additional growth is significant.
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q16	Whitlocks End railway station is on the boundary with Bromsgrove District Council and is the main public transport facility for Dickens Heath. Whitlocks End station car park is heavily used and consequently this has led to an increase in traffic on local roads, again without any improvement in infrastructure.
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q16	In Balsall Common the necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Ellen Darlison [3307]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 2:</p> <p>Playing fields and allotments are key contributors to health and well-being. Both are important for community cohesion and physical activity. These should not be built on.</p> <p>Not an accessible location.</p> <p>Will result in 150+ extra cars.</p> <p>Existing congestion in village.</p> <p>Ground water flooding on site.</p>
Ms K Standley [1724]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.</p>
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Lisa Inkpen [3557]			Q16	In Balsall Common, I would really welcome a bypass. The traffic is vey heavy and fast during rush hour. I walk along Kelsey Lane to the primary school. It feels unsafe as lorries and cars speed along the road many doing over the 30mph speed limit. With the proposed housing development there will be more cars on the road. Parents will be put off walking from the new housing development due to the unsafe levels of traffic on Kelsey Lane, Alder Lane, Kenilworth Road.
Ms Louise Taylor [3443]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Roads will not cope with extra traffic.</p> <p>Not enough school places.</p> <p>Doctors overstretched.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Ms Susan Agnama [3078]		Q16	<p>Appropriate infrastructure to be considered please before any housing is approved at all!</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>Solutions to handle the increased traffic along the Kenilworth Road, through and around the village centre that will arise from new housing development.</p> <p>Is a relief road planned?</p> <p>Station car park already full to capacity - where will new residents park? Could use GP car park?</p> <p>Plans to pedestrianise shopping area?</p> <p>Knock down Shell garage for shoppers.</p> <p>Will there be more regular buses into Knowle/Solihull?</p> <p>Semi rural area where car is a necessity.</p> <p>Impact of traffic and school run.</p> <p>Need to provide sufficient school places.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Ms Susan Holden [4423]		Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sporting use. Site not been well promoted by existing owners.</p> <p>Lack of sporting facilities in the area.</p> <p>Add to existing traffic issues, particularly at peak times and school run. Increased risk to pedestrians, especially schoolchildren.</p> <p>Increase to flood risk due to increase in hardsurfacing. Other green spaces been lost nearby, e.g. Lucas sports ground.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation.</p> <p>Local amenities already overstretched, e.g. GPs and Solihull hospital.</p>
Myran Larkin [4296]		Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
N Birtley [4453]			Q16	<p>Site 1 Objection.</p> <p>Generate high volume additional traffic. Already busy area. Inadequate parking in village; little or no opportunity to increase provision. Would create congestion at/near station roundabout.</p> <p>Traffic flow towards Coventry already restricted by the light controlled light underpass.</p> <p>Pressure on station car park. Many rail travellers already park on Hallwmeadow Road up to Lavender Hall Road roundabout, creating difficulty for passing traffic.</p> <p>Pressure on oversubscribed schools and local health services.</p>
Nadia McGarry [4240]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Neal Clements [4379]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of too much green space.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>More pressure on oversubscribed schools and services in the area.</p>
Neil Jackson Baker [4668]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Neil Sears [3923]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Network Rail (Town Planning Team) [2537]			Q16	<p>Where proposals are likely to increase footfall at railway stations the Local Planning Authority should consider a developer contribution (either via CIL, S106 or unilateral undertaking) to provide funding for enhancements as stations as a result of increased numbers of customers.</p>
Network Rail (Town Planning Team) [2537]			Q16	<p>On page 144 there is a comment, "Improvement to passenger waiting facilities at Berkswell Station." The council should clarify exactly what improvements to pedestrian waiting facilities they envisage or are seeking.</p> <p>Any enhancements at railway stations, including Berkswell Railway Station, would need to be fully funded by the third party developer from either S106 or CIL or unilateral undertaking. Any additional facilities at Berkswell Railway Station (over that which is extant) would need to be agreed with London Midland and agreement would need to be reached over who would have ownership of the asset with London Midland and Network Rail.</p>
Nick Larkin [3514]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick Spence [4973]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, 4G floodlit pitch, multiple sports hall, cricket net facilities. I believe the school does not currently offer facilities that are up to date and suitable for the community to use. With the addition of these facilities the school would be able to offer the community meaningful facilities that could be used to promote a healthy lifestyle to all in a time in which health and obesity problems are such a wide concern and provide lifelong learning and healthy lifestyles to all.
Nick Williams [4950]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with additional infrastructure for medical, parking and shopping facilities and new theatre and gym.
Nick & Abby Fox [4508]			Q16	Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q16	Residents and business' concerns are very clear that there is too much pressure on local infrastructure now and the scale of development proposed must be reduced. These concerns over infrastructure impacts have not been addressed. It is unreasonable to expect residents to accept any substantial further development in KDBH without any indication as to how the wider infrastructure impacts would be overcome.
Nick Ager [3055]			Q16	In relation to Site 8 and 9 objections. Development would exacerbate already unacceptable congestion along the High Street and Station Road.
Nick Ager [3055]			Q16	No suitable transport infrastructure appears to have been identified to support the proposed the development of the Arden Triangle.
Nick Crowe [3569]			Q16	I object to Site 9 and support the views submitted by the KDBH Forum. No provision made for the impact on infrastructure Eg roads / primary schools / medical provision.
Nicola Cleaver [4188]			Q16	infrastructure cited in the response has been identified in DLP as needing to be delivered by the developments

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nicola Dugmore [4898]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, gymnasium, sports pitches/tennis courts/squash courts, classrooms.</p>
Nigel Barney [4583]			Q16	<p>Sites 11, 12, 13.</p> <p>High levels of existing congestion on local roads: Dog Kennel Lane, Tanworth Lane, Shakespeare Drive, Blackford Lane, Haslucks Green Road and Bills Lane.</p> <p>Stretton Road is a rat run.</p> <p>Structural issues on Blackford Lane.</p> <p>Hard to get out of drive on Tanworth Lane in the mornings.</p> <p>Public transport not fit for purpose. Railway stations too small, inadequate parking, delay and cancellations, insufficient land to expand.</p> <p>Schools oversubscribed. Difficult to get children into Secondary school.</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded and Heartlands a long distance.</p> <p>Loss of flood storage.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and community benefit.</p>
Nikki Burns [4068]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Norman McKeown [4113]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
North Warwickshire Borough Council (Mr M Dittman) [3848]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 19:</p> <p>Access to the rural road network should be restricted and focused on local services and local settlement access only, with Interchange Station Traffic concentrated, directed and routed onto the Strategic Transport network only.</p> <p>Where necessary, to avoid traffic conflict with local traffic and adverse impacts on rural settlements (particularly heavy construction traffic, rat runs etc), some route and road closures should be considered as an option.</p>
North Warwickshire Borough Council (Mr M Dittman) [3848]			Q16	<p>In relation to housing and economic growth proposed in Solihull:</p> <p>DLP should take account of and address the highway infrastructure capacity wider than the Metropolitan area, and to include across the boundary into North Warwickshire.</p> <p>Note the need to address and minimise traffic levels and impacts on rural settlements and rural road network.</p> <p>Seek to separate local traffic and networks from strategic traffic, both generated by and servicing the growth in Solihull, Birmingham shortfall, construction of HS2 and eventual commuting traffic to Interchange station.</p> <p>Should be clearly addressed and stated in DLP.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerdea Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q16	Yes. infrastructure identified is appropriate.
Oliver Turley [4333]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Cause increased traffic and congestion on already busy road.</p> <p>Increased danger to pedestrians and cyclists. Designated cycling route on Sharmans Cross Road. Particular danger to children on way to Junior School.</p> <p>Increased in parking on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities. Land covenanted in 2013 for sports use. Solihull has low adult participation in sports.</p> <p>Loss of green space.</p>
P & D E Cooper [4457]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on congested road network. Will also be affected by new developments in Tidbury Green and Powergen.</p> <p>Inadequate parking provision at nearby railway stations, i.e. Whitlocks End, Shirley, Wythall and Earlswood. Therefore people will not be encouraged to use railways.</p> <p>Insufficient school places.</p> <p>Oversubscribed doctor surgeries.</p> <p>Pressure on existing busy supermarkets.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P & C Benniman [4751]			Q16	<p>Concerned about parking at Dorridge station.</p> <p>Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities.</p> <p>Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.</p>
P May [4988]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.</p>
Pamela Cheshire [4383]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing high volume of traffic.</p> <p>Long traffic queues on Streetsbrook Road and Sharmans Cross Road at peak times.</p> <p>Junction of Dorchester Road/Streetsbrook Road is particularly dangerous.</p> <p>Consider safety of schoolchildren walking to school.</p> <p>Parents dropping children off are partially blocked by parked cars.</p> <p>On-street parking issues caused by people parking car in area and walking to station or town centre.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools and doctors surgeries.</p> <p>Land should be retained for sport or leisure activities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Pamela Deakin [4406]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Existing congestion on busy roads.</p> <p>Local amenities will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Oversubscribed schools and doctors.</p>
Patricia Harfield [4767]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure inadequate; high levels of congestion. Leaving or returning to Woodlands Estate during rush hour is very difficult. Steady stream of traffic from Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green.</p>
Patrick McLarnon [3452]			Q16	<p>Site 13</p> <p>Local resources already at breaking point</p> <p>Traffic is beyond ridiculous at rush hour</p> <p>Only real green area and will have a major impact on local wildlife and greenery</p>
Patrick Taylor [4955]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with cycle parking, swimming pool and climbing wall facility.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Patrick Wells [4396]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site Objections 8 and 9.</p> <p>Traffic problems will increase.</p> <p>Disagree with proposal to demolish Arden School and rebuild. Waste of millions of pounds of taxpayer money that has been spent on the school. Should restrict catchment to Knowle and Dorridge.</p>
Paul & Julie Meaden [4528]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Paul Deane [3120]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Paul Eden [4841]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire:</p> <p>Would like to see following community facilities at new school:</p> <p>Gym,</p> <p>Pool.</p>
Paul Haver [3395]			Q16	<p>Infrastructure will not cope.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul J Dufrane [4410]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Road network cannot support this number of homes.</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation, exercise and health & wellbeing.</p>
Paul Lamaison [4863]			Q16	<p>Rather than a new secondary school at Arden, a new school should be built in Hockley Heath to rival Knowle allowing both to operate with smaller class sizes and raise standards through competition.</p>
Paul Moore [3990]			Q16	<p>Phasing of Balsall Common developments will take place at the same time as HS2 and will put strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for before further development.</p>
Paul Robbins [4392]			Q16	<p>Traffic problems on Sharmans Cross Road at peak times. Will increase danger to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Increase in parking issues. Already difficult at peak times, school run and when football club has major fixtures. Local business and commuters use the rugby club ground for parking.</p> <p>Increase in flood risk.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities. Solihull continues to fall in national league tables. In 3rd quartile nationally for over-16 participation in sport 3 times a week.</p> <p>Neighbouring football club has a shortage of pitches and wish to use the rugby pitches.</p> <p>Sporting covenant on rugby pitches. Safeguard land for sporting use.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Paul Rylah [4994]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Sports centre, sports track, community hall / theatre / meeting place, swimming pool would be nice but unsure if the maintenance would be a financial burden to the school. No convinced it would generate enough income to cover costs.</p>
Paula Pountney [4579]			Q16	<p>Already congestion around Shirley and gridlocked on Haslucks Green Road, Bills Lane, Dog Kennel Lane etc.</p> <p>M42 interchange is busiest motorward outside M25.</p> <p>How will Bromsgrove Council respond?</p> <p>Loss of open space for recreation and children's play.</p> <p>Shirley Park too small and only restricted dog area.</p> <p>Loss of flood storage and greater flood risk to properties.</p> <p>Council haven't described infrastructure required to support these development.</p>
Paula Quinn [3821]			Q16	<p>Highlights need for increase in primary school facilities for new housing proposals in Knowle and Dickens Heath, in particular impact on St George and St Teresa school which has been unable to expand and is forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings at school, and whose catchment includes new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and Blythe Valley as well as Knowle/Dorridge, which should be addressed as a matter of priority.</p>
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q16	Believe that the infrastructure identified to support the proposed allocations are correct- funding from CIL or S106 contributions will assist the council in providing the right infrastructure to meet the needs resulting from new development.
Peter & Eunice Simpson [4447]			Q16	In relation to Site 4 Objection. High levels of existing congestion. Local roads used as rat runs, e.g. Drawbridge Road. Shirley and Whitlock End railway station car parks full at 8am. Are there any plans to extend these car parks? Existing traffic from Dickens Heath is already a problem.
Peter & Penny Coggan [4888]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with sports facilities including possible swimming pool, community hall to replace village hall, youth facilities and extra primary provision as moving a primary school will not solve shortage of places.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q16	A new primary school will be needed and a down grading of incoming students from other areas to the senior school. There is a poor village centre, with only one modern retail building. The centre requires elevation to something like a moderate town centre. Not that Balsall Common should be elevated to a town but one has to be realistic. Poor bus services need to be looked at and the station requires personnel and a timetable that has every local train stopping.
Peter Holmes [4371]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Loss of green space for recreation and visual amenity. Impact on infrastructure.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Lowe [4776]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Peter Owen [3493]			Q16	<p>Density of proposal out of character for the area.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Doubt there will be sufficient parking for Arden Club and properties at Site 18.</p> <p>Flooding issues in nearby back gardens.</p> <p>Schools and medical centres overstretched.</p> <p>Loss of sporting use.</p>
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q16	<p>In Balsall Common the bypass should be a dual carriageway to the North East of site 1 along the corridor, blighted by HS2 development, and continue to rejoin the existing A452 where it forks to go to Kenilworth / Honiley, known as Gambols Corner.</p> <p>Regarding Frog Lane, If this site is seriously considered it should be mandated for the developer to provide a reasonable roundabout to calm traffic.</p>
Phil Chessell [4287]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Phil Henrick [4427]			Q16	<p>Site 9.</p> <p>Focus of Arden 2020 project (rebuilding Arden Academy) should be exclusively on the pupils and driving up standards of education in Solihull.</p> <p>Would be more appropriate to leave Arden Academy where it is and meet demand for secondary school places on another site? The competition between the two would drive up standards. A super-school will not benefit children's education.</p>
Phil Leech [4543]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure; current utilities under pressure e.g. surface water flooding and foul drainage. Loss of green space will remove a natural soakaway.</p> <p>Impact on oversubscribed schools and doctor surgeries.</p> <p>Local traffic congestion at peak times and school run.</p> <p>Loss of local sporting facilities.</p>
Philip Colclough [3572]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Philip Wood [4552]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Philippa Lowe [4778]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Phillip Shakles [3440]			Q16	<p>Regarding the sites to the south of Shirley - Schools, doctors, hospitals and other services & amenities are stretched now. Will they be able to cope with an increased the population? Are there Plans to improve these services and facilities?</p>
Prof Jon Binner [3054]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4.</p> <p>I can find no indication of any plans to increase facilities in Dickens Heath to accommdate new population, e.g. car parking, shops, pubs, restaurants, etc.</p> <p>Dickens Heath is already over-populated for its size and facilities (as is the railway station at Whitlock's End) and the roads are too narrow for yet more cars.</p> <p>More streetlighting required. Danger of road fatality.</p> <p>Considerable cost to upgrade to a small town.</p>
Professor Derek Sheldon [3955]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Existing shortage of pitches in Solihull. Should be replaced with equivalent accessibility and quality.</p> <p>Will increase volumes of traffic; already heavily congested area.</p> <p>Serious impact on highway, pedestrian and cyclist safety, especially schoolchildren.</p>
R Ilyas [4928]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, gym, astroturf.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rachael Jackson [4933]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool for lessons.
Rachel Caswell [4871]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with theatre and swimming pool.
Raghu Devarajan [4374]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Increase in traffic will lead to significant noise and pollution, and adverse impact on residents and those walking and cycling for leisure/commute. Increase in congestion. Impact on road safety. History of traffic related accidents on this stretch of road.
Rajko Pajic [3828]			Q16	infrastructure cited in representation has been identified in the DLP.
Raymond Wong [3450]			Q16	Regarding site 13 - I do not believe that we have the necessary infrastructure in place to support such a huge increase in population.
re West Mercia Police [684]	Ms H Winkler	re West Mercia Police (Ms H Winkler) [1910]	Q16	Disappointed there is no mention of the need to consider the impact on emergency service infrastructure or of the need for increased Police infrastructure provision. The scale of development proposed will inevitably have implications for the maintenance of safety and security. There is likely to be a need for additional Police infrastructure. Wording similar to that included in the Solihull Local Plan 2013 should be included in the table of allocated sites. For each of the allocated sites the wording should be as follows: '...Consider impact on social infrastructure provision, eg. Emergency services and community facilities.'

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rebecca Clare [3956]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Rebecca England [4901]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Computers, sports, library/working space</p>
Rich Westman [4314]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities. One of five sports grounds at risk in the DLP. Understand Council has a statutory requirement to ensure lost pitches are replaced with facilities of equivalent quality and accessibility. Difficult to see how this will achieved.</p> <p>Not meet accessibility criteria in Policy P7. Will encourage car dependency.</p>
Richard Coles [3499]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Evans [2640]			Q16	<p>Lack of infrastructure in Balsall Common:</p> <p>Primary and secondary schools oversubscribed and no room to expand.</p> <p>Re-siting schools would make them inaccessible and add to congestion.</p> <p>Inadequate parking at train station; Hallmeadow Road unofficial overspill parking.</p> <p>High car ownership.</p> <p>Cycle lanes inadequate.</p> <p>Village centre is not thriving.</p> <p>Should have put a community facility next to Coop. High need in the village.</p> <p>Youth club barely used.</p> <p>No room for village centre to expand.</p> <p>Consider social impact of site proposals.</p>
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q16	<p>With regard to Site 1, the proposed highway access is unsuitable and will put traffic onto residential roads. No "bypass" is proposed, but with the lack of funding the proposals are likely to create a rat-run that will cause further environmental harm for residents. There is no strategy to deliver bus service and school provision. With regard to Site 3, it is far too distant from the village centre to benefit from the quoted infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>The A452 only becomes congested when there are problems on the motorway network, and there is no identified need for improved capacity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Onions [4280]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.
Richard Shaylor [4323]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic movements on already congested Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Parking reduces traffic to one lane.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Existing lack in Solihull.</p> <p>Extra demand on overstretched hospitals, GP services, schools.</p>
Rishi Jassal [3523]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion and parking issues</p> <p>Need for sports ground</p> <p>Schools and medical centres oversubscribed</p>
Robert Street [3904]			Q16	<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <p>Traffic and congestion in and around Dickens Heath, particularly Tythe Barn Lane.</p> <p>Entire road network in Dickens Heath in a poor state; road surface and safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Current infrastructure inadequate. Concerns about school and medical facilities.</p> <p>Parking - severe lack in the village currently and at Whitlocks End station. Cannot see how this can be remedied by proposal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert & Doreen Warnock [4445]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Will schools and doctor surgeries be expanded or new ones built to meet increased demand?</p> <p>Solihull hospital been downgraded, will be inadequate to meet new demand.</p> <p>Local roads only 'B' class.</p> <p>Existing congestion. What measures are planned to ease traffic flow?</p>
Robert Harrison [3968]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 1, 2 and 3 Objections.</p> <p>Roads and lanes around the village are noticeably busier since new developments on Kenilworth Road.</p> <p>Meeting House Lane will become a thoroughfare, lane will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Balsall Common grown enormously over last ten years; reaching maximum capacity.</p>
Robert J Price [4750]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground. Inadequate supply in Solihull..</p> <p>Doctors, primary schools and other local services are not 'accessible' in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Parking would be inadequate.</p> <p>Local sewerage system overloaded.</p> <p>Site been designated for sporting uses only by Council.</p> <p>Should be leased for sport and not social housing.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Robert Jones [3970]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of leisure amenity facility. In decline generally.</p> <p>Increased traffic to Junior School. Junction with Streetsbrook Road highly dangerous.</p> <p>School expansion to cope with increased pupils would result in loss of play areas.</p>
Robert Stafford [4398]			Q16	<p>Four allocations (4,11,12,13) will have detrimental impact on already congested roads, i.e. Stratford Road, M42, Bills Lane, Tanworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane, Haslucks Green Road and Blackford Road. Other roads such as Shakespeare Drive are rat runs.</p> <p>Loss of open space for exercise, recreation, dog walking. Detrimental to health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Loss of sports fields. Government trying to promote healthy living through exercise.</p> <p>Should replace sport facilities.</p> <p>Impact on schools, GPs and other local services.</p> <p>Solihull hospital and Heartlands already under pressure.</p>
Robert Verrion [3613]			Q16	<p>Local schools and medical centres in the Sharmans Cross Road area are already oversubscribed: an additional 100 houses will exacerbate the position for local residents.</p>
Robin Hill [4621]			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - require additional provision for schools, medical and other facilities. - It would appear that this needs to be planned and enacted before the developments commence to minimise the impact and allow maximum flexibility in planning new roads/connections

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Roger & Valerie Godwin [3496]			Q16	<p>Gridlock on Stratford Road and feeder roads.</p> <p>Poor road network.</p> <p>Bills Lane is not a road, traffic problems all times of day.</p> <p>Major impact on schools, doctor surgeries, local hospital, roads, parking.</p> <p>Shirley station cannot accommodate additional parking so people park on local roads.</p> <p>Existing lack of amenities, including reducing Shirley Park and loss of trees for development.</p>
Roger Chapman [3972]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increased traffic volumes on Sharmans Cross Road and surrounds.</p> <p>Increased highway and pedestrian safety risks, especially to Junior School.</p> <p>Increased congestion at peak times.</p>
Roger Flood [3937]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Shortage of pitches currently in Solihull.</p> <p>Any loss of pitches should be replaced.</p> <p>Inadequate local facilities e.g. schools and medical care.</p> <p>School on Sharmans Cross Road already been lost to housing.</p> <p>Extra traffic would aggravate existing issues and increase danger to children walking to school.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Rosemary Bowcott [4742]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18.</p> <p>Land has been safeguarded for sporting use only. Sporting facilities are precious and should not be lost.</p> <p>Schools and services will suffer.</p> <p>Existing flooding issues.</p> <p>Added pressure to additional congestion and school traffic.</p> <p>Access from Winterbourne Road would result in too much traffic, roads are too narrow.</p> <p>Whole idea unviable.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Russell East [4330]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 4:</p> <p>Council has not fully examined the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Existing congestion through Dickens heath and surrounding roads. Used as rat runs.</p> <p>Parking shortage in Village.</p> <p>Would create substantial car traffic, along with other proposals.</p> <p>Major road improvements would be necessary - not a sustainable location.</p> <p>Rail service from Whitlocks End only goes to Birmingham and Stratford upon Avon; not Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Town centre poorly accessible on bus.</p> <p>No direct road/cycleway to village centre. Cycle and pedestrian access to the village centre was a core principle of original masterplan. Proposal would be too large for that.</p>
Russell Hogg [3235]			Q16	infrastructure identified as being deficient in response is highlighted in DLP
Russell Trevis [3172]			Q16	Infrastructure in Shirley is inadequate for growth with A34 gridlocked at peak times, insufficient schools and those in the catchment oversubscribed, and pressures on medical facilities creating problems obtaining an appointment before addition of thousands of new homes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 4, 11, 12, 13.</p> <p>Added pressure on infrastructure: schools, medical and social support, transport.</p> <p>Schools and doctors already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Transport pressures for schooling is already a dangerous activity.</p> <p>Stations at Shirley and Whitlocks End are over full.</p> <p>Reduction in quality of life.</p> <p>Loss of amenity land.</p>
Ruth Kirby [4945]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, gym.</p>
S Olsen [4971]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with additional school facilities including sixth form centre, after school clubs and caf��.</p>
Sadia Ahmad [4297]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Development will result in:</p> <p>Increased traffic and associated pollution</p> <p>Serious effect on highway safety and convenience of road users as well as pedestrians.</p> <p>Increased volumes of traffic moving in/out of site, especially those turning right out of site towards town.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrians, in particular unaccompanied children going to/from Sharmans Cross Junior School.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sally Anne Coles [3500]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Sally Hobday [4434]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation.</p> <p>Added to loss of Shirley Park as part of Parkgate scheme.</p>
Sarah & Ben Service [4598]			Q16	<p>Wish to highlight issues with capacity of boroughs schools, in particular St T&G in Knowle, whose catchment area alongside the proposed new development will result in loss of places for local children</p>
Sarah Bees [4858]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool, gym, sports hall, 4G pitch and youth centre.</p>
Sarah McGrath [4389]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation, children's play.</p> <p>Additional pressure on oversubscribed schools and GPs.</p> <p>If some land must be used for housing, suggest that part of it is kept for park or nature reserve.</p> <p>Ensure new schools and surgeries are built to meet increased demand, even before houses built.</p>
Sarah Ravenscroft [4478]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Walshaw [4310]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>More cars</p> <p>Overcrowded schools</p> <p>Drs surgeries unable to cope</p> <p>Loss of playing fields</p>
Sean Tompkins [3084]			Q16	<p>Around Dickens Heath significant road infrastructure works are required. Parking has been a problem. Upgrading of the pavements will be required. What scope is there for joint working with adjoining Councils ?</p> <p>Tythe Barn Lane traffic calming measures would need reviewing in light of the new proposal. Recommend re-opening Tythe Barn Lane so traffic can avoid the centre of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>This and surrounding development will put pressure on infrastructure like doctors and schools.</p> <p>Can the existing drainage and sewage system cope?</p>
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q16	<p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p> <p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p>
Senior Public Health Consultant (Mrs S Leahy) [2489]			Q16	<p>Concerns have been raised by Solihull GPs about the potential increased pressures on GP practices from house building in GP catchment areas.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Shaida Zaman [4341]		Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Heavily congested area with commuters and school run.</p> <p>More development will result in serious impact on highway safety and danger to pedestrians, especially children.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road is main route from Shirley to Solihull.</p> <p>Lack of amenities. Train station and town centre 1000-1100m away.</p> <p>Local bus services only run every half hour Mon-Sat and every hour on Sunday.</p> <p>GPs and primary schools 1500m from site with no direct bus links.</p> <p>Local junior school oversubscribed.</p> <p>Land covenanted for sports use. Only publicly accessible sports ground in the vicinity.</p>
Sheena Holland [4920]		Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>All weather pitch with floodlighting, swimming pool.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q16	<p>List of 'likely infrastructure requirements' is vague. Need to identify true infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>In relation to Sites 4, 12, 13 - Dickens Heath unable to cope with proposed number of new homes:</p> <p>Highways in poor state.</p> <p>High existing volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Added strain on local amenities and services, e.g. shops, doctors, schools.</p> <p>Existing parking is inadequate.</p>
Simon Bore [4864]			Q16	<p>Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with community centre, sports facilities, improved IT facilities and bus stops.</p>
Simon Clare [3953]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.</p>
Simon Gates [4847]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 9 Arden Academy questionnaire:</p> <p>Swimming pool,</p> <p>Theatre/arts centre.</p>
Simon Heath [3403]			Q16	<p>Regarding sites 11, 12 and 13, education and health care provision will struggle to meet future demand.</p> <p>The surrounding road network is at capacity (including local roads, the A34 and M42, J4).</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Simon Standley [4985]			Q16	Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.
Siobhan Williams [3683]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with relocated primary school, swimming pool and sports centre, theatre, youth zone and 4G floodlit pitch/multi-use games area.
SMBC - Childrens Services and Skills Directorate (Ms A Pearson) [2032]			Q16	see comments by the School Place planning team by school primary planning areas
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q16	Sites 4 and 13: Local infrastructure cannot cope with 2550 new homes in Blythe Ward/south of Shirley. Traffic on main and feeder roads. insufficient parking at Whitlocks End Station.
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q16	Sites 4 and 13: Local infrastructure cannot cope with 2550 new homes in Blythe Ward/south of Shirley. Traffic on main and feeder roads. Insufficient parking at Whitlocks End Station.
Solihull School [261]	Gill Brown	Nigel Gough Associates (Gill Brown) [2510]	Q16	Little mention of additional education provision proportionate to proposed housing provision.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stan Lewis [3879]			Q16	concerns on localised flooding, traffic congestion, school and medical facilities, playing pitches
Stephanie James [3497]			Q16	Objection to Site 13: Impact on local roads, schools and healthcare.
Stephen Beck [2637]			Q16	Concerned about parking at Dorridge station. Parking restrictions put in place have only moved vehicles further away; not solved chronic shortage of parking facilities. Any development in Knowle/Dorridge will increase pressure on station parking and this needs to be taken into account.
Stephen Joyce [4242]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Stephen O'Connor [3951]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Traffic regularly gridlocked in Sharmans Cross Road. Parents bring children to school in sometimes dangerous circumstances. Medical centre appointments oversubscribed. All of above will worsen with 100 additional houses. Will destroy local character. Loss of light and privacy.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Steve & Samantha Townsend & Cook [4336]			Q16	<p>Objection to Balsall Common Sites.</p> <p>Traffic significant issue in village.</p> <p>Little parking available.</p> <p>Meeting House Lane inappropriate access point to Barratt's Farm.</p>
Steve Harris [3947]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and consequently pollution.</p> <p>200+ extra cars.</p> <p>Road safety concerns, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians. Will worsen current situation, despite cycle lane. Safety of children walking to school will be jeopardised.</p> <p>Under law local amenities should be within 800m. Site 18 would be 1700m from Solihull Town Centre and 1000m from train station.</p>
Steven Dugmore [4895]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Swimming pool, gymnasium, sports pitches/tennis courts/squash courts, classrooms.</p>
Sue Dilworth [3373]			Q16	<p>Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth."</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q16	Acknowledging that any more substantial release of Green Belt land in Solihull would require additional infrastructure to that proposed in the SDLPR, the evidence base fails to consider reasonable alternatives that could deliver the necessary levels of development.
Suren Bharadwa [3944]			Q16	In relation to site 18 Objection. Schools oversubscribed. Local amenities being stretched by invasive developments. Been little effort to balance schooling with development. Existing traffic volume at peak times is excessive. Will increase and lead to increased accidents, increased air and noise pollution, danger to cyclists.
Surinder Jassal [4381]			Q16	In relation to Site 18 Objection. Increase flood risk. Land safeguarded for sports use. Policy should be reaffirmed. Increase in traffic volume, already busy road and hazardous to schoolchildren. Parking will get worse. More pressure on oversubscribed schools and medical centres. Loss of sporting facilities. Site not accessible, i.e. not within walking distance of town centre or train station.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Susan Roberts [3451]			Q16	<p>Objection Site 13</p> <p>Extra traffic on already busy roads and at junctions</p> <p>Inadequate doctor facilities</p>
Susan & Michael Avery [4542]			Q16	<p>Site 16 Objection.</p> <p>Upgrading local roads will not resolve ongoing traffic issues or accommodate 650 homes. Contrary to Policy P8.</p> <p>Schools and GPs oversubscribed.</p> <p>Bus services do not comply with Policy P7.</p> <p>Seek guarantee that increased school places, health services and public transport will be provided.</p> <p>Loss of sports facilities not accord with Challenge J.</p>
Susan & Paul Knight [4235]			Q16	<p>Objection to Sites 11, 12, 13.</p> <p>Intensive development in this area will cause issues for the following:</p> <p>Roads - will add to existing congestion issues. Most households have at least 2 cars. Tanworth Lane, Blackford Road and Stratford Rd affected by traffic from Dickens Heath and Earlswood. New development at Cheswick Green and proposed Site 4 will add more.</p> <p>Public Transport - needs to be considered.</p> <p>Schools - cannot currently cope</p> <p>Health Services - cannot currently cope</p> <p>Public amenities, e.g. shops</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
T Phillips [4976]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with community centre, gym facilities and swimming pool.
T Williams [4293]			Q16	In relation to Site 13 objection. Building in this area will create more traffic, pollution, fill up schools and stretch struggling medical centres.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q16	Understood that 'likely infrastructure requirements' for Site 9 in Appendix C are for the entire site. Our component is only 1.04ha, capable of delivering 36-40 dwellings. Recent planning permission at 'Middlefield Spring' (Site 14 in SLP) included open space provision which is to the north of Taylor Wimpey's site, north of Grove Road. Therefore not considered appropriate to provide further open play space within this small element of the overall allocation. Financial contribution towards the installation and enhancement of the play space would be considered more logical.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q16	In relation to Site 12: Taylor Wimpey specific comments include: * Integrating new highway with proposed development at West of Dickens Heath on B4102 and Dog Kennel Lane. Further clarification is required from the Council on this requirement. * Possible capacity enhancement to A34. TW support the need for possible 'mobility' capacity enhancements to A34, with priority given to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in terms of the movement hierarchy. * Requires multiple points of vehicular access. This should also include non-vehicular access.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Teresa Freville [4376]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Schools and medical centres oversubscribed.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities. Shortage of pitches in the area. Understand Council has a responsibility to ensure lost pitches are replaced with facilities of equivalent quality and accessibility.</p> <p>Traffic on Sharmans Cross Road already gridlocked every morning.</p> <p>Increase journey times by 6 times already.</p> <p>Parking issues.</p> <p>Will be dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]			Q16	<p>Site 13.</p> <p>Loss of green space for recreation and community benefit.</p>
Terry Corns [4446]			Q16	<p>Residents and business' concerns are very clear that there is too much pressure on local infrastructure now and the scale of development proposed must be reduced. These concerns over infrastructure impacts have not been addressed. It is unreasonable to expect residents to accept any substantial further development in KDBH without any indication as to how the wider infrastructure impacts would be overcome.</p>
TG Autos sarah Guest [3447]			Q16	<p>The road systems (tanworth lane, dog kennel lane, dickens heath road & stratford road) can not cope with traffic as it stands already & is often grid locked in rush hour, the impact any further housing / traffic would have i cannot imagine.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Cars Area (Aimee Mallinson) [4203]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 15.</p> <p>Since closure of Bosworth Wood Primary School, local children have to go out of area as Smith Wood Primary Academy is full. 100 additional families will exacerbate issue.</p> <p>Limited recreational facilities in the area. Field on Auckland Drive is one of largest in area and well used.</p> <p>Loss of open space for sports, children's play and recreation. No alternatives available nearby.</p> <p>Existing parking issues, as many houses don't have frontages.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q16	<p>In relation to Site 16:</p> <p>Given the size of the proposed allocation, it should be feasible and viable for the existing football fields and associated community building in the north east corner of the proposed allocation to be retained for outdoor sport and recreation use.</p> <p>Sufficient size for opportunity to further improve accessibility by providing on-site community facilities.</p>
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q16	<p>In relation to Sites 8 and 9.</p> <p>Will require traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Enlarged sports complex is inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Scale of development will create urban sprawl.</p> <p>Concern that new Arden School Complex is already taken as a statement of fact. Much work still needs to be completed for inclusion in a planning application, and may not be built at all.</p> <p>A singular access to site 9 from the Warwick Road would be unacceptable, even with a roundabout.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Theresa Dacombe [4893]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, sports facilities, a centre for elderly people to meet / be cared for.
Thomas Macey [4962]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with improved community facilities including swimming pool.
Tim & Morwenna Hocombe [4917]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, youth zone, theatre, floodlit playing fields. Concern regarding access and drop off points. Access from A4141 only would be inadequate.
Tim Mason [4294]			Q16	Existing infrastructure does not support the village, in particular parking and traffic congestion.
Toby Green [4912]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, gym, sports pitches.
Tony Moon [4964]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with sports, cultural, adult education and arts facilities.
Tracy Jolly [4770]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q16	<p>Despite reference being made to the infrastructure requirements, to make that development an attractive and sustainable location, it is hard to understand how this will be the case for those more rural locations.</p> <p>Despite stating in Policy P7 'bus services will be provided for and offering at least a 30 minute daytime, evening and weekend frequency within 400m of the residential development over 100 dwellings', we feel services to these locations will not be profitable and will result in TfWM subsidising these services in long run. Therefore TfWM does not support significant development taking place at rural locations.</p>
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q16	The UGC considers that greater clarity should be provided on the amount and type of infrastructure required within the Borough in order to support the new homes, jobs and economic investment required to meet the aspirations of the Draft Plan. In turn, such clarity would also benefit the proposals for development within The Hub area and enable potential public and private funding support and investment to be agreed. The HGIP and current work evolving through the Hub Framework and Infrastructure Investment Appraisal will provide a supporting evidence base for the local plan requirements for the Hub in this regard.
V Ritters [3781]			Q16	Concerned about lack of commitment to improve infrastructure for proposed housing growth in Balsall Common. In particular, Balsall Common Primary School needs replacing by purpose built 4 form entry school, with no less facilities for the children than now, shared community facilities such as before & after school care/sports/swimming/social/multi purpose hall, realistic access for cars/parking as parents will drop off young children, safe walking/riding routes and positioned away from other schools to reduce congestion/pollution. 4 form size is needed for capacity, future proofing, financial viability, resilience & capacity to handle specialist needs and should be designed in from start.
Valerie Bennett [4600]			Q16	Our local services, such as doctors surgeries and schools will not stretch to accommodate the extra numbers of residents.
Victor & Christine Callow [3619]			Q16	The infrastructure will need to be upgraded for site 13 in terms of schools, roads and traffic management, and who will pay for this additional cost without increasing council tax, when cuts everywhere are being made by the government.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Victoria Linekar [4359]			Q16	<p>Site 18 Objection.</p> <p>Increase in traffic. Concerned for children's safety. Risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>Existing traffic issues, e.g. entrance to Squash Club on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross School is oversubscribed. Development will have major effect on school places. Will require children travelling further to school.</p> <p>More traffic pollution.</p> <p>Loss of sporting area.</p>
Victoria Lynch [4353]			Q16	<p>Site 13 Objection.</p> <p>Impact on schools, doctors and traffic.</p>
Vikki Sunner [4432]			Q16	<p>Site 18.</p> <p>Existing high levels of traffic.</p> <p>Land has been intended for sports and recreational use.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>
Vivian Drury [4984]			Q16	<p>Regarding Balsall Common, the bypass is not required. There is a lack of car parking spaces in and around the village. The GP surgery is at capacity. There is no room for expansion of surrounding roads to cope with additional traffic.</p>
Vivienne & Maurice Hadley [4745]			Q16	<p>In relation to Site 11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>Loss of green space. Important to protect amenity fields.</p> <p>Add to existing congestion, e.g. Stratford Road.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Wayne Taylor [4387]			Q16	In relation to Site 13 Objection. Loss of well-used green space. Suggest Site 13 is turned into a community park.
Wendy Cairns [4226]			Q16	need for a new/replacement junior school has been identified in the DLP
West Santisook [5007]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Swimming pool, gym, large theatre rooms, more social areas.
William B Gibbs [4369]			Q16	Phasing of the 3 sites in Balsall Common will take place in years 1 - 5 at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill. This will see a strain on the settlement in terms of already overstretched infrastructure and facilities e.g. primary school. It contravenes SMBC's stated intent to "manage the growth." The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development.
Wythall Parish Council (Miss Kerie Harris) [1943]			Q16	Concern that road infrastructure unsuitable for additional traffic, that traffic flow analysis not undertaken, that Houndsfield Lane inadequate as floods during heavy rain, that roads within Worcestershire incapable of taking additional traffic and that train service already at capacity.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q16	There is not the necessary infrastructure required to support the proposed development in Balsall Common. If Balsall Common is to become a small town rather than village the community requires more than schools and doctors surgery. A play ground for children of all ages is desperately required e.g War Memorial Park/Abbey Fields. A leisure centre for all members of the community is needed. Cycle routes linking Kenilworth and Warwick University are needed. Transport links from Kenilworth, Warwick University, Solihull, to Balsall Common then on to the Birmingham Airport and the HS2 Hub/NEC/Resort Centre with its cinema, shopping facilities are needed.
Youseff Hennous [4919]			Q16	With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include: Sports including swimming pool, public library with café, high tech youth centre, cinema.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Yvonne & Stephen Palin [4878]			Q16	Site 9 South of Knowle should be supported with swimming pool, Forest school, sports centre with community use outside school hours, and up to date ICT.
Yvonne Naylor [4456]			Q16	<p>Site 1.</p> <p>Increased traffic pressure on congested roads. Only 6% in area use public transport.</p> <p>Routes to exit the village to the east is very restricted at Station Road and Lavender Hall Lane, with no room for expansion. Most traffic will be travelling north on the A452.</p> <p>Inadequate parking provision in village for station or local services.</p> <p>Doctors oversubscribed.</p> <p>Put further strain on capacity.</p> <p>Impact of construction traffic, added to HS2 construction.</p> <p>Noise, congestion etc from new homes and proposed bypass.</p> <p>Bypass only acting as access road to new houses and not easing congestion pressure in the village.</p>
Zaki Fergusson [4903]			Q16	<p>With regard to site 9, community facilities that should be built at the new school include:</p> <p>Football pitch, gym.</p>
Zoe Speed [4472]			Q16	The necessary infrastructure to support any significant expansion of Balsall Common must be identified and planned for alongside any development recognising that phasing all allocations at same time as HS2 will allow insufficient time for necessary improvements.

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Question 17 Policy P6 Provision of Sites for Gypsies and Travellers			
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]		Q17	suggest that the wording of the policy is amended and expanded to include a criteria based approach for the assessment of planning applications on sites that have not been allocated, to allow a more responsive approach.
Colin Davis [3352]		Q17	if the council have tried to met the perceived need no one has told the gypsies as the travellers are plaguing Solihull with mass invasions on a regular basis - allocating sites for them to live on seems the opposite of the travelllers way of life its just a political fantasy and a box to tick
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]		Q17	I agree with policy P6.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Q17	I'm quite happy with the policy as it is laid out in the plan.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]		Q17	Agree - existing sites should be expanded first, and we agree with the Green Belt exceptions wording.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]		Q17	Agree - existing sites should be expanded first, and we agree with the Green Belt exceptions wording.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]		Q17	No further comment - but in agreement, so no further suggestions to Policy P6.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]		Q17	Yes, however it is not the responsibility of the local authority to provide access to 'fresh food', commendable as it is. Everyone has access to fresh food it is just the education of buying habits that need to be readjusted. This policy is equally applicable to non-Travellers as it is to Travellers.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q17	admittedly a difficult question. experience shows that such sites will become messy. preclusion against Green Belt mistaken. there are many sites ion the fringe where such lifestyle would be suitable, eg Lincoln Farm caf� Kenilworth road, a large brownfield site in GB.
Mr D Wigfield [2264]			Q17	<p>Policy needs to refer to assessment of applications, not just allocations.</p> <p>Suggest removing or amending words to cross-refer to Green Belt policy and need for vsc's. The reference to 'other locations' is ambiguous and could raise equality issues if it imposes a requirement on travellers which is not expressly imposed on others.</p> <p>Supporting text:</p> <p>Remove specific reference to 38 pitches to allow opportunity for review of need as and when necessary. Suggest more general wording to clarify that the Council will assess need through robust local evidence and meet it through allocations.</p> <p>Supporting text should also refer to planning applications.</p>
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q17	Travellers don't pay Council Tax - I don't expect so why do they enjoy such consideration?
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q17	It is impossible to disagree with the policy; the protests will come when specific sites are proposed.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q17	Agree.
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q17	Why should Gypsies & travellers be given sites. They already fail to contribute and just cause costs to the borough
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q17	Concerned about definition of 'very special circumstances' this would be hard to sustain
mr Robert Powell [3830]			Q17	Existing number of sites is adequate.
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q17	I agree but what is classed as 'very special circumstances' ?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q17	Support
Mrs Christine Baker [3080]			Q17	I feel strongly about this. Please ensure they have drinking water and toilets
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q17	Proposed approach is fine, but need to ensure that only these sites are used and that other sites are effectively protected.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q17	Agree with the policy - the problem is where!
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q17	Yes, I believe permanent sites should be available similar to Houndsfield Lane.
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q17	We have to recognise that the relative affluence of this area makes it attractive for itinerant people to come here and try to earn a living.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q17	I think the policy in P6 is rather extraordinary. All the objections one might make to building on the Frog Lane site are only applied to travellers! institutional discrimination or no money to be made out of them? The criteria in Policy P6 should apply to Frog Lane.
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (Mr A R Yarwood) [2247]			Q17	The policy is non-compliant with National policy in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites as it only deals with the allocation of sites "should it be demonstrated that additional pitches are required". This is unacceptable as it is not consistent with national policy as set out in National guidance which clearly states that local plans must set out criteria for assessing planning applications which may come forward where there is no identified need and that all applications should be determined on merit and in accordance with appropriate criteria, irrespective of need. The policy wording and justification should be modified.
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q17	Natural England recommends that "Any unacceptable adverse impact on landscape or local nature conservation designations, ecology, biodiversity or the historic environment can be mitigated" also notes national designations such as SSSIs.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q17	no comments on this.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q17	I have no opinion on this matter other than there is no point designating sites without local agreement and sites need to be managed. The last thing that is wanted is another Meriden incident.
Philip Wood [4552]			Q17	The proposed allocation of 3 greenfield sites in Balsall Common, when there are 14 brownfield sites available, would strongly suggest that due consideration has not been given to these sites, so very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be reused in preference to green field and be subject to consultation with community.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q17	17-YES
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q17	Suggest amended wording to bullet point 4: Any unacceptable adverse impact on landscape or local nature conservation designations, ecology, biodiversity or the historic environment can be avoided or mitigated;
Question 18 Improving Accessibility and Encouraging Sustainable Travel				
Alastair McCulloch [3624]			Q18	I am in general agreement but am concerned that the focus of developments proposed in Balsall Common will have the effect of increasing car use in contradiction to the overall intentions of the policies.
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q18	Whilst these are a good beginning, they are somewhat pusillanimous. There is little but lip service provided to cycle routes, for example. Solihull has an inglorious history of slapping some paint on a busy road and pretending that it's now a cycle path of some sort. The development about to be started at Blossomfield Road incorporates the standard amount of cycle provision for Solihull infrastructure developments - i.e. none. These developments offer an opportunity to, at least, build a new approach that offers true separation for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Applegreen PLC [3725]	Mr Nick Roberts	AXIS (Mr Nick Roberts) [3724]	Q18	<p>There is an overriding need for a Motorway Service Area within Solihull, which will need to be located within the current Green Belt.</p> <p>The only deliverable site for such a MSA is on land adjacent to junction 4. It is requested that the land identified be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for a MSA.</p> <p>Failing that, the Proposals Map should be updated to identify the junction 4 site as a potential location for an MSA within the Green Belt and the LPR should include a specific policy in relation to MSA provision.</p>
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q18	<p>regards as excessive the requirement for non-residential development to provide access to bus services at the frequency suggested by the DLP.</p> <p>size threshold has not been included for non-residential development, which may result in onerous application of the policy on planning applications for smaller developments, extensions etc.</p> <p>suggest amending 3rd bullet point of the policy.</p>
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q18	Support the principles of Policy P7 and P8. However, in terms of the evidence base, there is concern that the sustainability of the Arden Cross location has not been appropriately assessed.
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q18	None of the proposed sites in Balsall Common/Berkswell fulfil the criteria set out in policy 7. A lack of public transport means the proposed developments will be heavily car dependent, and do not encourage sustainable travel The present frequency of limited bus services does not meet the criteria for 100+ dwellings, and the poor rail connectivity of only two trains an hour Monday to Saturday and only one an hour Sunday means the public transport accessibility is inadequate for the three sites proposed. Policy P8 indicates SMBC are unlikely support these developments sites in such circumstances.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q18	<p>Support a long overdue bypass for Balsall Common to relieve congestion and provide better access for new development. Would create opportunities for cycle paths in the village</p> <p>Public transport is poor in Balsall Common, this needs to be bettered to accommodate the level of development proposed. A realistic plan for how improvements to public transport are to be achieved must be included in the Local Plan.</p>
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7 is too prescriptive and simplistic.</p> <p>It has restricted wording which prevents a more flexible interpretation of sustainable development to include social and economic considerations.</p> <p>Should be an 'unless justified by local circumstances' clause like previous Policy P7.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q18	<p>Support policy 7 concerning access to public transport but do not support a reduction on bus service frequency from 15 minutes.</p> <p>Do not support the change from a 'walking distance of 400m' to a 'distance of 400m'. The policy should be 'walking' distance.</p> <p>Bus services should be improved or there should be no more homes in Balsall Common. How this public transport is included must be in the plan.</p> <p>Affordable housing tends to be more reliant on public transport. Poor public transport is incompatible with the 50% affordable housing objective. The level of housing and/or affordable housing should be reduced.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q18	<p>As drafted, Policy P7 expects developments to 'fulfil' a number of requirements for the location of development in terms of access. The policy is onerous and does not contain the flexibility of the PPF which states that development should be focused in locations "which are or can be made sustainable". In order to be found sound Policy P7 should be redrafted to be more flexible and encompass the 'can be made' focus of the NPPF.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q18	<p>Many of the sites detailed in the plan do not enjoy a service to the levels required by P7 and there is no real commitment to them being provided. The size of the developments which are covered by the policy should be reduced from 100 to 20 as most of them shown in this document are situated next to existing communities whose residents could enjoy the benefit of this policy.</p> <p>There is nothing in the Draft Local Plan or the Solihull Connected document to ensure that any of the various policy objectives will be achieved or adopted.</p>
Chris Crean [3631]			Q18	<p>The Council is unlikely to support developments:</p> <p>'where the impacts of increased delay to vehicles, pedestrians or cyclists, taking account of the residual cumulative transport effects of development, are severe'. This would indicate that all other forms of development will be supported. This is not sustainable. There needs to be far more restrictions on the private car.</p> <p>HS2 should not be supported and the threats to the future of Meriden Gap should be rejected.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q18	<p>We are in agreement with the proposed policies.</p>
Colin Davis [3352]			Q18	<p>more pie in the sky talk about none car modes of transport, walking and cycling. and no detail on the metro and rapid transit , both of which could be disruptive and take more land dependant on the route .Solihull dont have a great track record for sustainable travel. Resort World and the Arena at the NEC have been allowed but they are not on a main bus route or accessible except by car</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7: object to restrictive wording. Prevents a flexible interpretation of sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainability is not a formula and suitability of a site for housing development should not be solely measured by distance from high frequency bus stops.</p> <p>If distance to public transport is included, then should also include proximity to train station, safe cycle and walking routes.</p> <p>Reword to state: '...unless justified by local circumstances...and investment in improvements to local transport provision, cycling and/or walking measures will be sought in association with development proposals...' to improve accessibility where appropriate.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q18	<p>There are many welcome elements of this part of the plan. I will be happy if they can be delivered. I am not aware of any decision having been made regarding the location of the new motorway service station between junctions 4 and 6 on the M42.</p>
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q18	<p>There are many welcome elements of this part of the plan. I will be happy if they can be delivered. Where I am less certain is in relation to the motorway services at Catherinede-Barnes. Not only is this in relation to the impact on residents in the area, but also the impact this is likely to have on the M42.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q18	<p>Broadly agree.</p> <p>Greater emphasis should be on 'green buses' as in Norwich.</p> <p>Metro could extend to Solihull TC, or even Coventry instead of SPRINT.</p> <p>Extend Metro line along A45 from Birmingham.</p> <p>Bus lanes add to congestion.</p> <p>Recognise financial constraints.</p>
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q18	<p>Broadly support the aims and content of the transport policies but need strengthening, particularly in relation to cycling as per Solihull Connected. The Local Plan needs to recognise that walking and cycling are separate modes that require separate consideration by developers.</p> <p>New developments should be designed to make footway parking unnecessary.</p> <p>The Local Plan should contain a policy that all new developments with roads adopted as public highways should include Traffic Regulation Orders to prevent pavement and verge parking. Where a development may lead to similar problems in adjacent areas this requirement might be extended to cover those areas.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q18	<p>policies will not deliver sustainable travel - do not address congestion and pressure on key roads/m42.</p> <p>- should be proposals for cycle routes and a cycle network</p> <p>- re-siting of HS2 platforms to Birmingham International to protect the Green Belt east of M42.</p> <p>-</p>
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q18	<p>The plan does not take into account that in Balsall Common the social and economic links are closer to Warwickshire and Coventry than with Solihull. Public transport routes need to reflect this.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q18	Policy 7 is only concerned with the proximity to and the frequency of bus services. A defining factor for commuters' transport mode choice is the destination or the appropriateness of the service. e.g. Whether a dwelling is within 400m of a bus stop is irrelevant if the service cannot deliver you to your destination in a timely manner.
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q18	<p>The distance to a regular bus route is nearly half a mile. This is excessive, particularly in bad weather, for the elderly or ill, and when carrying heavy bags.</p> <p>However, two of the three proposed developments for Balsall Common (Barrets Farm and Windmill Lane) are so large that a large percentage of the dwellings will be OUTSIDE this criteria.</p> <p>The impact of car travel demands will be huge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *GRIDLOCK in the village centre *peak travel commuter trains will be DANGEROUSLY FULL/INADEQUATE *station car park OVERFLOW will double to 400 yards up the "bypass". <p>The developments SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED.</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q18	Paragraph 267 suggests that the A452 in Balsall Common associated with HS2 will already cause an increase in traffic. This has to be a strong reason for avoiding development on Site 1.
Education Funding Agency (John Pilgrim) [3977]			Q18	In identifying sites and developing policies for new schools, consideration should be given at an early stage as to how the use of public transport, cycling and walking can be encouraged to help reduce the number of car journeys to and from new schools. The inclusion of a well-developed local authority green travel plan can help to ensure that new schools are better integrated with existing communities. The EFA therefore support Policy P7 'Accessibility and Ease of Access' which broadly reflects these principles.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q18	<p>No mention of role and importance of Motorway Service Area in policies P7 and P8.</p> <p>Whilst Paragraph 270 notes that significant unmet need remains, it is not clear that in previous appeals the the Secretary of State had concluded harm at Junction 4 exceeded the location close to Catherine de Barnes.</p> <p>Paragraph 271 is a serious derogation of duty and conflicts with paragraphs 31 and 182 of NPPF.</p> <p>Circular 02/2013 notes "the maximum distance between motorway service areas should be no more than 28 miles". Exceeded in Solihull and negative impact on highway safety.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q18	<p>Policy P7 objectives are commendable.</p> <p>Concern that criteria in Policy P7 are unviable, particularly given that Solihull is predominantly rural. Should test viability of P7 to ensure it does not prevent delivery of housing land.</p>
Genting Solihull Ltd [3409]	Ms Andrea Arnall	Turley Associates (Ms Andrea Arnall) [2025]	Q18	<p>Support the concept that new development should be focussed in the most accessible locations. Agree that development proposals for retail and leisure uses should be directed to other established locations, including the NEC. The sustainability of the NEC will be enhanced by the arrival of Midland Metro, SPRINT and HS2.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q18	<p>Policy P7</p> <p>Housing developers should not be allowed to construct roads of inadequate width and pavements of inadequate widths.</p> <p>Policy P8A</p> <p>It is not acceptable that the Knowle to UK Central corridor is not included in the rapid transit plans.</p>
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q18	<p>There is no policy or action that will address the inconsistencies between sites 6 and 16 and the criteria in policy P7 and supporting paragraph 249 relating to highway congestion.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q18	There is no policy or action that will address the inconsistencies between sites 6 and 16 and the criteria in policy P7 and supporting paragraph 249 relating to highway congestion.
Highways England (Mr A Slack) [2007]			Q18	We will require further detail to be provided in relation to the proposed allocations and the transport related policies put forward in the Local Plan Review. This is necessary to consider the implications of the levels of planned growth upon the SRN so as to ensure the potential transport implications of developments are considered and necessary infrastructure is planned accordingly.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q18	SMBC should instigate formal traffic monitoring to validate the traffic management study with respect to BVP, and HHPC would welcome discussions in this regard.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q18	<p>Concern over traffic levels in Hockley Heath.</p> <p>Acknowledge and welcome the plan's commitment to ensuring new developments are located in locations where reliance on the private car is low and that developments should be focussed in the most accessible locations, and do not result in the reduction of safety for users of the highway or other transport network.</p> <p>A freight management strategy which removes the heaviest vehicles from residential roads is a positive move and would be welcomed in Hockley Heath.</p> <p>Disappointing there is so little mention of plans to extend the existing cycling network.</p>
Holiday Extras & Airparks Ltd [3677]	Matthew Williams	Williams Gallagher Town Planning Solutions (Matthew Williams) [3672]	Q18	Support policy P8 which recognises the sustainable transport approach to off-Airport car parking offered by the Airparks Park and Ride model.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q18	<p>Policy P7 - Support aspiration that all new development should be focussed in accessible locations, and seek to enhance existing accessibility levels and promote ease of access.</p> <p>Important to ensure that sites can be made more accessible.</p>
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q18	<p>Good ideals but difficult to execute when public transport apart from Birmingham focused rail is very, very poor in the area</p>
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q18	<p>No policy providing approach to determining proposals for new transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Should take positive approach to proposals which address Challenge H by diverting traffic from congested routes and providing alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>Policies do not identify or promote any of the transport improvements necessary to address existing and future issues.</p> <p>Policy P7 should be revised to refer to SPRINT, METRO etc as well.</p> <p>Policy P7 does not refer to where employment developments should be located.</p> <p>Welcome provisions in Policy P8.</p> <p>METRO and SPRINT schemes should take account of potential for adverse effects on existing businesses and residents e.g. JLR.</p>
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q18	<p>* Policy P7. Accessibility and Ease of Access - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P8. Managing Travel Demand and Reducing Congestion - Agree in principle</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Johnnie Arkwright [3903]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q18	<p>Believe our proposal for development around Hatton Station to meet Greater Birmingham HMA's housing needs aligns with Section 8 of DLP, WMCA Movement for Growth strategy and Solihull Connected.</p> <p>Support principle of Policy P7 of focussing development in most accessible locations.</p> <p>Hatton station has direct links with Dorridge, Widney Manor and Solihull stations.</p>
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q18	<p>Bypass improvement lines - the existing roads of Meeting House Lane, Windmill Lane and Station Road (east section) should not be used for bypass purposes.</p> <p>Cycling and footpath access from new developments must be as direct as possible to encourage use, not tucked away; and pleasant to use.</p>
Julie Betts [3173]			Q18	<p>Should be concentrating on flattening the speed bumps on Tanworth Lane, Stretton Road and Hathaway Road and reducing the amount of noise from motorbikes and them using our roads like a race track.</p>
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q18	<p>The policies will enable the steering of new developments to most appropriate, accessible locations to reduce the reliance on the private car and to encourage the take up of new sustainable modes of travel thereby not materially adding to the existing highway congestion. It agrees with the Council that the Policies can influence road safety through its control or influence on the design of new development and manage the demand for travel.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7: object to restrictive wording. Prevents a flexible interpretation of sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainability is not a formula and suitability of a site for housing development should not be solely measured by distance from high frequency bus stops.</p> <p>If distance to public transport is included, then should also include proximity to train station, safe cycle and walking routes.</p> <p>Reword to state: '...unless justified by local circumstances...and investment in improvements to local transport provision, cycling and/or walking measures will be sought in association with development proposals...' to improve accessibility where appropriate.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q18	<p>Unless rural travel is improved, it will not reduce inequalities in the area as those residents with disabilities will be discriminated against.</p> <p>Question whether challenge J Improving health and well being is addressed in these policies. Walking and in particular cycling in Meriden is hazardous due to the rural roads that carry large vehicles with little or no cycle paths. More vehicles on the road increases air pollution. What about the provisions for those with disabilities? Will sustainable travel be dementia friendly?</p> <p>Speeding traffic is a problem through Meriden.</p>
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q18	Good ideals but difficult to execute when public transport, apart from Birmingham focused rail, is very, very poor in the area.
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q18	Good ideals but difficult to execute when public transport, apart from Birmingham focussed rail, is very very poor in this area.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q18	<p>* Policy P7. Accessibility and Ease of Access - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P8. Managing Travel Demand and Reducing Congestion - Agree in principle</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q18	I agree with the policies and principles for an integrated approach to transport and development but I don't believe that this actually will be applied on the ground. I already experience grid lock in the morning and evening because of the volume of traffic coming from Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green
Mr A Hodge [2011]			Q18	The policy statements are high level and it is the way that they are implemented that needs addressing, recognising the realities of people's lives rather than a theoretical ideal that will never survive in the real world resulting in a botched solution. An example is the closing of Tythe Barn Lane when Dickens Heath was planned causing all through traffic to be routed through the "village" and past the school, a fatality in the making. I suggest that the whole of Tythe Barn lane be re-opened to take excess traffic away from the school.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q18	I generally support these policies but object to the reduction from 3 trains per hour to a 30 minute service which seems an illjudged justification to allow building in Balsall Common. I wish that SMBC would apply them when making their selection for sites which ignore these policies as far as Balsall Common is concerned. There is no objective justification for a bypass, no change since 2012 when the line was removed.
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q18	<p>Your policy reads well but the housing areas proposed for Balsall Common do not follow it.</p> <p>If you are going to build 800 homes you can put in a new bus route to service it. Wherever you build houses they will be within half an hour's walk of Berkswell train station .</p> <p>The simplest way to manage congestion and access id to build housing where the road capacity is, and avoid putting it at the wrong end of a village. Balsall Common development should be at the north of the village, with perfect access to motorways and HS2.</p>
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q18	Yes, but as a lifelong cycle commuter there is no provision for cyclists crossing motorway junctions within the borough without putting their lives at risk.
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q18	a logic leap here. more houses should attract better bus services. recent history in Balsall Common of a specialist bus service removed! expansion of Balsall Common may be more acceptable with better bus services.
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q18	<p>None of the existing or proposed developments in Balsall Common meets the requirements of point 2 P7. Additional parking will be needed at the train station especially if Hall Meadow Road would no longer be used for overflow vehicles(would become part of the by-pass). Better train service essential as current one is already at full capacity(standing AND seating) at peak times.</p> <p>All proposed developments in Balsall Common will be car dependent. Under Policy P8 it states in these circumstances the Council would be unlikely to support such developments</p>
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q18	They are largely impossible to deliver. They rely on outside and not always available funding outside Solihull's control. Without WMCA input you can't isolate Solihull's transport plan. You must improve parking facilities at Stations and alleviate on road commuter parking. Painting Yellow lines to discourage the on-street parking practice by commuters only exports the problem to other roads without yellow line restrictions. Taking the Metro to Chelmsley Wood won't happen soon. The M42 will be clogged up very soon as all the growth in envisaged along its length.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Varley [3385]			Q18	Balsall Common's bus service is hourly. To get from Waste Lane to the A45 in Coventry by bus takes 45minutes to Coventry City Centre then wait for 15 mins for a 20 minute bus ride to take you back to the A45 arriving near your destination of 4.1miles away from Balsall Common in 1hr 20mins. This is why most households have 2 cars . This will mean a further increase in vehicle movements and problems in a village centre location.
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q18	see letter
Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]			Q18	I support the policy but consider that it has not been applied in the case of Balsall Common where the proposed developments are in an area of inadequate public transport and will serve to increase car usage in the Borough substantially. This is contrary to the stated policy.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q18	<p>I disagree. I do not agree with the section on Bypass Improvement Lines - paras 266/267.</p> <p>The road proposed by Coventry if built will remove most of the increased traffic expected to arise from the HS2 hub. No Balsall Common by-pass should be considered until plans for this road are finalised. It certainly should not be pursued as a "basis for new residential developments"</p> <p>See also my representation to question 15 earlier.</p>
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q18	<p>Proposed housing developments South of Shirley are remote from economic activity proposed at the UKC Hub. Will exacerbate existing congestion issues.</p> <p>Major infrastructure will be required to ease existing and future congestion.</p> <p>Shirley and Whitlock's End stations are not on a direct route to UKC Hub.</p> <p>Will require extra parking facilities.</p> <p>Plan takes little account of Duty to Cooperate with Bromsgrove on transport issues.</p> <p>Such development could place further strain on the local road and rail infrastructure, further hindering accessibility and the development of other alternative transport options.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q18	Unlike other areas of the borough none of the proposed sites in Balsall Common/Berkswell fulfil the criteria set out in policy 7. All will be heavily car dependent, and do not encourage sustainable travel. Poor rail and bus connectivity means the public transport accessibility is inadequate for the three sites proposed. Policy P8 indicates SMBC are unlikely support these developments sites in such circumstances, and therefore they should all be withdrawn from the Local Plan.
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q18	Why is Balsall Common regarded as a sustainable transport location? Bus services are intermittent and do not run in evenings. Journey times to Solihull are very slow due to the indirect route adopted. There are only 2 local train services per hour in each direction with over 40 minutes gap and services are often overcrowded. Local roads are poorly maintained and often dangerous for cycling. Employment opportunities in the vicinity are limited meaning residents have to travel for work. All these will serve to limit the delivery of affordable housing which is often dependent on good public transport links.
Mr Les Jobson [3537]			Q18	Plan the road, rail and bus infrastructure that give acceptable travel times first then begin the plan for additional housing. Revisit the Shirley bypass route to ease awful traffic conditions on the Stratford Road through Shirley.
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q18	<p>In P7, it is futile to expect (as some objectors do), that all housing sites can be built in the most accessible locations. Please also see my answer to the previous question.</p> <p>Dorridge Station car park capacity could be trebled by making it 3 storey (basement/ground/first) without it being unduly intrusive.</p> <p>All of Site 9 is within walking & cycling distance of both Knowle & Dorridge centres, and the Station, which makes it a particularly good choice for new housing. Well done.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q18	<p>Departure from existing policy regarding access to public transport not acceptable.</p> <p>By densely building at Barratts Farm will increase car useage. No exit onto Meeting House Lane due to H & S!!</p> <p>Existing walks and paths will be pushed much further out of the village.</p> <p>The availability of car parking at the station is currently totally inadequate - cars parking almost on the roundabout at the station every working day! This can only get worse if the planned disproportionate increase in housing is allowed to go ahead</p>
Mr Michael Scott [3291]			Q18	<p>It mentions that a bypass around Balsall Common will not be assessed until later. However, the plan already concludes 1150 new houses will be sited at Balsall Common.</p> <p>The two issues are completely interlinked and no allocation of new housing in Balsall Common should be undertaken without the firm commitment to build a by-pass, with the village having a right to see, review and challenge the proposals.</p>
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q18	<p>For reasons set out in response to Question 15 it is considered that the omission of SHELAA site 134 represents a retrograde step in relation to the achievement of a sustainable transport pattern. It is very well located in relation to the rail link to central Birmingham and elsewhere.</p>
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q18	<p>Do not agree with the HS2 Strategy.</p>
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q18	<p>New homes in Balsall Common will generate significant increases in traffic in total and in particular on small/narrow roads. Public transport is not adequate. 2 trains an hour already overcrowded at peak times and 1 bus per hour</p>
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q18	<p>Really supporting and promoting effective bus travel as a realistic alternative to the car journey is agreed. Perhaps implementing a holistic public transport policy would be the way forward. A 'congestion' charge in Birmingham together with increasing the cost of parking in the city would enable/encourage people to actually use the buses,</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7 is too prescriptive and simplistic.</p> <p>It has restricted wording which prevents a more flexible interpretation of sustainable development to include social and economic considerations.</p> <p>Should be an 'unless justified by local circumstances' clause like previous Policy P7.</p>
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q18	Homes should be built where public transport is available at frequency greater than 30 minutes or 15minutes
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q18	I agree with what is trying to be achieved but totally reject the possibility of it actually being possible. Mention is made of cycling however the road network in and around Solihull would have needed to be designed from day one with cycling in mind. The roads are too cramped and too busy to allow safe cycling by more than the brave few and I just can't see this happening. Also it appears to be assumed that local housing developments will mainly contain people who will work in the town centre, what proof is there of this?
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q18	<p>Allocation 13 has not obvious access to main roads with little or no options to be improved via Bills Lane or Tamworth Lane</p> <p>Shirley & Whitlocks end train station car parks are over current capacity with not many options to improve and already has issues with parking in local side road and estates</p>
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q18	In rural locations such as Balsall Common and Berkswell you must recognise that public transport of the frequency you envisage is unlikely to be sustainable, it's not commensurate with the life style of the community that is predominantly rural and dormitory travelling fair/major distances to work, this is what people do, you don't seem able to recognise it. If buses are put in place they are unlikely to be sustainable.. In large towns/cities buses do work but rural locations 6+ miles from a nearby big town or city it's doomed. Improve the rail frequency and build a bigger car park.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7: object to restrictive wording. Prevents a flexible interpretation of sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainability is not a formula and suitability of a site for housing development should not be solely measured by distance from high frequency bus stops.</p> <p>If distance to public transport is included, then should also include proximity to train station, safe cycle and walking routes.</p> <p>Reword to state: '...unless justified by local circumstances...and investment in improvements to local transport provision, cycling and/or walking measures will be sought in association with development proposals...' to improve accessibility where appropriate.</p>
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q18	Support.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q18	Improved parking is needed at Berkswell Station, currently too many cars park on Hall Meadow Road during the week.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q18	Balsall Common public transport is inadequate to support travel to work for most people. A bypass will be needed but will bring major issues if it uses Hallmeadow Road which has a Doctors Surgery and housing estates off it. It is also used as overspill parking for the station car park.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q18	Need to provide significantly improved cycling and pedestrian routes. Also need much better public transport from Solihull town centre to Birmingham airport and business parks.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q18	<p>Only require a by-pass in Balsall Common to gain access to proposed new houses.</p> <p>The new trunk road to be built between the A46 and the A452/A45 via Warwick University should alleviate through traffic from M40 towards NEC, M42, M6 and HS2hub.</p> <p>The majority of the traffic through Balsall Common is local.</p> <p>Development north or north east of the village would limit future traffic build up</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
mrs jacqui gardner [3687]			Q18	<p>However, question why you have picked Balsall Common for development as train services do not go to places like Solihull, Warwick etc and the bus service isn't great?</p> <p>If development is to take place in Balsall Common, public transport links will need to be improved otherwise the policy to manage car use will be mute!</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q18	<p>In accordance with Policy P8, the proposed housing sites at west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley should not be supported since the impacts of increased delay to vehicles taking account of the residual cumulative transport effects of development are likely to be very severe. A Transport Assessment would be required to accompany planning applications as the proposed housing sites at west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley would likely have a significant impact on the local highway network.</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q18	<p>It will be required to demonstrate that the proposed housing sites at West of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley have been assessed in accordance with Policy P8 Managing Travel Demand and Reducing Congestion. There is already severe traffic congestion in the morning peak time along Dickens Heath Road from traffic leaving the village, and on Stratford Road from traffic heading towards the nearby business parks and the M42.</p>
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q18	<p>Hockley Heath roads are struggling with traffic flow currently and this will worsen with planned developments. Policy should make reference to traffic monitoring and supporting local communities who identify issues.</p> <p>Also challenge some assumptions that are being made around increased traffic associated with new developments, which assume too low reliance on car travel and therefore underestimate the impact on local roads.</p> <p>More mention of sustainable travel alternatives particularly cycle routes required.</p>
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q18	<p>The delivery of affordable housing should be limited to locations with good public transport links, to assist affordability.</p>
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q18	<p>Cheaper, safer and more availability is needed to ease road congestion. More car parking at Whitlocks End and Shirley Stations would be needed if more houses are to be built in the area.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Kathryn Smith [3251]			Q18	I am concerned about increased traffic flow in the Tamworth Lane area. There is already congestion between 8.00 and 9.00am with commuters travelling out of Dickens Heath towards Shirley so the additional homes will make this worse. Thought needs to be given to traffic flow here along with sufficient infrastructure to cater for those additional homes before they are built
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q18	I agree with the principles in this policy but I worry that because the Housing allocations have homed in on the less accessible parts of the Borough, the policy will not be able to be realised. Cycling and walking are healthy activities which contribute to well being, but they need to be separated from roads used by motor vehicles and we need to have lighting on these paths. People will not walk or cycle in greater numbers unless they see these activities as safe. How will SMBC secure continuation of bus and rail services ?
Mrs Maria Morris [3534]			Q18	I feel that point 267 should state where the alternate route will lie as it will affect the character of the area quite considerably
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q18	Berkswell Station car park cannot cope with the number of cars on a daily basis. Local roads used for additional parking daily.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q18	Good ideals but difficult to execute when public transport, apart from Birmingham focused rail, is very, very poor in the area.
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q18	Not enough parking at Shirley and Whitlock's End railway stations, cars parked on residential roads,
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q18	Good quality, well lit cycle paths separate from traffic (but not slower to use than the road) should be drawn into any of these planned developments and linking to major sites. With the increase in traffic on the roads, Solihull's roads will become even more dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians.
Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [3301]			Q18	With the increase of new residence we can look forward to yet more cars park in our residential road with people looking for parking space to use the train, buses and shops. Haslucks Green Road enjoys almost traffic jams at present so we will be able to enjoy a complete gridlock should all the 41% be realised. This brings me back to health issues. Pollution from additional traffic is yet another increase to be looked forward too.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q18	I agree with the thrust but you haven't really taken any consideration for the use of the motor vehicle and current congestion it seems to me. The North west of BC is clearly better connected that the south east of the but has been ignored. I don't understand how you reconcile this.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Lisa Inkpen [3557]			Q18	In Balsall Common, I would really welcome a bypass. The traffic is vey heavy and fast during rush hour. I walk along Kelsey Lane to the primary school. It feels unsafe as lorries and cars speed along the road many doing over the 30mph speed limit. With the proposed housing development there will be more cars on the road. Parents will be put off walking from the new housing development due to the unsafe levels of traffic on Kelsey Lane, Alder Lane, Kenilworth Road.
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q18	Support the extension of the metro and Sprint services as per Policy P8 in the DLP (page 3 of representation)
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q18	Support for Policy P7 and in particular final points of the policy
Network Rail (Town Planning Team) [2537]			Q18	see comments on transport assessments
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q18	<p>Farms and rural businesses are totally reliant on car and HGV transport, there is no alternative.</p> <p>In order for these businesses to remain vibrant their needs must be taken into account when planning investment in the rural transport network.</p> <p>Concerned that policy P7 will set out a sustainability trap for diversified businesses in the rural areas, particularly if they are not on a rural bus route.</p> <p>Tourism business in desirable rural locations rely on access by private car, therefore important that new tourism enterprises are allowed to develop in locations other than those that are accessible by public transport.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Notcutts Limited (Mrs E McDonald) [2266]	Dan Di-Lieto	Lichfields (Dan Di-Lieto) [3929]	Q18	<p>Agree with the principle of directing new development to the most accessible locations.</p> <p>Support wording of Policy P7 which directs development proposals for office, retail and leisure development to town centres in the first instance and then "other established locations".</p> <p>These should include established hubs of activity within the Borough and not be confined to the Birmingham Business Park, Blythe Valley Business Park, Birmingham Airport and the NEC.</p>
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q18	<p>Agree with the 3 policies in this section of the DLP.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7: object to restrictive wording. Prevents a flexible interpretation of sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainability is not a formula and suitability of a site for housing development should not be solely measured by distance from high frequency bus stops.</p> <p>If distance to public transport is included, then should also include proximity to train station, safe cycle and walking routes.</p> <p>Reword to state: '...unless justified by local circumstances...and investment in improvements to local transport provision, cycling and/or walking measures will be sought in association with development proposals...' to improve accessibility where appropriate.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q18	Policy P8A: Plan showing the proposed route of the rapid transit would be helpful, and should be considered when allocating sites for housing/development.
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q18	Distance to a bus stop of 400m is a general rule of thumb. Other factors should be considered such as: perceived safety, topography, expectations in locality. Should also be considered against other sustainable modes of transport within walking distance.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q18	The policies are sensible and justified. The policies will enable the steering of new developments to most appropriate, accessible locations to reduce the reliance on the private car and to encourage the take up of new sustainable modes of travel thereby not materially adding to the existing highway congestion. The Policies can influence road safety through its control or influence on the design of new development and manage the demand for travel.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q18	The plan may be right for efficient operation, you need a crystal ball to confirm it is OK for 2033. I don't believe the council controls all, if any of the services mentioned in the LP so at this time the policy quotes what sounds nice but cannot guaranteed for the future. Possibilities change overtime. To read the policy, the proposals are expensive, the most difficult problem to bridge easily. The car is changing and may become the first choice of the future. It is difficult to get motorists out of there cars now and I cannot see that improving.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q18	<p>Putting the proposed Balsall Common bypass route on the map is essential before proceeding with a strategy for the village. Previous &quot;UDC&quot; route still looks largely appropriate, as largely follow line likely to be blighted by HS2. Accessibility to that bypass route will drive better informed choices of housing site in the village. Proposed route should also look to reduce West-East traffic and links to increasing employment sites South of Coventry (University / JLR etc).</p> <p>Also should consider light rail / transit system from central Solihull to new HS2 interchange via Lode Lane.</p>
Richard Evans [2640]			Q18	18-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q18	<p>Para 267 is incorrect, the HS2 Environmental Impact has been assessed on the basis that no road improvements would be needed south of the A45.</p> <p>There is no justification for expensive projects like Metro and Sprint (Policy 8A). The passenger demand should first be proven by running bus services. There are other barriers to public transport use such as lack of services and long intervals between services. Few dwellings are within 400 metres of a stop, so Policy P7 is optimistic and unrealistic.</p>
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q18	<p>* Policy P7. Accessibility and Ease of Access - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P8. Managing Travel Demand and Reducing Congestion - Agree in principle</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q18	<p>* Policy P7. Accessibility and Ease of Access - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P8. Managing Travel Demand and Reducing Congestion - Agree in principle</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SMBC - Public Heath & Commissioning Directorate (Nick Garnett) [2295]			Q18	P7 Remove '/or' from first sentence after bullet iv) and the following paragraph on the basis that both forms of active travel need to be promoted in order to maximise take of these sustainable forms of transport that also promote health.
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q18	Policy P7 objectives are commendable. Concern that criteria in Policy P7 are unviable, particularly given that Solihull is predominantly rural. Should test viability of P7 to ensure it does not prevent delivery of housing land.
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q18	The Potential Housing Allocations at Frog Lane, Balsall Common (Site 2) and West of Dickens Heath (Site 4) accord, or can be made to accord with, the locational and accessibility criteria of Policy P7. These allocations can or would be able to accord with the criteria in Policy P8 for managing travel demand, reducing congestion and providing parking. Highway consultants have been engaged by Richborough Estates Limited for both draft allocations to address access, linkages and impacts of the highway network
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q18	* Policy P7. Accessibility and Ease of Access - Agree in principle * Policy P8. Managing Travel Demand and Reducing Congestion - Agree in principle
Stratford on Avon District Council (John Careford) [4666]			Q18	Stratford District Council is supportive of the proposals for the delivery of METRO and SPRINT as part of an inter-connected network of rapid-transit lines providing improved access to UK Central Hub and Birmingham Airport. However, no reference is made for the need to seek subsequent improvements on existing transport routes that would act as 'feeder lines' to the new rapid-transit modes. The plan should include such references (or signposts to relevant transport strategies) in order to express support for proposals that would assist in the delivery of these improvements e.g. between the airport and the international tourist destination of Stratford-upon-Avon.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q18	<p>Agree with policies in principle.</p> <p>P7: deals appropriately with accessibility and ease of access which is required for all types of development.</p> <p>P8: agree with wording and requirements. Transport Assessments and Travel Plans considered an acceptable requirement.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q18	<p>Whilst it is reasonable to expect good connectivity to public transport, including buses, good connectivity does not necessarily always mean a bus stop within 400m of each and every property.</p> <p>Nowadays, it is the ease of access, and quality of provision that is most important, and whilst distance is one factor it is by no means the only, or even the most important. Decision making is based on perception of convenience, and not just distance.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q18	<p>Whilst it is reasonable to expect good connectivity to public transport, including buses, good connectivity does not necessarily always mean a bus stop within 400m of each and every property.</p> <p>Nowadays, it is the ease of access, and quality of provision that is most important, and whilst distance is one factor it is by no means the only, or even the most important. Decision making is based on perception of convenience, and not just distance.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q18	<p>Whilst it is reasonable to expect good connectivity to public transport, including buses, good connectivity does not necessarily always mean a bus stop within 400m of each and every property.</p> <p>Nowadays, it is the ease of access, and quality of provision that is most important, and whilst distance is one factor it is by no means the only, or even the most important. Decision making is based on perception of convenience, and not just distance.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7: object to restrictive wording. Prevents a flexible interpretation of sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainability is not a formula and suitability of a site for housing development should not be solely measured by distance from high frequency bus stops.</p> <p>If distance to public transport is included, then should also include proximity to train station, safe cycle and walking routes.</p> <p>Reword to state: '...unless justified by local circumstances...and investment in improvements to local transport provision, cycling and/or walking measures will be sought in association with development proposals...' to improve accessibility where appropriate.</p>
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q18	<p>Policy P7 -</p> <p>Bullet points 2&3 requiring developments to be within 30 minute frequency bus service is overly onerous, which may frustrate the development of otherwise sustainable sites.</p> <p>Policy requirements should reflect NPPF (Para. 17). This 'can be made sustainable' focus is missing from Policy P7.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q18	<p>Policy P7: object to restrictive wording. Prevents a flexible interpretation of sustainable development.</p> <p>Sustainability is not a formula and suitability of a site for housing development should not be solely measured by distance from high frequency bus stops.</p> <p>If distance to public transport is included, then should also include proximity to train station, safe cycle and walking routes.</p> <p>Reword to state: '...unless justified by local circumstances...and investment in improvements to local transport provision, cycling and/or walking measures will be sought in association with development proposals...' to improve accessibility where appropriate.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
<p>Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]</p>		<p>Q18</p>	<p>Policy P7 - criteria not achievable for large developments in rural locations.</p> <p>Policy P8 - Support range of measures to promote sustainable and active travel.</p> <p>Further consideration should be added on the following:</p> <p>Park and Ride Opportunities;</p> <p>Parking Policy;</p> <p>Cycling and Walking;</p> <p>Smart technology;</p> <p>Key Route Network;</p> <p>Bus services;</p> <p>Bypass Improvement Lines.</p> <p>Policy P8A - Request amendment to second bullet point:</p> <p>"Birmingham City Centre to UK Central Hub and Solihull SPRINT".</p> <p>Suggest SPRINT routes included in an Appendix.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q18	<p>In addition to the requirement for sites to be within 400m of a regular bus service, it is suggested that the unique nature of sites within UKC Hub is also taken into account given the relative proximity and access to a range of existing and future transport facilities.</p> <p>The area will be the focus for new sustainable travel options both locally, nationally and internationally and will be one of the best connected locations in the country. Proposals for development of individual sites should be considered in the context of wider Hub aspirations in addition to the criteria in Policy P7.</p>
Wendy Cairns [4226]			Q18	<p>- A452 runs through BC and is commuter route, with heavy use during peak hours. increase in traffic on side roads.</p> <p>- any access to barrett farm development from Meeting house lane, Oxhayes close, Barrets lande/sunnyside lane or even a new access point al</p>
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q18	<p>Policy P7 - Intent is supported but focus is too narrow on accessibility to bus and rail.</p> <p>30 mins bus frequency is unduly onerous.</p> <p>Will frustrate development of several sites coming forward.</p> <p>Conflicts with Atkins Accessibility Study.</p> <p>Policy should be revised to reflect Para. 17 of NPPF.</p>
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q18	<p>I agree that with the principles behind the policies to improve accessibility and encouraging sustainable travel. However, these have not been applied to the proposed development in Balsall Common. The majority of residents drive to work, many being commuters on the motorway network. This will not change with the proposed development. Despite access from Hall Meadow Road the volume of traffic will increase dramatically. The current train service operates twice an hour in each direction and is only used by a minority. As is the sporadic 87 bus service which operates a few hours per day. Accessibility is not addressed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Question 19 Protecting the Environment				
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q19	<p>The proposals detailed are useful as far as they go. Which isn't far. From a B90 perspective, there is no indication that access to public open space has been considered at all. This is already a very urban environment - the plans only increase the urbanisation, without any increase in public open space. Where buildings are currently set in space they are to be demolished and replaced with high-density developments.</p> <p>Still, at least kids in B90 will be able to play on their Playstations safe in the knowledge that their power is generated sustainably...</p>
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q19	<p>POLICY P11</p> <p>- Wording in policy P11 relating to water use is too prescriptive. should instead reference the national standards, which will future-proof the policy against any changes to national standards.</p> <p>- text in the policy relating to planning obligations in respect of flood risk management schemes is ambiguous and not in compliance with national regs.</p>
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q19	<p>POLICY P13</p> <p>- overly prescriptive to require all developments to demonstrate that not resulting in sterilisation of mineral resources. an appropriate threshold for development size for requiring such information should be included for proposals for non-mineral development of that development within defined settlement boundaries should be exempt from this requirement.</p>
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q19	<p>Support the principles of Policy P9 and state that the Arden Cross proposals will make a significant contribution to this policy. However, concerns over the expectation that new development and specifically the UKC Hub area should develop and contribute to the development of heat networks within the Borough. This statement appears to have been generated in the absence of any Local Plan evidence to confirm the viability of such networks. The Heat Network delivery Unit Report is not specific to Solihull. Policy P9 should be amended to include a viability element.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q19	But the three sites selected in Balsall Common/Berkswell contradict policy P10, particularly in protecting the Arden Landscape, green infrastructure assets and habitats, and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, policy P11, refers to Sustainable Drainage Systems, and we question whether the full impact of the proposed developments on the existing aging drainage system in the area has been fully assessed.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q19	With regard to policy P10 it is important to create buffers to any new development so they connect with existing and created green infrastructure assets. With regard to P14 agree that important trees and hedgerows should be retained.
Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]			Q19	We applaud the vision of the Council in its approach to the Green Belt and we fully support the statement in the Local Plan that Solihull will continue to be Urbs in Rure, "without compromising the quality of its environment, protecting the integrity of the Green Belt and retaining the strategic gap between the Birmingham conurbation and Coventry."
Canal & River Trust (Anne Denby) [3983]			Q19	Policy P9-The Trust would wish to highlight the potential of the canal for heating & cooling for district heat network or individual schemes such as the allocation Ref 4- West of Dickens Heath. The Policy or supporting text should be amended to include reference to the potential of the canal to contribute to low carbon technologies. Policy P11-highlight that any proposed discharge to the canal would need to be in consultation with the Canal & River Trust and appropriate wording should be included within the policy.
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q19	Amongst other issues policy P14 deals with the development of electronic communications etc. We are disappointed to see that there is no statement of ambition/policy to ensure the residents of SMBC have access to a speedy broadband internet service without which communities will not be able to function effectively in the future.
CEMEX (Mr S Denny) [2502]			Q19	CEMEX UK Materials Ltd. fully supports the continued identification of Marsh Farm as a Preferred Area for the extraction of sand and gravel (Policy P13). It also fully supports the identification of the wider Area of Search as a means of the Borough continuing to contribute towards its consumption of aggregate products.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Chris Crean [3631]			Q19	<p>Policies do not go far enough and unlikely to have the strength to stop inappropriate development, as other policies within plan are opposed to the thrust within these policies.</p> <p>There is a need for a food waste collection service within the borough. This would reduce the amount of food waste and raise awareness of this issue. The collection could support anaerobic technology which could be mentioned in the plan.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q19	We are in agreement with the proposed policies
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q19	<p>I welcome the inclusion of this in the document and accept that a reasonable amount of detail has been provided.</p> <p>Concern in relation to flood risk prevention. Many residents in south Shirley have problems relating to flooding that affect their gardens, as well as issues at site 13.</p>
Councillor C Williams [2087]			Q19	support the policies, but would want to see stronger/greater clarity on how they are aligned with the other policies in the DLP.
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q19	But with mineral extraction,hs2 construction ,JLR developments it would be reasonable to delay additional housing?
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q19	Policy P9 is a very welcome part of this Plan, as is Policy P10 but it's difficult to determine what level of importance these will be given in relation to other, potentially competing, concerns. For example, the statement that areas of importance for biodiversity will be protected "where it is reasonable, proportionate and feasible to do so' may make it easy to find reasons to avoid doing so (as was, perhaps, the case with Babb's Mill recently). Similarly, the quality of buildings required to address climate change and reduce fuel poverty could be more explicit.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q19	<p>Overall this is welcome to see in the plan.</p> <p>concerned thought that flood risk in Shirley and to the sites (esp. 12 & 13) has been underestimated. Also question whether local knowledge, information and most recent data has been used.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q19	<p>Broadly agree.</p> <p>Policy P9 - could be more explicit about Council's expectations and role of spatial policy in reducing GHG emissions. Will the Council set up a renewable energy services company?</p> <p>Policy P10 - welcome.</p> <p>Policy P11 - Need greater scrutiny of development in flood risk areas, e.g. near Rivers Cole and Blythe. Set out specific measures and legal requirements. Requires ongoing surveillance.</p>
CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mr M Sullivan) [2309]			Q19	<p>Chapter 9 covers a range of environmental policies. Policy for the Green Belt is not one. Green Belt is a planning and not an environmental designation so it would not be correct to have a Green belt policy in Chapter 9.</p> <p>No clear Policy setting out the aims and purposes of the Green Belt and how these will be applied. A separate Policy is needed for the Green Belt. Compare the absence of such a Policy with Policies C1, C2 and C3 on the 2006 UDP, all Policies for Solihull's Green Belt</p>
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q19	<p>Broadly support these policies.</p> <p>Sites 4 and 13 do not comply with Policy P10 due to degradation of Arden landscape character and associated wildlife.</p>
Dr Deborah Hope [3133]			Q19	<p>With reference to 287: I would expect that the emissions from cars used by owners of the new, several hundred proposed houses to be built in Knowle would significantly effect air pollution and congestion. The immediate area and main routes into Solihull are already heavily congested for significant periods; the bus services are infrequent, parking at Dorridge Station is insufficient, and the cycle routes become progressively more dangerous the closer to Solihull. I would ask there is a study of the likely emmissions to be undertaken, and that a review of the overall useable, practical alternative transport is undertaken.</p>
Dr P Johnson [2408]			Q19	<p>Planning approval process is flawed and does not consider health and environment of existing council tax payers as shown by the bad example at Middlefield Spring development where lorries allowed to operate 6 days per week from 7am on roads that are too narrow.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]		Q19	<p>"Quality of life" is referred to in this section. I do not consider that the Council's proposals will achieve this.</p> <p>I cite the impact on the current population of Balsall Common of the three proposed developments in the village. If these are allowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *green belt space is further eroded, and critically, THE MERIDEN GAP IS FURTHER REDUCED *the near doubling in size of the village will irrevocably destroy the character and nature of the village *it will become a herculean task for the falling relative academic standards of the overscribed secondary school to be turned round. CHILDREN WILL SUFFER
Environment Agency (Martin Ross) [4669]		Q19	<p>Policy P9: Support</p> <p>Policy P11: Suggest additional wording/amendments to various parts of the Policy and to the Policy Justification (see full response). The Policy title should be changed to Water and Flood Risk Management. The Policy is lengthy, so suggest consideration of 2 separate policies.</p> <p>Policy P13: Suggest changes to 8th bullet point of the policy (see full response)</p> <p>Policy P14: Text in relation to Contaminated Land appears somewhat out of place. The protection and remediation of Controlled Waters is more of a water quality issue, so suggest that it is included a policy relating to Water Quality.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q19	<p>Recognise importance of protecting the environment.</p> <p>Policy P10: 'Full ecological survey' and 'net gain or enhancement' to each development is overly arduous and not in spirit of NPPF, which states 'provide net gains in biodiversity where possible.'</p> <p>Policy P11: Approach in policy alludes to sequential test, but this is not explicit.</p> <p>Unreasonable to state 'there are no other viable site at lower risk of flooding'. Viability is a much more restrictive test than availability, which is not in accordance with national guidance and should be revised accordingly.</p>
Genting Solihull Ltd [3409]	Ms Andrea Arnall	Turley Associates (Ms Andrea Arnall) [2025]	Q19	<p>Policies to protect the environment should be used to control any new residential development at the NEC and ensure the effects of existing adjacent uses can be mitigated against through careful consideration of layout, landscape buffering and/or appropriate acoustic insulation.</p>
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q19	<p>Policy P10 - the landscape part of the policy does not seem to meet criteria in NPPF.</p>
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q19	<p>Support the principles and policies in Section 9 and urge the Council to ensure that the commitments and criteria enshrined in policies P11 and P12 are met, particularly when dealing with major developments such as HS2 and plans to relocate the Municipal Waste Recycling Centre. Support the criteria in policy P14 for electronic communications networks, but highlight the continuing lack of reliable broadband service in Hampton and its consequence on employment opportunity.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q19	Support the principles and policies in Section 9 and urge the Council to ensure that the commitments and criteria enshrined in policies P11 and P12 are met, particularly when dealing with major developments such as HS2 and plans to relocate the Municipal Waste Recycling Centre. Support the criteria in policy P14 for electronic communications networks, but highlight the continuing lack of reliable broadband service in Hampton and its consequence on employment opportunity.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q19	Hockley Heath largely supports the plan's policies for protecting the environment but is disappointed there is so little mention of the village within the need to protect the natural environment. HHPC would welcome more reference to the historic place of "Oakley Heath".
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q19	<p>Little mention of Hockley Heath within the need to protect the natural environment. HHPC would welcome more reference to the canal infrastructure and to more alternative transport links such as cycle lanes to mitigate and adapt to climate change.</p> <p>With the frequent dumping of household and other waste in the roads around our village, the plan's requirement to address the waste capacity in Solihull is welcomed.</p>
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q19	Support Policy P14 seeking to protect amenity for all, including businesses.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q19	I am very pleased to see the commitment to reducing carbon and protecting the environment given in the green policies. I agree with the policies.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Policy P9 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change - Agree in principle. * Policy P10. Natural Environment - Agree in principle. * Policy P11. Water Management - Agree in principle * Policy P14. Amenity - Agree in principle.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q19	Policy P14. All the mature trees on any proposed development site should be preserved. This doesn't mean building so close to them that they are compromised by movement of machinery during construction or placing them within the gardens of new properties where they all too often are subsequently removed as a perceived nuisance to the homeowner.
Julie Betts [3173]			Q19	There are steel Pylons through the land south of Shirley, surely that is not suitable building land?
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q19	The policies are consistent with advice within the National Planning Framework and subject to the measures required by each of the proposed policies not having an adverse impact on viability, the policies would appear to be acceptable.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q19	No joined up thinking regarding cumulative effect on local residents. Meriden already has a problem identified by the Quarry Liaison group of dust particles emanating from several operations. Extraction is inevitable but must be strongly regulated by the council in order to minimise impacts on local roads, residents and the environment. Meriden has been affected by minerals extraction for many years and it is evident that at times regulation and monitoring has been ineffective as impacts have been significant. Another key factor is ensuring the necessary mechanism and financial security is on place for restoration once the extraction has ceased.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Policy P9 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change - Agree in principle. * Policy P10. Natural Environment - Agree in principle. * Policy P11. Water Management - Agree in principle * Policy P14. Amenity - Agree in principle.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q19	<p>In general I support the approach but suggest adding</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All new commercial, retail and industrial development should contain solar generation capacity particularly roof top capacity but also on green areas maintained for water run off management 2. All proposals for significant development should demonstrate that they would not add to the risk of flooding or pressure on flood plains.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]			Q19	<p>Coverage of resource management/minerals lacks appropriate detail in many important respects and data sources dated. Justification for the proposals, and their effectiveness, is questionable, with no details of waste management facilities needed and when. Unjustified selection of Area of Search in the Green Belt contrary to Government policy, and inadequate guidance to providers of waste management facilities on what is needed and likely to be approved, where and when.</p> <p>Existing sand and gravel quarries not mapped, no indication of their expected lifespan or when new facilities required. Exploration/pre-application procedures take a long time so future planning not assisted.</p>
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q19	Yes
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q19	one the whole a good idea. BUT From Frog Lane to Meer End, there is open countryside. the nomination of Frog Lane as a development sites is nonsense and contrary to this policy. some clear thinking needed here.
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q19	dark sky is important in the countryside. development at Frog Lane Balsall Common is contrary to that. site should be withdrawn
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q19	why promote development in Green Belt without accompanying public transport services - another logic leap. Sound very "motherhood and apple pie" - fine words have to be delivered.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q19	I do not agree with the policies put forward by the plan. The scale of development in Balsall Common is surely counter to any purported protection of natural ecosystems, species diversity and the health providing qualities of the external environment for existing residents. important wildlife species (Bats, mice, amphibians, migrating birds, domestic birds etc) all reside within the focused areas. I personally am an active walker of the Meriden gap and wealth of public footpaths that will be lost. the considerable amount of additional run-off from development at Barratts Farm will contribute to flooding, and then there's HS2 to consider
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q19	Yes even though the developments proposed within the document seem to be at odds with Policy P10- particularly as regards the Arden Landscape. I do question as regards Policy P11 (water management)as to whether the impact of additional proposed developments for Balsall Common has been fully considered in respect of the existing drainage system in the village

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David McGrath [3508]			Q19	Views of Meriden residents expressed at a public meeting on 6 December 2016, noting that policy P13 included wording relating to permitting the search for coal bed methane subject to criteria to conform with national guidance, whilst recognising that any such proposed extraction would be highly controversial and have significant potential impacts, requiring full consultation and the earliest possible notice.
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q19	Perhaps try harder to protect our environment. Poor consideration is given to air quality. Water run off areas are worthy of more planned consideration - Blythe Valley river is often of poor quality.
Mr Eric Homer [3721]			Q19	Protection of eco systems on site 13. If the proposed development of Site 13 was to go ahead then there would be significant effects on the water table in the area, both in terms of run-off and drainage. The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy from April 2015 doesn't factor in surface water meaning that the flood risk at site 13 is significantly underestimated. The long term predictions are for wetter weather throughout parts of the year. The constraints map used to detail the flood risk across the borough doesn't fully capture all the areas of concern, especially Site 13.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q19	There is not much in this section which I disagree with. However, I do not understand how destroying large areas of Green belt will protect the Arden landscape.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q19	A thorough environmental assessment of Site 13 should be made. Popular area with dog walkers, ramblers, and such like as well as being a valuable habitat for a range of wildlife and flora. Risks of flooding from Site 13. Section 9 fails to address Challenges in respect of Site 13.
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q19	But all three sites selected in Balsall Common/Berkswell fly in the face of policy P10, particularly in protecting the Arden Landscape, green infrastructure assets and habitats, and should be withdrawn from the Local Plan for this reason.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q19	<p>The Green Belt around Balsall Common is vital in preserving a distinct boundary with Coventry and plays a valuable role within the community both in supporting a vibrant range of wildlife and in providing many paths for recreation, walking etc. The major Barratts Farm development will severely impact this and plans must reflect this by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. retaining trees and hedgerows 2. preserving green corridors for wildlife, potentially through the creation of substantial green buffers or tree belts to protect existing residents from new build 3. linking such spaces with existing green leisure provision such as the Lant Trust.
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q19	<p>One aspect which seems to be overlooked is providing new housing developments that are pleasant to live in. Flat fields crammed with high-density housing, that forces people to live cheek by jowl, are not the answer. A more enlightened approach would be to allow reduced densities in areas, like Knowle, which have a pleasant and more spacious atmosphere, so that new development can be in keeping with the character of existing housing. The southern part of Site 9 (Lansdowne Farm) for example is not flat, and could provide really pleasant developments, surrounding the proposed new public park.</p>
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q19	<p>I agree with the policy BUT the overloading of additional housing in Balsall Common is NOT consistent with this policy</p>
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q19	<p>However, when you look at Balsall Common proposal it would appear that these policies have either been ignored or their has been a lack of assessment of the impact of the proposed developments</p>
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q19	<p>Building on Barratts Farm could cause significant drainage issues when coupled with HS2 and increase flooding risk which is already an issue at Berkswell Station.</p>
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q19	<p>Agree</p>
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q19	<p>Concern that potentially hedge rows and tree's will be removed from proposed development.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q19	I agree with the policies but I am at a bit of a loss to understand how some of the proposed housing plans fit in with the policies. I for instance live on Pinfold Road which is on the boundary of the proposed development off Lugtrout Lane. At the moment I look out across fields, in the last two weeks have seen a Tawny Owl, Barn Owl, Sparrow Hawk, Kestrel, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Cattle in Field If the plan goes ahead I will see none of these, I will lose my tranquil view and suffer increased noise.
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q19	There is no clear commitment to protect the Meriden gap to stop the sprawl towards Coventry or preserve green belt close to existing residential areas.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q19	Support.
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q19	Protecting the environment is vital. However, the plans for housing developments on green belt land contradicts the policy on protection the environment.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q19	Building in the Meriden Gap at it's narrowest point is a major concern. Building on Barratts Farm will impact local drainage especially when coupled with HS2 works. The station underpass already regularly floods.
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q19	In addition to renewable energy and energy efficiency there has to be local energy plan to ensure that domestic heating commercial heating and road transport can be decarbonised to ensure that carbon reduction targets can be met.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q19	Probably, but the Draft Local Plan does not adhere to these principles with regard to protecting the Arden Landscape and protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements.
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q19	The proposed housing sites at west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley should be removed as these two sites do not support the policy of protecting and enhancing the environment given that: would result in the loss of ponds, hedgerows, woodlands and public rights of way; the site west of Dickens Heath would result in the loss of designated ancient woodlands and local wildlife sites; the loss of wildlife corridors between urban areas and rural village settlement of Dickens Heath that support legally protected species including badgers, bats and great crested newts.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q19	Largely support plan's policies for protecting the environment but disappointed at lack of mention of Hockley Heath within the need to protect the natural environment. I would also welcome more alternative transport links such as cycle lanes to mitigate and adapt to climate change. I would also point out the issue of poor drainage and flooding on Hockley Heath's roads, particularly evident on Stratford Road, and in gardens on School Road.
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q19	The Green Belt around Balsall Common plays a valuable role within the community both in supporting a vibrant range of wildlife and in providing many paths for recreation, walking etc. Housing site 1 will severely impact this and plans must reflect this by retaining trees and hedgerows, preserving green corridors for wildlife, potentially through the creation of substantial green buffers or tree belts which could also protect existing residents from the impact of development, and linking such spaces with existing green leisure provision such as the Lant Trust.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q19	I hope that there will be enough central funding to deliver all the proposals set out.
Mrs Linda Homer [3729]			Q19	The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy from April 2015 doesn't factor in surface water meaning that the flood risk at proposed development sites, such as Site 13 is significantly underestimated. The long term predictions are for wetter weather throughout parts of the year. The constraints map used to detail the flood risk across the borough doesn't fully capture all the areas of concern, especially Site 13.
Mrs M Hughes [3268]			Q19	support for green spaces, and the environment for fauna
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q19	Concerns that flood plains will be used to build on.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q19	I agree, but again with the Frog Lane you are building on green belt land, including parts and allotments, and next to ancient meadow land which seems to me counter to your policies - which I agree with.
Ms Susan Agnama [3078]			Q19	I am not convinced that the Council is able to reconcile the Green policy agenda with the proposed housing development for Balsall Common.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q19	welcome the references in Policy P9 of DLP to CHP.
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q19	<p>Support policy P9</p> <p>Object to Policy P10. Amendments are recommended so that the Mitigation Hierarchy heading comes ahead of the Site headings, to show that SSSIs have significantly increased levels of protection than LNRs and sites outside statutory designations.</p> <p>No evidence that an HRA report has been undertaken.</p> <p>Policy P11 should refer to the river Blythe SSSI, to reflect its status. The Policy should recognise the need to protect habitats from water related impacts and seek enhancement, especially SSSIs, but also local sites.</p> <p>Recommends changes to Policy P13 and separate policies on Soils and Agricultural Land Quality and Ancient Woodland.</p>
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q19	Policy P9 - Many farmers are considering opportunities for investing in renewable energy production. This could include; roof mounted solar panels, wind, Anaerobic digestion or growing Biomass (for local heating etc). These farms represent a significant opportunity for the borough to produce renewable energy.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q19	<p>Policy P11 - Large new urban developments have the potential to cause downstream impacts, even when new SUDs techniques are employed.</p> <p>Important to recognise that farmers have to deal with these impacts as they are responsible for maintaining many of the area's watercourses and drainage infrastructure.</p> <p>Waterlogging and flooding impact upon food production and the productivity of agricultural land.</p> <p>Need to emphasise downstream effects and considerable additional demands on the drainage capacity of the rural areas downstream of the area.</p> <p>Remain concerned about the future management of SUDS structures. Need to investigate the wider impacts of water management.</p>
NFU West Midlands (Ms Sarah Faulkner) [2490]			Q19	<p>Policy P10 - Farmers and landowners must be fully engaged with discussions on the natural environment as they own and manage many of the areas key green and blue infrastructure assets.</p> <p>Should acknowledge that for many farmers environmental management is a core business activity. Routine investment in e.g. hedging, tree planting, cutting and grazing. Farmers who do not participate in agri-environment schemes also make valid contributions. The work of the Campaign for the Farmed Environment has shown that these farms use a range of voluntary techniques to enhance the options and that this management is funded by farm businesses.</p>
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q19	<p>on the whole, agree with the policies in this section.</p>

Name	Agent Details	Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]		Q19	<p>Policy P10 -</p> <p>Natural Environment:</p> <p>Welcome importance being placed on maintaining a healthy, natural environment, which is consistent with Packington Estate's longer stewardship objectives.</p> <p>Suggest including contribution development (in rural areas and Green Belt) makes to the viability of maintaining landscape biodiversity. Conservation and enhancement cannot take place without income and capital.</p> <p>Arden Landscape section could be linked to Policy P3.</p> <p>Arden Landscape, Biodiversity/Geodiversity:</p> <p>Packington Estate, in particular the Deer Park contribute to the original Forest of Arden landscape. Any expansion east of A452 would negatively impact landscape character, River Blythe SSSI and result in 1000s of mature trees.</p>
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]		Q19	<p>Policy P11 -</p> <p>Flood Risk Reduction:</p> <p>Welcome policy that ensures developers must promote developments that reduce flood risk and look to reinstate the natural floodplain where feasible, to include de-culverting and improvements of on-site watercourses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q19	<p>Policy P13:</p> <p>Welcome policy effectively encouraging developers to ensure minerals have been extracted before development occurs.</p> <p>Packington Estate has planning consent to extract mineral at the Arden Cross Interchange Station site and is in the process of extraction.</p> <p>Recognise the important contribution the mineral reserve to the east of NEC/M42 could play in contributing towards the Borough's mineral requirement.</p> <p>Recognise the most sustainable mineral is that which could be excavated and used on site again and again.</p> <p>Urge the Council to aid with implementing a mineral extraction plan to ensure balance of extraction and development are forthcoming.</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q19	<p>Policy P9: Energy efficiency measures listed at strategic and site level should not be over and above national requirements as set out in Approved Document L of Building Regulations.</p> <p>Should also be considered how these policy measures will impact the viability of a scheme.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q19	<p>The policies are consistent with advice within the National Planning Framework and subject to the measures required by each of the proposed policies not having an adverse impact on viability, the policies would appear to be acceptable.</p>
Peter Bray [4040]			Q19	<p>I cannot claim to be an environmentalist but I would not endanger the environment only support it. I pray that you can fulfill the fine words under this heading. However, I have to say I have my doubts judging by the destruction you support to the east of Balsall Common. It is a travesty of monumental proportions. This is not a NIMBY statement I am only thinking about the next generation just as you say you are but perhaps you have no choice.</p> <p>You are not responsible for HS2 but you did support it and are busily adding to it.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q19	SMBC policy should ensure that all new housing built in the Borough have a minimum energy rating of A.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q19	19-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q19	There should be a clear policy for requiring solar PV on all new buildings, and prohibiting green-field solar farms. In addition, policies should encourage use of solar PV in paved areas etc. There should be clear architectural/design standards for all solar PV installations.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Policy P9 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change - Agree in principle. * Policy P10. Natural Environment - Agree in principle. * Policy P11. Water Management - Agree in principle * Policy P14. Amenity - Agree in principle.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Policy P9 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change - Agree in principle. * Policy P10. Natural Environment - Agree in principle. * Policy P11. Water Management - Agree in principle * Policy P14. Amenity - Agree in principle.
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q19	Agree with policies. However, some of proposals in DLP contradict these e.g. suggesting development on areas with a higher combined Green Belt scores than those omitted.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q19	<p>Our project contributes positively to SMBC aims 274/279/280; in particular biodiversity and physical and mental health.</p> <p>As explained in previous answers we also contribute to objectives C, J and K.</p> <p>We contribute to Policy P10 in sections Arden Landscape and Biodiversity and Geodiversity through our conservation activities including hedgerow management, the planting of trees, hedges and shrubs to break up the area, and species-rich grass land.</p> <p>This policy also states that 'Developers will be expected to incorporate measures to protect, enhance and restore the landscape.</p> <p>The Arden development will prevent the positive contribution of the current use of the land.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q19	<p>Policy P11 - 110L per person per day is not justified in the text.</p> <p>Water Cycle study has not identified Solihull as a water stress area.</p>
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q19	<p>Recognise importance of protecting the environment.</p> <p>Policy P10:</p> <p>'Full ecological survey' and 'net gain or enhancement' to each development is overly arduous and not in spirit of NPPF, which states 'provide net gains in biodiversity where possible.'</p> <p>Policy P11:</p> <p>Approach in policy alludes to sequential test, but this is not explicit.</p> <p>Unreasonable to state 'there are no other viable site at lower risk of flooding'. Viability is a much more restrictive test than availability, which is not in accordance with national guidance and should be revised accordingly.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q19	Further consideration is necessary regarding the detailed drafting of Policies P9 to ensure does not go beyond Government requirements, subject to being cost effective and based on fabric first approach and not encourage district energy schemes as financially unsustainable, P10 to balance against other objectives and provide more flexible approach to local sites, P11 to not go beyond Government requirements and being cost effective, P12 to provide a proportionate approach to the level of detail for site waste management plans, and P14 to remove duplication with P15 and separate amenity from design considerations.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q19	<p>* Policy P9 Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P10. Natural Environment - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P11. Water Management - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P14. Amenity - Agree in principle.</p>
Tarmac Trading (Ltd) [4599]	Joel Jessup	Heaton Planning Limited (Joel Jessup) [4597]	Q19	<p>Policy P13 -</p> <p>Overall support for principle for growth in DLP.</p> <p>Will have a significant call on local mineral reserves in Borough, such supply is invaluable.</p> <p>Meriden Quarry is an important resource for Borough and wider region.</p> <p>Support identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas.</p> <p>Support inclusion of associated infrastructure within MSAs.</p> <p>Support statement that proposals for ancillary uses to sand and gravel extraction will be permitted where appropriate.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, proposals for sand and gravel extraction outside of the identified Area of Search should not be prejudiced where there is a proven workable reserve, in accordance with Para. 144 NPPF.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q19	<p>On the whole agree with policies P9, P10, P11, P12, P13 and P14.</p> <p>P9 - agree with national requirement to reduce carbon emissions on new developments.</p> <p>At site level would suggest fabric-first approach to improve energy efficiency, rather than provision of renewable energies that can be quickly out of date. Fabric first is in line with Building Regs.</p> <p>Recommend that P14 would sit better in Chapter on Quality of Place, as refer more to design than protection of the environment.</p>
The Coal Authority (Ms R Bust) [2429]			Q19	<p>Policy P13 - Having reviewed the document, whilst is noted that Policy P13 Minerals identifies Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) for deep coal resources in the eastern part of the Borough, I can confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage of the Local Plan preparation process.</p>
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q19	<p>Policy P11 -</p> <p>Should delete higher optional water efficiency standard of 110 litres per day per person.</p> <p>NPPG is explicit that higher water efficiency standards should only be proposed in identified areas of water stress.</p> <p>It is noted that the Water Cycle Study by the EA and STW has not identified Solihull as a water stress area (see Para.'s 303 and 304).</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q19	<p>Recommend change to the paragraph on Biodiversity and Geodiversity (see full response).</p> <p>Disagree with paragraph on LWS, LNR and Geological Sites. Should not be differentiated in terms of avoidance (see full response).</p>
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q19	<p>Policy P11 - Requirement for higher optional water efficiency standard of 110 L per day per person cannot be justified and should be removed.</p> <p>PPG clear this can only be applied in areas of water stress; not justified by Water Cycle Study.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Woodland Trust (Mr Justin Milward) [3457]			Q19	Whilst we are pleased to see the references to ancient woodland in the 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity' paragraph of Policy P10, it still does not reflect national planning policy as we highlighted in our earlier Issues & Options consultation response in November 2015. We therefore raise two objections to this Local Plan Review document on (a) including ancient trees and (b) improving the wording of protection for ancient woodland.
Woodland Trust (Mr Justin Milward) [3457]			Q19	We would like to see the abbreviation WAST in Appendix A relate to relevant text in the Draft document, which it presently doesn't.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q19	I agree with policies to protect the environment. However, these have not been put in place when proposing the development sites in Balsall Common. The site at Barrett's farm has several ponds throughout it which are vital to land drainage of existing homes and land. These also provide a safe haven for many birds, bats, animals, amphibians such as newts and frogs. Housing on this site is likely be used by two car family commuters which simply encourages carbon emissions and thus climate change. Instead additional housing should be in urban areas where people can walk or cycle to work.
Question 20 Quality of Place				
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q20	The plan talks about distinctive places - but the plan, and Solihull's actions over the past few years, show that as far as Shirley is concerned, the Council isn't prepared to pay even lip service to the built environment. It has encouraged the demolition of distinctive buildings, encouraged development on public realm (and then not benefited financially after all). Solihull Council gives no impression that it considers Shirley as anything other than a cash cow for the local authority. This plan does little to dispel this impression, with no plans for the Quality of the Shirley Place.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q20	fully supportive of the policies, subject to continuing the approach set in the DLP re Green Belt release for 'Arden triangle'

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q20	<p>Support the aims of Policy P15.</p> <p>Object to paragraph 343 of the Plan which conflicts with the Vision and Spatial Strategy. These should be revisited to ensure suitable recognition that there will be necessary alterations to existing Green Belt boundaries within the Borough on the basis of identified exceptional circumstances</p> <p>Support paragraph 349 of the Plan.</p>
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q20	But the three sites selected for development in Balsall Common/Berkswell does not meet the Council's ethos with regard to the Green Belt. Furthermore, it is imperative that any development in the Green Belt must be with clear, definable, and strong defensible boundaries to prevent urban sprawl and loss of this important 'quality of place' asset to future generations.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q20	The policies only have value if they are implemented. Recent developments have not delivered the required amount of space and designs have not been in keeping with the character of the area.
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q20	<p>Policy 15 should be amended by omitting reference to the need to achieve compliance with Building Regulations as this is a requirement of other legislation.</p> <p>Reference to Secured by Design should be omitted as this is now addressed through Building Regulations.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	<p>Outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt cannot constitute very special circumstances if they are lost unnecessarily due to development being directed to their existing locations in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Policy P17 incorrectly does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sport and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances', contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87 to 89.</p> <p>Changes of use to accommodate outdoor sport and recreation uses should be removed from the list of very special circumstances or the policy amended similar to that for the expansion of existing businesses.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q20	<p>In general support. But disappointed the principles are not being applied to development on land to the east of Balsall Common.</p> <p>Allocation 1 conflicts with Policy 10 as the Council's own LCA findings are ignored.</p> <p>Need to protect the Green Belt, particularly the Meriden Gap.</p> <p>In explanation to Policy P17 the importance of the Meriden Gap is highlighted but the Council has disregarded this by allocating site 1. There are no exceptional circumstances.</p>
Cannock Chase District Council (Clare Eggington) [2371]			Q20	<p>Policy P17 - Paragraph 5.19.2 of the Sustainability Appraisal states that wording of Policy 17: Countryside and Green Belt is flexibly worded to enable 'reasonable expansion of established businesses' creates uncertainty.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q20	<p>Commenting only on Policy P17.</p> <p>consider the policy as being sound, in accordance with NPPF para 182.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q20	It is misleading to suggest that settlements inset in the Green Belt are not subject to Green Belt Policy because some areas of the settlement are within the Green Belt and subject to full Green belt provisions and policies .
Chris Crean [3631]			Q20	More efficient design standards can reduce the need for increased heating demands usually provided from gas combustion which contributes to climate change and poor air quality.
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q20	We are in agreement with the proposed policies
Colin Davis [3352]			Q20	the size and location of new developments on green belt is directly opposite to the objective of sustaining the attractiveness of the Borough and protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	Policy P17: Does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sports and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. Contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87-89.
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q20	Broadly agree. P15 - need to do more to enhance local green spaces. Make more biodiverse and community friendly. Can become places for fly-tipping and ASB, e.g. Ribble and Redwing Walks, areas off Anglesey Avenue and Falkland Way in Smith's Wood.
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q20	Broadly support these policies. Sites 4 and 13 conflict with Policies P16 and P17.
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q20	The Green Belt is there to be protected. Balsall common and Berskwel are in the Green Belt, and are not suitable areas for any further housing

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q20	<p>I consider that particular policies are inadequate/incorrectly applied. I cite the three proposed massive developments in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Paragraph 343 - "Strategic importance of the Meriden Gap". There is only one Gap in the Borough and with continued piecemeal "justified excuses" to erode it, will result one day in a Coventry/Solihull urban sprawl. It is strategic, it is green belt, there should be NO PLANNING PERMISSIONS GRANTED for its destruction.</p> <p>P16 - The "local distinctiveness" of Balsall Common will be DESTROYED by 1350 new homes</p> <p>P17 - The green belt "visual amenity" will be DESTROYED by 1350 new homes</p>
Environment Agency (Martin Ross) [4669]			Q20	Policy P17 -Recommend additional wording to the Policy.
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q20	<p>Policy P17 - Paragraph 359 should include reference to delivery of supporting infrastructure for Junction 6 improvements.</p> <p>Some 'joined up, positive planning' is required with regard to this part of the Green belt. The Local Plan should remove land required for the Junction 6 improvements and MSA from the Green Belt and allocate the site of the current application MSA application at Catherine de Barnes as suitable for a MSA and as the most appropriate and policy compliant location in which to meet a significant and growing road safety need.</p>
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q20	<p>Recognise the importance of quality of place.</p> <p>Policy P17:</p> <p>No national policy requirement for development not in the Green Belt to preserve the visual amenity of the Green Belt. Unduly restrictive wording and would limit land development in Solihull.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]			Q20	<p>Policy P15 - We support importance of good design. Need to ensure that such stringent policies are in accordance with NPPF and do not adversely impact site deliverability.</p> <p>Policy P17 - Wording on BMV agricultural land does not accord with NPPF policy. Considers as a more constraining factor.</p>
Graham Jones [3354]			Q20	<p>Policy P15</p> <p>a) Developers should be required to demonstrate how the proposed development meets the principles of being well planned, designed and sustainable.</p> <p>b) Housing developers should not be allowed to construct roads of inadequate width and pavements</p> <p>c) Air quality standards should be included in Policy 15 with a requirement for on-going monitoring of inadequate widths.</p>
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q20	<p>Policy P17 provides guidance on small settlements inset from the green belt, but is misleading as it suggests that the whole of the built up area of the villages is inset when this is clearly not the case.</p>
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q20	<p>Policy P17 provides guidance on small settlements inset from the green belt, but is misleading as it suggests that the whole of the built up area of the villages is inset when this is clearly not the case.</p>
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q20	<p>Policy 15 should be amended by omitting reference to the need to achieve compliance with Building Regulations as this is a requirement of other legislation.</p> <p>Reference to Secured by Design should be omitted as this is now addressed through Building Regulations</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]			Q20	Policy P16 - could we encourage SMBC to take the opportunity to refine this early example of a post NPPF heritage policy to reflect current good practice? Wording additions and amendments suggested.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q20	Following recent planning decisions in and adjacent to Hockley Heath there are concerns that SMBC will not take into account the importance of the rural setting and note any feedback or objections from HHPC and residents. The importance of maintaining the distinctiveness of the village and its separation with Dorridge should be reinforced in the Plan.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q20	<p>Objectives of P15 are appropriate. But concern over current levels of engagement with developers and SMBC in relation to planning decisions. Policy needs to detail the terms and levels of pre-planning consultation.</p> <p>Agree with principles of P16.</p> <p>P17-Agree with policy that inappropriate development will not be permitted. But concern that SMBC will not take into account the importance of the rural setting of Hockley Heath. The importance of maintaining the distinctiveness of HH and its separation with Dorridge should be reinforced in the Local Plan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q20	<p>Policy P17 -</p> <p>As a Green Belt review is taking place and new Green Belt boundaries are being defined, it is necessary for the Council to identify as part of the review, 'safeguarded land' to meet longer term development needs.</p> <p>Land south of Fillongley Road, Meriden is proposed as 'safeguarded land' (see rep).</p> <p>The NPPF paragraphs 83 and 85 states that once established Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and that, when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' to meet longer term development needs.</p>
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q20	<p>Welcome Policy P17. 'Reasonable expansion of existing businesses into the Green Belt' is in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>NPPF also identifies that 'appropriate facilities' should be included as very special circumstances, and P17 should therefore include reference to supporting facilities (e.g. changing rooms, clubhouse etc).</p>
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q20	<p>Absolutely, there is great value in maintaining the distinctive character of Solihull.</p>
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q20	<p>* Policy P15. Securing Design Quality - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P16. Conservation of Heritage Assets and Local Distinctiveness - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P17. Countryside and Green Belt. - Agree in principle</p>
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q20	<p>Support.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q20	The policies are consistent with the NPPF.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	Policy P17: Does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sports and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. Contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87-89.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q20	Support. Any design needs to retain rural landscape. Agree with Policy 16 & 17. Policy 15 - Building in rural settlements should take regard of character and modern design of new build should be disallowed. Tightening up of policies of "garden grabbing" by home owners to stop public open space/green space owned by the Principal Authority to be transferred or sold without consultation; encroached upon and materially affected without consultation and liaison.
Michael Doble [3296]			Q20	The creation of a commercial sports complex on the land off Hampton Road, by the canal, would be totally inappropriate within the Green Belt.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q20	* Policy P15. Securing Design Quality - Agree in principle * Policy P16. Conservation of Heritage Assets and Local Distinctiveness - Agree in principle. Catherine de Barnes should be acknowledge as one of the rural settlements making a significant contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the Borough. * Policy P17. Countryside and Green Belt. - Agree in principle

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q20	<p>Policy P15:</p> <p>Increasing trend of enclosing residential properties with high iron railings, e.g. St Bernard's Road and Dovehouse Lane. Make properties look like compounds; have a forbidding look and are designed to exclude. These detract from the relaxed, traditional, friendly streetscene that contributes to Solihull's attractiveness.</p> <p>Planners could resist these more if there was a policy on retaining traditional boundary treatments and discouraging erection of new railings.</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q20	I agree in theory but I have concerns that Solihull Council's commercial considerations/aspirations will outweigh the need for retaining historical features, nature and the green belt.
Mr & Mrs David hull [3876]			Q20	There is already a shortage of sporting facilities in the area how will these playing fields be replaced if built on, surely it would be better to put effort into ensuring this land is used for its designated purpose.
Mr & Mrs Hogarth [4532]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	<p>Support Policy P17, in particular:</p> <p>"...The reasonable expansion of established businesses into the Green Belt ... providing that appropriate mitigation can be secured..."</p> <p>This support is SUBJECT TO an amendment to Para. 364 of the DLP, for the sake of clarity, to confirm that Policy P17 does not exclude 'established businesses' other than Jaguar Land Rover and Whale Tankers; in accordance with the High Court Judgement.</p> <p>To read: "...The reasonable expansion of these and other established businesses into the Green Belt, whilst remaining inappropriate development..."</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q20	Balsall Common should be added to the list of settlements shown in Policy 17 at the bottom of page 119 that are classified as inset within the greenbelt.
Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]			Q20	Knowle should be added to the list of settlements in Policy P17 where infilling in the Green Belt could take place without harm, in roads in the Green Belt such as Lady Byron Lane, Hampton Road and Kenilworth Road.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Bob Holtham [3530]			Q20	The current design guides are inadequate for the needs of Rural Village settlements as evidenced by the recent 'Middlefield Spring' scheme by TW in Knowle. Local Design standards from agreed Neighbourhood Plans should be a material consideration in deciding planning applications.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q20	Yes, but to expand the back areas of the likes of Hockley Heath, Chadwick End, Illshaw Heath as this would not detract from the core centre of these settlements.
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q20	consideration should be given to ensuring that provision for the elderly should be realistic not all old people are gardeners, but like areas to sit out. long/large gardens not essential.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q20	The development of green belt land in Balsall Common to my mind does not qualify special circumstances as Solihull has not illustrated why. Removal of a vast swathe of the quatably important Merdien Gap at Barratts Farm is not in agreement with the national or local guidelines on protecting the green belt. What does Government think of the proposed destruction of the green belt? This proposal needs to be escalated and ratified by the highest national powers if we as residents are to believe the circumstances are special enough to build over a 1000 homes on virgin green belt.
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q20	Yes - BUT are the proposed new developments in line with the ethos of this policy?
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q20	same answer as Q19 - Perhaps try harder to protect our environment. Poor consideration is given to air quality. Water run off areas are worthy of more planned consideration - Blythe Valley river is often of poor quality.
Mr G E Leighton [3320]			Q20	support the retention of green belt
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q20	The policy is right - once again stressing the importance of the Meriden Gap between Solihull and Coventry but it is not being implemented. Astonishingly, the sites proposed on the eastern edge of Balsall Common are in direct contravention of this policy and will eventually lead to total destruction of this part of the Meriden Gap.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Graham Roderick [3521]			Q20	<p>disagreeing to the sites inclusion on the basis of not meeting policy 19, lends support to what is included in P19</p> <p>Policy P19:- Range and quality of Local Services promotes developments will need to be sensitive to local character and enhance public realm and suggest that a development of this size in this locality fails to meet this criteria.</p>
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q20	<p>The development outlined for Allocation 13 in terms of scale, access, infrastructure, location and loss of important Green Belt areas, as well as the impact on the existing environment and loss of amenity for existing residents meet none of the objectives in Section 10 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The alternatives to revisit the spatial strategy and alternatives.</p>
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q20	<p>While agreeing with the policies, all three sites proposed for development in Balsall Common/Berkswell fail to meet the Council's ethos with regard to the Green Belt. It is imperative that any development in the Green Belt must be with clear, definable, and strong defensible boundaries to prevent urban sprawl and loss of this important 'quality of place' asset to future generations, and I am pleased that SMBC have dismissed development of Grange Farm in the site selection as there would be no defensible boundary between Balsall Common and Hampton if this was allowed.</p>
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q20	<p>The policy should acknowledge and address the impact on Balsall Common. Large scale developments are already leading to the creation of a disconnected series of housing estates rather than a broader community and every attempt must be made to avoid this. Adoption of a series of smaller sites rather than the Barratts Farm large site would assist in this.</p> <p>The policy does not recognize that there is significant impact on green belt at Balsall Common. Specifically Meeting House Lane is a rural lane and plans must be adjusted to maintain this without significant loss of local amenity.</p>
Mr Mark Sutton [3007]			Q20	<p>Quality is mentioned in several areas and I assume that relates to residents quality of life. It is difficult to see how placing greater burdens on the local roads and schools in Knowle while also providing spaces for travellers really helps to maintain quality. Also, it is difficult to see how the constant erosion of green-belt land is improving quality. It appears that the plans are driven more by the appeal to property investors and political correctness than a real housing strategy.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Matthew Taylor [2935]			Q20	It is of great importance that the local areas have a level of protection. They are of historical importance and they add to so much of the great character of Solihull and the borough's appeal.
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q20	<p>Although I agree with most of the policies I do not understand how this allows or justifies the allocation of 20% of the new housing plan to Balsall Common - in Green Belt and also in Meriden Gap.</p> <p>The quality of new houses is also an issue - if the model recently seen in Elysian Gardens development on Kenillworth Road - then SMBC will have a massive problem in the future</p>
Mr P Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI [2415]			Q20	<p>It is considered that the Proposals Map should be altered to exclude from the Green Belt all land between Widney Manor Road and the railway line in the vicinity of 114 -118 Widney Manor Road in order to facilitate allocation of the site as housing land. It is suggested that this apply to all the ribbon of development surrounding and to the north of Widney Manor Station.</p> <p>This note invites officers concerned with the Local Plan to visit the site.</p>
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q20	Not in the case of Balsall Common - there seems to be total disregard of the policies when the current proposals have been submitted. Balsall Common will cease to have any sense of place.
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q20	Barratts Farm proposed development is in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q20	<p>Paragraph 369 - Why although Catherine de Barnes, Meriden, Hockley Heath, Hampton in Arden are not in Green Belt is there specific mention made about conserving their rural setting and special character when considering development proposals yet with regard to Knowle village with its rural setting and special character Area 9 has been selected to develop 750 homes despite this location being Green Belt.</p> <p>This is an inconsistent stance to take and entirely at odds with the proposed intention to build in Knowle which has a better case for exclusion of building than the villages identified as being special cases.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	<p>Outdoor sport and recreation in the Green Belt cannot constitute very special circumstances if they are lost unnecessarily due to development being directed to their existing locations in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Policy P17 incorrectly does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sport and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances', contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87 to 89.</p> <p>Changes of use to accommodate outdoor sport and recreation uses should be removed from the list of very special circumstances or the policy amended similar to that for the expansion of existing businesses.</p>
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q20	Justifying use of green belt and failed promises on design and attractive places.
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	Policy P17: Does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sports and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. Contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87-89.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q20	Support.
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q20	Green belt and agricultural land needs to be preserved
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q20	<p>It should not be necessary to build on large green belt sites as this leads to a significant reduction in quality of life for people living close to these spaces.</p> <p>Agricultural land should be kept whenever possible. In light of Brexit there is more pressure than ever on the production of local fresh agricultural produce. Food security is an important issue and keeping agricultural land safe from housing developments should be a key priority for the Borough Council.</p>
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q20	Balsall Common developments exclusively in Greenbelt ignoring PDL sites and narrowing the Meriden Gap

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Denise Delahunty [3156]			Q20	<p>Future generations will not thank us for allowing Green Belt to be used. The ONLY alternative is to build UP.</p> <p>I am in my 50s and thinking back to when I was bringing up a family, I would rather live a few floors up, with good size rooms & have easy access to Green Belt/ recreational parks than tiny living space & a postage stamp size back garden.</p> <p>Other major cities in the work accept high rise living as the norm & sometimes it is the most sought after. High rise living should be considered</p>
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q20	<p>It should contribute to, or create, high quality places and spaces which have regard to local distinctiveness to achieve high quality, inclusive and sustainable design, ensure effective waste management and strike right balance between green belt protection and provision of required amount of housing, including affordable housing.</p>
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q20	<p>No problem with the policy but the plan does not adhere to it.</p> <p>Balsall Common is within the Green Belt and situated within the Meriden Gap. To the east this is at its narrowest between Solihull and Coventry. A lot of this will be eaten up by the HS2 corridor and proposed trunk road from A46 via Warwick University to the A452/A45. It is not appropriate to take another 57+ hectares out of the Green Belt in this gap.</p> <p>The disruption caused by these major infrastructure projects should not be exacerbated by further construction work until completion of these projects</p>
Mrs J A Leighton [3321]			Q20	<p>support for Green Belt retention</p>
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q20	<p>The proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley would impact negatively on public rights of way and permissable footpaths which are enjoyed by local residents and would remove opportunities for walking in the countryside and interacting with nature and wildlife observation; and would result in an increase in air pollution and noise from traffic congestion and increased risk of road traffic injuries; and increased flood risk from the increase in hard paving and loss of natural infiltration.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jane Carbray [3306]			Q20	The proposed housing sites west of Dickens Heath and south of Shirley would result in the loss of key gaps between the urban area of Shirley and the rural settlement of Dickens Heath; would not conserve and enhance biodiversity due to the loss of trees, hedgerows and ponds and ancient woodland, and would not enhance landscape quality nor protect the character of the countryside.
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q20	<p>More reference to the historic place of Oakley Heath required. Would like to see further emphasis on Hockley Heath keeping a village feel and retaining its rural character.</p> <p>Would also like some additional protection for Hockley Heath as an inset into the green belt to reinforce separation, protect rural setting and ensure fields that keep Hockley Heath contained are not compromised by development.</p>
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q20	Policies should acknowledge and address the impact of large scale developments on Balsall Common, which are already leading to the creation of a disconnected series of housing estates rather than a broader community and every attempt must be made to avoid this. Adoption of a series of smaller sites rather than site 1 would assist in this. Policy P17 does not recognise the significant impact on green belt at Balsall Common, and its vital role in preserving a distinct boundary with Coventry .
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q20	I agree with the policies but again I am doubtful that the funding will be available to carry out all of the proposals. The major draft plans for the Shirley are does not take into account retaining gaps between urban developments.
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q20	Allocation 13 .There is less than one kilometre of open green fields between Shirley and Dickens Heath at this moment, building on this land will leave a very narrow corridor/airfield of green belt land, with no public footpaths.
Mrs Sarah Smith [3872]			Q20	The poor design of Dickens Heath has lead to significant levels of on-street parking and made it dangerous to cycle through village as drivers are impatient to pass. Similar problems could easily happen with any of the new housing sites if not well designed.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q20	I agree with policies for place but actions need to be more ambitious. Adding on to local towns and villages in a way that you hope wont be noticed is not radical enough and will mean services, education, health and the environment will creak under the strain. The LA needs to think about what provision there will be for new residents and outline it clearly for the next 10 years, rather than immediately jumping into developers pockets! Also - and to repeat myself - a sense of place wont be enhanced by building on park and recreational land or allotments!

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
National Motorcycle Museum [370]	Louise Steele	Framptons Planning (Louise Steele) [4592]	Q20	<p>Policy P17:</p> <p>National Motorcycle Museum is a brownfield site in the Green Belt and effective use should be made of it. Accords with Para. A.63 of Housing White Paper.</p> <p>NMM Site been assessed as part of R18 in Green Belt Review, and scores relatively poorly against purposes of Green Belt.</p>
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q20	Agree with the policies for quality of place. Pleased to note references to biodiversity, landscape, green infrastructure (including greenspace), sustainable drainage, climate change adaptation, and soils.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q20	Agree with suggested policies to ensure a quality of place.
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	Policy P17: Does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sports and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. Contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87-89.
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q20	<p>Policy P14 -</p> <p>Dark Sky:</p> <p>Welcome policy that would safeguard parts of the countryside that retain an intrinsically dark sky from the impacts of light pollution and would welcome a plan identifying where these 'dark areas' are to ensure that any development within these areas must comply with low light emitting design guidance.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q20	Policy P15 - Supportive of any policy that delivers high quality/safe environments where people and nature are able to flourish. This should be delivered through 'stewardship' excellence that ensures a long term approach to place making.
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q20	Policy P16 - Welcome the importance being placed on heritage assets and the Arden landscape in particular. Whilst Packington Hall and parkland are outside the Borough, the Estate's land and landscape within the Borough make a significant contribution to its local character and distinctiveness. Packington Hall is a Grade II* listed house and the Park is a Grade II* listed parkland with remnants of the original Forest of Arden landscape, (of which only a few remain) and lies immediately adjacent to Solihull border. Expansion of Airport east of A452 would destroy listed Park and Gardens and adversely affect landscape character.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q20	Policy P17 - Generally support, including changes of use to accommodate outdoor sport and recreation. Should give support to opportunities that enhance biodiversity of the GB linked with alternative users. Generally welcome section on reasonable expansion of established businesses in the GB, however, 'significant contribution' is too limited and vague. E.g. is a small scale expansion of 1,000-2,000 square foot office to provide additional employment for 8 people significant? Is significant for the firm, but not necessarily wider economy. We suggest changing 'significant' to 'proportionate'.
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q20	Policy P15: Documents listed are out of date and not based on current national standards.
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q20	The policies are consistent with the NPPF.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Pertemps Ltd [4531]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	<p>Support Policy P17, in particular:</p> <p>"...The reasonable expansion of established businesses into the Green Belt ... providing that appropriate mitigation can be secured..."</p> <p>This support is SUBJECT TO an amendment to Para. 364 of the DLP, for the sake of clarity, to confirm that Policy P17 does not exclude 'established businesses' other than Jaguar Land Rover and Whale Tankers; in accordance with the High Court Judgement.</p> <p>To read: "...The reasonable expansion of these and other established businesses into the Green Belt, whilst remaining inappropriate development..."</p>
Peter Bray [4040]			Q20	<p>I support promoting the quality of space, securing good design quality, conservation of heritage assets and local distinctiveness, protection of the countryside and greenbelt it's just a pity you have not followed the challenge 'Protecting Key Gaps between Urban Areas and Settlements' at Barretts Farm in Balsall Common. Likewise promoting quality of space seems to have been forgotten on the current Kenilworth Road development.</p>
Prof Jon Binner [3054]			Q20	<p>Referring to the site west of Dickens Heath (either side of Tythe Barn Lane), the plans will significantly impair the quality of Dickens Heath for existing local residents. It is already badly overcrowded and this development will make matters much worse - unless proper plans are put in place to mitigate the effects by significantly increasing the facilities in and around Dickens Heath, including car parking, shops, restaurants, travel (e.g. Whitlock's End train station) and the size / lighting of nearby roads (which are already dangerous - sooner or later there will be a fatality).</p>
re West Mercia Police [684]	Ms H Winkler	re West Mercia Police (Ms H Winkler) [1910]	Q20	<p>Welcomes the changes proposed to the wording of Policy P15 Securing Design Quality with the following useful additions:</p> <p>'...Creates 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...'</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Richard Evans [2640]			Q20	20-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q20	<p>Policy P16 should be expanded to include requirements to identify unrecognised archaeological remains during any development. A more integrated approach should be adopted to finding traces of early settlement in the area. All works in new areas should be preceded by geophysical surveys.</p> <p>Policy P17 should specify Balsall Common as inset in the Green Belt and protected like the other named settlements</p>
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q20	<p>* Policy P15. Securing Design Quality - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P16. Conservation of Heritage Assets and Local Distinctiveness - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P17. Countryside and Green Belt. - Agree in principle particularly at paragraph 361 which refers to minor changes to address anomalies in Green Belt boundaries across the Borough, taking into account an assessment of submissions made during the preparation of the Plan</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q20	<p>* Policy P15. Securing Design Quality - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P16. Conservation of Heritage Assets and Local Distinctiveness - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P17. Countryside and Green Belt. - Agree in principle</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SMBC - Public Heath & Commissioning Directorate (Nick Garnett) [2295]			Q20	<p>P15</p> <p>We would advocate the adoption of the Sport England/Public Health England Active Design principles as a means of creating the environment to help get people active and sustain that activity creating the health benefit required in the Borough.</p> <p>The specification of Lifetime homes standard is supported. There needs to be a reference to 'the creation of civic spaces that promote physical activity'.</p>
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q20	<p>Our current use of the land which may become part of the Knowle Arden Triangle development contributes to Policy 15 challenges C,F,J.K.</p> <p>Additionally we hope that the developers conform to the Policy by altering the boundary line to allow us to retain of land for the delivery of mental health services. The policy states that developments must demonstrate that it 'respects and enhances landscape quality, including trees, hedgerows and other landscape features of value and contributes to strategic green infrastructure'.</p>
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q20	<p>Policy P15 - Overly prescriptive and places too many design requirements on future development proposals.</p>
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q20	<p>Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced 'Active Design' (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. We would commend the use of the guidance in the master planning process for new residential developments.</p> <p>We seek to ensure that Active design is utilised in the determination of planning applications and is embedded in Planning Policy P15 in order to influence the design and promote healthy communities and active lifestyles.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q20	<p>Recognise the importance of quality of place.</p> <p>Policy P17:</p> <p>No national policy requirement for development not in the Green Belt to preserve the visual amenity of the Green Belt. Unduly restrictive wording and would limit land development in Solihull.</p>
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q20	<p>Further consideration is necessary regarding the detailed drafting of Policies P15 to encourage a master plan led approach to a site's development and avoid dogmatic application of national design standards, and P17 to enable consideration of changes of use to outdoor sport and recreation uses as not inappropriate development, or identify areas where such changes of use would be supported to include land generally contained by Tythe Barn Lane, Tilehouse Lane and the Stratford upon Avon Canal to the north of Dickens Heath as a Community Sports Hub associated with Site 4.</p>
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q20	<p>* Policy P15. Securing Design Quality - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P16. Conservation of Heritage Assets and Local Distinctiveness - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P17. Countryside and Green Belt. - Agree in principle</p>
Stratford on Avon District Council (John Careford) [4666]			Q20	<p>Stratford District Council (SDC) supports the approach in respect of Hockley Heath that account will be taken of its rural setting and special character in considering development proposals. This should include the impact of any development on adjacent land and communities in Stratford District.</p> <p>SDC notes the identification of Earlswood Living Landscape in Appendix E: Draft Green Infrastructure Opportunities Map and supports the principle of enhancing the biodiversity of this area. However, SDC would reiterate the previous concerns of local residents about how any such improvements were implemented.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q20	Agree with Policies P15, P16 and P17 on the whole. Would raise points on definition of 'significant' development within Policy P15 in relation to the review by the MADE board panel to assist in securing design quality. The definition of significant development should be set out so that the required quantum of development can be assessed appropriate within the context of MADE board and it doesn't place unnecessary requirements upon the majority of development proposals within the Borough.
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q20	Policy P15 requires all residential development to meet Building for Life 10 or its equivalent. Please note this is now BFL12 and should be referred to in the policy.
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	Policy P17: Does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sports and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. Contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87-89.
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q20	Policy P15 - Overly prescriptive.
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q20	Policy P17: Does not qualify when changes of use to accommodate outdoor sports and recreation uses could be regarded as 'very special circumstances'. Contrary to the spirit of NPPF paragraphs 87-89.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Urban Growth Company [2668]	Julian Pye	ARUP (Julian Pye) [4061]	Q20	<p>Policy P15- support the requirement for a concept framework to be prepared for the UKC Hub area to guide future development.</p> <p>Support the proposed removal of land from the Green Belt within the UKC Hub area.</p> <p>However, the UKC Hub area as a whole is unique and opportunities for economic investment should not be contained to individual parts or sites. There are additional areas of Green Belt land which similarly at best have only scored moderately against the key purposes of Green Belt which could also be considered for future development to deliver the jobs, homes and infrastructure required.</p>
Viv Smith [4670]			Q20	Dickens Heath should be identified in plan as having particular character and design with limits to growth in numbers and direction, and should be conserved as a new village within its countryside setting.
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q20	Agree with proposals being expected to conserve, restore or enhance biodiversity.
West Midlands HARP Consortium [3204]	Meghan Rossiter	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Q20	Policy P17 - Whilst Policy P4(B) sets out that rural exception schemes in the Green Belt can be considered acceptable in certain situations, it would be good practice to also include reference to Paragraph 89 of the NPPF under Policy P17 to avoid any doubt that the Local Plan is in accordance with the NPPF.
West Midlands HARP Consortium [3204]	Meghan Rossiter	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Q20	<p>Policy P15 - fourth bullet point should be removed as it is unnecessary. All housing development has to meet Approved Document M of the Building Regulations as a mandatory requirement.</p> <p>New optional standards include a higher standard of Approved Document M of the Building Regulations under M(2) and M(3).</p> <p>Have to demonstrate a "clear need" for the introduction of the optional technical standards. Should consider the impact of using these standards as part of Local Plan viability assessment.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
William Davis Ltd [671]	Mr Mark Rose	Define (Mr Mark Rose) [2547]	Q20	<p>Policy P15 - Support intent of the policy.</p> <p>Concerns about how policy will be interpreted and applied.</p> <p>Lacks clarity.</p> <p>Reference to Building for Life 10, and not 12, is presumably an error.</p>
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q20	<p>I agree with policies for quality of place. However, this has not been addressed in the proposed sites in Balsall Common. Greenbelt land has been used over brownfield sites which is unacceptable. Key gaps between urban settlements of Balsall Common and Berkswell have not been maintained. The village will lose its identity as a village and become a small soulless commuter town servicing the motorway. Residents of Balsall Common already have increased traffic and congestion, noise pollution from the airport, the proposed HS2 development to contend with. Do not place further stress on our community by siting these developments.</p>
Question 21 Health & Supporting Local Communities				
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q21	<p>Fully support health and supporting communities. Unlike this plan. From a Shirley perspective the quote about 'Green / open space' in paragraph 378 rings particularly hollow, as the plans guarantee that the opposite will be true for a great number of households. This is already a very urban environment - the plans only increase the urbanisation, without any increase in public open space. Where buildings are currently set in space they are to be demolished and replaced with high-density developments.</p>
Andrew King [3581]			Q21	<p>Concerned at lack of reference to leisure/sporting infrastructure, and loss of pitches, inability to accommodate local teams, for example the junior cricket club and lack of leisure space in Balsall Common. Could be addressed by developing the football club/Lavender Hall Park into a multi-sports facility for hockey, football, rugby to provide for all age groups in Balsall Common/Berkswell.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q21	fully supportive of the policies as currently drafted.
Balsall and Berkswell Football Club (Mr James Aspinall) [3643]			Q21	<p>Understand need for housing in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Want to ensure appropriate sports facilities available to families and children.</p> <p>Balsall and Berkswell Football Club lease land from the Council on Lavender Hall Lane and rent pitches in Lavender Park.</p> <p>Sites 1 & 2 would result in 2-4 football pitches being lost to village.</p> <p>Proposed sports facility will not provide external pitch or outdoor facilities.</p> <p>Football Club and Council could develop facilities at grounds and Lavender Hall Park:</p> <p>E.g. Improve playing surface, drainage, car parking, install floodlights, provide integrated sports facility at Lavender Hall, all weather surface for hockey, netball.</p>
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q21	<p>Under these policies Balsall Common&Berkswell needs major investment in its public transport system,both road and rail, together with increased parking at the station in order to accomodate the demand from the proposed population growth, and past experience show this is not forthcoming. When the new medical centre was planned residents were promised a bus service to it, but that service no longer exists.</p> <p>The policy recognises the importance of promoting healthy communities, yet despite recent large housing development the community still has no centralised sports facilities or all weather pitch, and these must be in any development plans.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q21	<p>Support policy P18. A bypass in Balsall Common would facilitate more sustainable transport modes through the village and improve the health and well being of the community.</p> <p>However, the loss of playing fields at Holly Lane will have a negative effect on physical and mental health and well being.</p>
BBCSCA (Dr Bob Harris) [3681]			Q21	<p>Vision for sport and recreational facilities in Balsall Common should take into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current and future demand for such facilities, taking into account planned growth and potential loss of existing pitches. 2. Pitches should be serviced by and further support existing buildings which provide changing and social facilities for sport and recreation. BBCSCA's experience that Sport & Community Centre are equally important as pitches in encouraging participation across the community. 3. Investment in new sport and recreational facilities for schools and community use. Results in greater uptake and better value for money.
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q21	see response
Canal & River Trust (Anne Denby) [3983]			Q21	<p>Welcome references in the Plan which identifies canals as Green Infrastructure (Policy P20) acknowledging the role they can play in providing open space and contributing to green networks, providing healthy places with</p> <p>opportunities including cycling and walking.</p>
Chris Crean [3631]			Q21	<p>There are a number of very useful and progressive policies and proposals here. However if all of the development that the plan encourages elsewhere are allowed much of the vision here will be undermined. Equally how will these policies be promoted when planning application are submitted which undermine them?</p> <p>Mention additionally should be made of air quality and the contributions to poor air quality from housing, industry and vehicles.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q21	We are in agreement with the proposed policies
Colin Davis [3352]			Q21	<p>the proposed sites seem to remove sports grounds and open space and increase pressure on existing health services</p> <p>if there are plans to re provide facilities that will only take more green belt</p> <p>if site 20 is developed it will cut damsonwood residents off from Elmdon park as the access road to the church and park lies between the JLR entrance and the football club . that will deny me and other resident access to our valued park and church</p>
Councillor M Wilson [1886]			Q21	<p>Broadly agree.</p> <p>Policy P18 - Would like to see proliferation of fast food shops and takeaways, as well as lack of green spaces in North Solihull addressed in the Plan.</p> <p>Policy P19 - Lack of basic amenities in Arran Way centre, e.g. public toilets.</p>
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q21	<p>Broadly support these policies.</p> <p>Sites 4 and 13 would conflict with Policies P18 and P20 due to loss of sporting/leisure facilities and open space.</p> <p>Proposed replacement at Tythe Barn Lane may not be adequate.</p> <p>36% of residents object to the loss of outdoor sports and leisure facilities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Deborah Hope [3133]			Q21	With reference to P18, and supporting mental and physical wellbeing: Solihull Mind Horticultural Area behind Station Road, Knowle- the FULL field site and its moderate buildings should be completely protected in any proposed new development. It enhances and SAVES lives. It reduces the State's social and medical bills for the care of its users. The Government supports the need for better mental and physical health. Solihull's facilities for mental health are below parr. Do not fail this project for the monetary value of the land to a developer. It is a VITAL commodity, literally.
Dr P Johnson [2408]			Q21	Planning approval process is flawed and does not consider health and environment of existing council tax payers as shown by the bad example at Middlefield Spring development where lorries allowed to operate 6 days per week from 7am on roads that are too narrow.
Eamon Maguire [3770]			Q21	concerned over loss of sports pitches and what this means for the users of these facilities.
Elta Estates (Helen Lavery) [3169]			Q21	Local playing fields and allotments threatened with removal for housing site 2 should be protected, and additional local amenities planned for extra housing
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q21	Policy P20 - Provision of open space not always safe or feasible for commercial schemes, e.g. Motorway Service Area. Policy should be caveated to state 'where appropriate'.
Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]			Q21	Wish to see similar approach to that adopted for the Tame Valley for the enhancement of the River Blythe valley incorporating mitigation of the effects of HS2 and provision for a community and wildlife asset, which meets aspirations under policies P18 and P20.
Hampton-in-Arden Society (John Doidge) [3917]			Q21	Wish to see similar approach to that adopted for the Tame Valley for the enhancement of the River Blythe valley incorporating mitigation of the effects of HS2 and provision for a community and wildlife asset, which meets aspirations under policies P18 and P20.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Hampton-in-Arden Surgery (Dr Ryan Prince) [3215]			Q21	There is no clear mention of primary care provision. Our surgery is very small and has a 1.5 full time doctor equivalent. Our practice area covers much of the proposed sites. We have 3000 patients between the 1.5 doctors, which is already above the national average. Any significant increase on this would seriously undermine our ability to provide safe and timely healthcare to the new residents unless we could procure funding to increase the staff (both medical and administrative) at the surgery to cope with the huge increase in demand for appointments and care.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Mr Greg McDougall) [3819]			Q21	Concerns raised at local consultation regarding provision of healthcare facilities in Hockley Heath and ability to access local services due to poor transport network, as village has no GP surgery or pharmacy so residents have to travel. This can be difficult for the local elderly population, particularly if they have to use public transport and residents have difficulty in accessing appointments at GP surgeries elsewhere. SMBC needs to consider new Primary Care facilities to ensure that they are accessible to all. HHPC would welcome more reference to the canal infrastructure with feedback from Canals & Rivers Trust.
Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms H Goodreid) [1921]			Q21	Agree with principles of P18. However, concerns raised by residents regarding provision of healthcare facilities locally and ability to access local services due to poor transport network. P19- Agree. P20 - Agree. Residents would welcome input into enhancement of canal network to improve towpaths and surrounding areas and also provision of cycle ways to access local areas.
Jaguar Land Rover (Mrs Sarah-Jane Loughran) [1962]	Mr Neil Tiley	Mr Neil Tiley [3889]	Q21	Policy P20 relates to the provision of open space, children's play, sport, recreation and leisure. It requires that all commercial developments of over 1ha or 1,000m2 provide open space. However, such provision may not be appropriate or viable on all commercial schemes. As a result, it is required that appropriate caveats are applied to Policy P20 such that open space provision is only required where this is both viable and appropriate.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q21	As per my response to question 15, the development plan includes several proposals where existing sporting facilities would be affected. This seems to go against the policy objective of "Supporting the retention and protection of facilities which promote healthy lifestyles such as open space, including public rights of way to open space, playing pitches and allotments; "

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q21	<p>* Policy P18. Health and Well Being - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P19. Range and Quality of Local Services - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P20. Provision for Open Space, Children's Play, Sport, Recreation and Leisure. - Agree in principle.</p>
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q21	<p>Any leisure and sports and recreation facilities should be integrated with existing well managed ones. Isolated pitches and changing facilities are not sustainable.</p> <p>Wherever possible, significant investments in all-weather pitches, pools etc should be within the management and site of the sports and community association, the football club or the schools and usage shared for maximum value to be gained.</p>
K M Davis [3598]			Q21	Concerned about loss of sports grounds, facilities for young children and quality of life.
Kler Group [301]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q21	Generally support the policies as they are consistent with the NPPF.
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q21	<p>Mostly agree. Removal of harmful food stuffs can be achieved to an extent but 'Free Will and Choice' cannot be taken away from the public. It should read "support those with serious health risks that will benefit quality of life within the community". Resisting hot food takeaways is pointing the finger at overweight individuals and/or risks to healthy individuals. The same, if not greater risks are those from newsagents and off-licences selling cigarettes and alcohol, which are taxable entities and obviously don't impact on communities as much as fast food.</p> <p>Agree with retention and protection of open spaces.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q21	<p>* Policy P18. Health and Well Being - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P19. Range and Quality of Local Services - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P20. Provision for Open Space, Children's Play, Sport, Recreation and Leisure. - Agree in principle.</p>
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q21	<p>The new policy should also require developers to replace any extensive footpath networks that are heavily used (as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment) with suitable green infrastructure to provide the same recreational and sporting outcomes. This includes off lead dog walking which is often practical in much arable land plus running, walking, and enjoying nature.</p> <p>The loss of such extensive heavily used footpath networks is detrimental to the health objectives of the nation and SMBC.</p>
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q21	<p>Yes, provision needs to be made for safe crossing of motorway junctions for cyclists to encourage cycling as one of the means of commuting. Some recreational areas do not have children's play facilities, for example Prospect Lane Recreational area . This would seem to conflict with the desires of government to get children to be more active. There is little SMBC can do to encourage recreational and leisure use of local rivers as most are now routed underground. The canal network could be put to better use although it is already actively used in some parts of the borough.</p>
Mr Christopher Hall [3220]			Q21	comment on healthy lifestyles and benefit of exercise
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q21	the drive for more houses should not be at the expense of open space. all major developments should provide "parkland" space for people to enjoy
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q21	<p>Leave the green space (and green belt) as it is. the only time the various suggestions noted in the solihull plan are appropriate are when a 1000+ extra homes are built that pressures existing amenities and invites anti-social behaviour to the village. I personally exercise throughout the proposed development site by foot and by bicycle. I have also been able to enrich the lives of my children by exposing them to this very special natural environment, where a sense of health comes from the outdoor and important ecology to be found.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q21	Although agreeing, under these policies Balsall Common will need investment in the public transport system, better parking in village centre; increased parking at the rail station plus improved train & bus services to meet the anticipated population growth. Currently the village has no centralised COMMUNITY sports facilities, a sports centre (an all weather pitch is needed in particular) There are private clubs but these are not open to all
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q21	The situation re provision of care is well below the requirements we expect . You can't have a child in Solihull! You have to go to Heartlands or Warwick. In Solihull you can't be mentally ill - the Bruce Burns unit is closing at the Hospital. If you have a problem you must go to a unit in Inner city Birmingham! The appointments system at many doctors surgeries is in meltdown. You won't improve any of these by creating a larger community of people and building more homes . There is no thought it appears over school places too.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q21	These are good policies but the test will come when developer's plans are submitted and the degree to which SMBC are able to ensure promises are met. The release of green space land at the current Windmill Lane development in Balsall Common suggests they will not
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q21	Scale of development in South Shirley would adversely affect the local community as described above. A large number of sports grounds will be lost. These play an important role in both health and wellbeing as well as community interaction. These also offer open space that breaks up the intensity of developments. Would like to see more information on how these sites will be compensated for and alternative locations provided that will be of equivalent benefit to the area.
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q21	But under these policies Balsall Common & Berkswell will need major investment in its public transport system,both road and rail, together with increased parking at the station in order to accomodate the demand from the proposed population growth. How will this be delivered?.
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q21	The southern part of Site 9 provides a particular opportunity to provide a new small park and wildlife area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q21	While the policies are sensible - I do NOT agree with including Balsall Common in the same category as Knowle, Castle Bromwich, Marston Green,, Hobs Moat, Kingshurst etc. The centre and available amenities are MUCH smaller and do not support the 20% allocation. This means that significantly improving the centre of Balsall Common including the provision of car parking has to be done BEFORE any new building goes ahead as we are already overloaded!
Mr Nick Nicholson [2298]			Q21	The Inland Waterways Association (Warks branch) is pleased to see that the canal system within the borough has been noted in Policy P20 as a possible transport route as well as an excellent tourist route and a extensive green space in a very built up area. We would like to see better signage for passing canal users to access the town's facilities.
Mr Patrick Montague [3329]			Q21	There are sports grounds under threat in the Draft Local Plan. If they are included in site allocations, there will be fewer facilities in the wrong places and less participation in sport. That will lead to a less physically and mentally fit population.
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q21	support
Mr Stephen Hill [3208]			Q21	No, the locations for Allocated Housing Sites identify the loss of too many existing Football Clubs/Pitches (with an apparent bias against Association Football and in favour of Cricket, Hockey and Golf), contrary to Policies P18/P20, without identifying any compensatory arrangements for their replacement (i.e. Sites 4, 8, 13, 16, 20). Policies P18/P20 need to be stronger, clearer and cross-referenced against Policy P5, in terms of supporting the retention of existing outdoor sports facilities (and in particular existing Football Clubs/Pitches) and, where necessary, identify how any future loss of facilities will be compensated for or improved upon.
Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]			Q21	South Shirley allocations will remove several sports and recreational facilities which impacts on heath and wellbeing of local people especial the younger generation who engage in football or similar What will they do if they no where to go ?? How will all these be replaced?

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]			Q21	There are around 9 football and rugby grounds that will disappear around Shirley South.
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q21	Developments must include green spaces, trees and landscaping. New residents must feel its a place worth coming to. Developments that take large portions of green belt should retain many of the trees, paths and hedgerows to promote the rural nature of the overall area. The provision of green areas between existing and new developments retain the established nature of the existing residential area and enhances new developments through easy access to green space for informal and formal recreation so it benefits all. A good example is the Ridding Hill development on the Balsall Common/Berswell parish boundary
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q21	Support.
Mrs Bolette Neve [3864]			Q21	A Local Plan proposing to build on the few green spaces available to people in Balsall Common does not comply with its own policy set out for health and supporting communities. Barratt's Farm green belt site is essential for the health and well being for many families in Balsall Common who use the site for daily walks.
Mrs Deborah Chard [3418]			Q21	Loss of sports ground at Sharmans Cross Road is contrary to policy to retain facilities for use for sport, existing covenant and Council decision to retain freehold, and incomprehensible given the number of sports clubs that wish to use the site, but are unable to do so because of the unrealistic rent demanded.
Mrs Denise Delahunty [3156]			Q21	Local plan involves the abolition of too many community football pitches. Each football club is used by AT LEAST 150 youths every weekend. There is already a shortage of playing fields, the evidence of this is shown if new teams form, it's almost impossible to hire a pitch. The long term effect of eliminating this community will be an increase in anti social behaviour, increasing obesity in our youth and loss of a huge voluntary community spirit
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q21	Important to promote and provide facilities for healthy leaving, exercise, local food production and children play. Should significantly improve pedestrian and cycling routes between all borough areas. Need increased focus on improving air quality and reducing congestion and pollution.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q21	Agree with the policies. SMBC must ensure that developers are not allowed to dilute these aims when actual construction starts. Green space is essential
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q21	Would like more reference to the canal infrastructure with feedback from Canals & Rivers Trust.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q21	I do in principal agree with the policy but the draft plan shows that football pitches i Tythebarn are to built on in therefore denying access to outdoor physical activity and the canal side will be built on. Green belt is to be built on denying people countryside walking and cycling in the immediate vicinity and building leisures centres cannot replace the health benefits of the outdoors. They are expensive and not accessible to all.
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q21	I support the policies but I worry that by homing in on less accessible parts of the Borough for new housing allocations (which will then become mainly car dependent), the policies may not be realisable. Cycling and walking are popular and healthy activities but people will only do them more if they are safe and the car becomes a less convenient alternative. Walkers and cyclists need to be separated from motorised transport users and paths need to be well lit. A by pass for Knowle would divide the village and devastate local businesses.
Mrs Maxine White [3854]			Q21	We need encourage families to explore the outdoors, but we also need to ensure that there is sufficient countryside for them to enjoy.
Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]			Q21	Allocation 13 , As the only green space with public access in the south of Shirley, This land is very widely used by the local residents and is extremely important for the health and welfare of the local residents of all ages. I walk over these fields every morning on well-worn footpaths, along with many other local residents making it a very enjoyable social activity.
Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [3301]			Q21	"Create an environment". How can this be creating a good environment. Less open space a depleting number of trees, wild life, clean air and much much more. I request you seriously think again to putting 41% in South Shirley and consider the residence who voted for you to look after their interests.
Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [3301]			Q21	How can you think that the recreation will be improved. When the loss of so many football and rugby clubs will be closed and access to fields will be removed,from the youth and adults of this area.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q21	I doooooo agree with your policies for healthy and supported communities but your actions indicate that you don't. If you do then you wouldn't build on the football pitches, parkland and allotments. And before you say it I don't believe that the developers will replace it leaving no public recreational area to the south east of Balsall Common. This hasn't happened in the development between Kenilworth Road and Hob Lane - where I am told it was promised but never materialised.
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q21	Agree with the policies on health and supporting communities. Please that they recognise the benefits of green infrastructure and the environment as a health benefit and towards supporting local communities.
Nigel Canning [4185]			Q21	<p>I request the council confirms it has;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completed all of the above assessments 2. that Sport England as the key partner has been fully consulted and what their decision was 3. If the council intends to go against Sport England's advice the application will be referred to the relevant Government Office 4. The council can explain why land it owns that has a covenant restricting its use to that of sports usage can be "purchased" by a property developer and not revert back to the council for allocation to the next sporting club that needs the land to deliver its clubs plans and development 5. that the council will not renege on its previous policy of not selling the freehold for sites where grounds are only for sport 6. that the council is committed to its statutory requirement that any lost pitches are replaced with facilities of equivalent quality and accessibility
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerde Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q21	the policies are generally supported as they seem to be in conformity with the NPPF

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q21	<p>Policy P20 -</p> <p>Waterways:</p> <p>Propose change of wording to '...providing that the development safeguards the historic and natural environment, the needs of agriculture and...'</p> <p>The needs of agriculture, such as running of cattle across areas of grassland adjacent to rivers and waterways could potentially conflict with proposals for greater recreational and leisure use on the river and canal network.</p>
Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q21	The policies as they are consistent with the NPPF.
Peter Bray [4040]			Q21	Health is important thus I support this policy but not at the expense of sustaining or increasing poverty.
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q21	<p>SMBC policy should be extended to require developers of sites greater than 100 units to work with and consult with existing sports bodies and clubs in the immediate locality to identify opportunities to enhance existing facilities. Developers are very keen to promote their houses as being in vibrant communities with lots of sports clubs without ever actually engaging with them in a meaningful manner.</p> <p>I have added some specific thoughts with regard to the Barratts Farm site in Balsall Common in the comments on individual sites (rep. 1142)</p>
phillippa holroyd [3193]			Q21	Delivering new and improved health services and facilities in areas accessed by sustainable transport modes (facilities for primary medical care should be identified and planned for); - there is nothing in the plan to advise how this will be addressed and other parties involved - surprised by this due to the moving to working together of local council and CCG

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Prof Jon Binner [3054]			Q21	For the site west of Dickens Heath, either side of Tythe Barn Lane, we do not feel that the community in Dickens Heath is being protected; rather we feel that it will be destroyed. It is already far too busy and overcrowded and this will only make it much worse. The housing estate will also only encourage Dickens Heath to merge in with Shirley; something that has been avoided until now.
re West Mercia Police [684]	Ms H Winkler	re West Mercia Police (Ms H Winkler) [1910]	Q21	Welcomes the changes proposed to the wording of Policy P18 with useful additions as follows: '...New development proposals will be expected to promote, support and enhance physical and mental health and wellbeing. Healthy lifestyles will be enabled by...Supporting safe and inclusive design that discourages crime and antisocial behaviour, and encourage social cohesion...'
Richard Evans [2640]			Q21	21-YES AND NO-There is an historic under funding of health care between Birmingham and Solihull as reflected by our local CCGs overspend and the combined Birmingham CCGs underspend. Perhaps this issue needs to be addressed at a Governmental level but it grates somewhat when we are expected to provide additional housing sites to make up for Birmingham's shortfall
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q21	Policy P20 does not provide sufficient long-term protection for public open space. All such areas should be designated as Village Greens, and green spaces in new developments should be dedicated as Village Greens by the developers.
Robert Blond [3614]			Q21	The sports ground in Sharmans Cross Road should be used for sports and maybe, through the Woodland Trust, add to the already rich wildlife by planting a few more trees, rather than be developed.
Robert Verrion [3613]			Q21	SMBC formally minuted in 2013 its policy with regard to the use of sport grounds and that it would not sell the freehold land at Sharmans Cross Road. A previous application for the proposed site has been refused and another withdrawn. It is clear, therefore, that the development of the site is unsuitable and should not be included in the LDP.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ron Shields [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q21	<p>* Policy P18. Health and Well Being - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P19. Range and Quality of Local Services - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P20. Provision for Open Space, Children's Play, Sport, Recreation and Leisure. - Agree in principle.</p>
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q21	<p>* Policy P18. Health and Well Being - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P19. Range and Quality of Local Services - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P20. Provision for Open Space, Children's Play, Sport, Recreation and Leisure. - Agree in principle.</p>
Russell Trevis [3172]			Q21	Where are you proposing to re site all the football fields you are planning on destroying for the proposed new housing, my son plays for Highgate Utd which is based on Tilehouse Lane and affected by housing site 4.
Senior Public Health Consultant (Mrs S Leahy) [2489]			Q21	<p>The Public Health Directorate fully supports the proposal to include HIAs in order to maximise positive impacts of the proposed development and minimise potential adverse impacts.</p> <p>Solihull GPs have also been consulted on the proposals and have raised concerns that the Solihull MIND facility may need to be closed due to local development plans on the land.</p> <p>Concerns have also been raised about the potential increased pressures on GP practices from house building in GP catchment areas. The document submitted contains communication from local GPs on these 2 issues which are covered under Site 9 and Q16.</p>
Shirley Golf Club Ltd and IM Properties Ltd [4153]	Gary Stephens	Marrons Planning (Gary Stephens) [4152]	Q21	<p>the policy fails to recognise circumstances in which a site becomes economically unviable/unable to operate as privately maintained recreational facilities.</p> <p>the policy should be amended as appropriate.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SILHILL FOOTBALL CLUB (MR PHIL HAYNES) [3612]			Q21	On behalf of Silhill football club members, aware of the significant demand for better quality small size sports pitches in Solihull from own and other clubs, and object to the relaxation of the planning guidelines with regard to the protection of sports pitches within the current Local Plan and the concerted, damaging proposals to identify sports pitches throughout the Borough for development.
SMBC - Public Heath & Commissioning Directorate (Nick Garnett) [2295]			Q21	<p>P18</p> <p>i) By including 'that promote' sport and 'the differ needs of the diverse population that may use a development'</p> <p>And rather than 'contribute' in ii and iii 'deliver'.</p> <p>The reference needs to be to 'accessible' open spaces.</p> <p>P20</p> <p>There is a need to make explicit reference the playing pitches as part of the sports & recreation provision and the playing pitch strategy as evidence.</p>
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q21	The current use of the land included in the Arden triangle development area contributes under most areas in this section - in particular 373,374,380,396-99; Policy 18 and SMBC Green Spaces strategy. These together advocate access to open spaces for exercise, physical activities, recreation, and 'opportunities for growing local produce and encouraging people to make positive healthy food choices'; all of which are currently provided through our project. The Green Spaces Strategy promotes 'strong protection of open space, sports and recreational facilities'; and the Health Impact Assessments for the new development will demonstrate negative impacts on the mental health of the population.
Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Guy Wakefield	Hunter Page Planning (Guy Wakefield) [4408]	Q21	Policy P18 - Health Impact Assessments should only be required for development proposals over 300 dwellings and are strategic in their nature given the limited opportunities to deliver such benefits through small scale housing sites.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q21	<p>Policy P18 - Support is offered for the principle that provides support for proposals which encourage healthy and active lifestyles. This is consistent with Government planning policy (section 8 of the NPPF) on creating healthy communities and consistent with Sport England's current strategy 'Towards an Active Nation'.</p> <p>The use of Health Impact Assessments for larger developments is welcomed as these can help ensure that developments give appropriate consideration to how environments can be created which allow healthy and active lifestyles to take place.</p>
Sport England (Mr James Morris) [3758]			Q21	<p>Policy P20 -</p> <p>Support protection and provision of sports facilities - does this include playing fields?</p> <p>Should be more specific on evidence required to demonstrate any sports facilities/playing fields are surplus to requirements.</p> <p>Would only accept a robust, up-to-date strategic assessment.</p> <p>Object to loss of playing fields and other sporting facilities where there is a substantial community benefit. Does not accord with Para. 74. Unclear what this involves.</p> <p>Part B should reference the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy as the evidence base.</p> <p>Seek to ensure that new development meets any new sports facility needs arising as a result of the development.</p>
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q21	<p>Until the health impact toolkit has been produced then this part of Policy P18 should not come into effect. A specific allocation should be made in P20 for a Community Sports Hub on land generally contained by Tythe Barn Lane, Tilehouse Lane and the Stratford upon Avon Canal to the north of Dickens Heath. Richborough Estates' preference is for the land to be excluded from the Green Belt. If the land remains in the Green Belt then, in the alternative, Policies P20 should still specifically identify the land as a location for sporting and recreation uses.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q21	<p>* Policy P18. Health and Well Being - Agree in principle</p> <p>* Policy P19. Range and Quality of Local Services - Agree in principle.</p> <p>* Policy P20. Provision for Open Space, Children's Play, Sport, Recreation and Leisure. - Agree in principle.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q21	<p>Policy P18 - Question whether HIAs are required for each application for significant development.</p> <p>Unclear in text what defines 'significant development'.</p>
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Miss Rebecca Caines	Lichfields (Miss Rebecca Caines) [3261]	Q21	Do not consider that it is necessary to prepare an independent Health Impact Assessment where an ES is prepared as this will cover all of the key relevant issues.
The Theatres Trust (Mr Ross Anthony) [2427]			Q21	<p>The Theatres Trust is disappointing by the lack of cultural content in the plan. Cultural and community facilities play a key role in vibrant centres, support the day to day needs of local communities and help promote well-being and improve quality of life.</p> <p>Policy P19 (or P2) should cover community/social facilities with a definition for social infrastructure, resist loss of or change of use and support new community/social facilities or temporary uses to enhance well-being, vitality and viability and to properly reflect guidance in the NPPF, and major developments should incorporate opportunities for cultural activities.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Transport for the West Midlands (Helen Davies) [3910]			Q21	<p>Support principles in this chapter.</p> <p>Policy P18 - Agree that transport is significant challenge to health, it is also opportunity for improvement e.g. walking and cycling.</p> <p>WMCA have launched 'Thrive West Midlands': An Action Plan to drive better mental health and wellbeing together with establishing a Wellbeing Board. This would create the governance framework for the implementation of the Mental Health Commission work and we welcome reference to this.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q21	<p>Agree with the inclusion of nature conservation and green infrastructure within this policy.</p>
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q21	<p>I agree with health and supporting communities. However, this has not been addressed in the proposed development in Barrett's Farm. The development does not protect and enhance natural assets; it does not improve accessibility and sustainability to travel; it does not protect key gaps between Balsall Common and Berkswell; it does not secure economic growth locally; no provision is made for health and well being. Balsall Common already has increased pollution from increased traffic and increased plane routes into Birmingham Airport. No provision is made for cycle routes, playgrounds and leisure centres to promote health and wellbeing.</p>
Question 22 Policy P21 Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Provision				
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q22	<p>supportive of the appropriated use of developer contributions but consider that SMBC should provide additional justification and detail regarding developers being required to provide additional contributions towards 'digital infrastructure'</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q22	<p>Policy P21 does not comprehensively set out how infrastructure provision and developer contributions will be sought.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a critical part of the necessary supporting evidence base for the LPR. It must therefore be robustly updated ahead of the Pre-Submission stage consultation. This could require an 'overhaul' of the Council's previous approach to producing their IDP given the scale of new infrastructure investment in the Borough that will be necessary to deliver the scale of planned growth.</p>
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q22	<p>The wording is too vague and must be strengthened to be meaningful.</p> <p>The first sentence reads 'Developers will be expected to...', and this should be strengthened to read 'Developers must...'</p> <p>Furthermore, providing infrastructure and mitigation measures in a 'timely' manner, is too nebulous and open to interpretation and abuse. This must be strengthened.</p> <p>We question the effectiveness of this policy, and ask how it will be monitored and enforced?</p>
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q22	<p>Generally support the approach to P21. However the policy allows for funds to divert away from areas with development to other areas of the Borough. Support the principle that all funds raised by development should be spent in the area where they are raised 'except in very special circumstances'. This is a proportionate approach for Balsall Common given the scale of development proposed and the infrastructure issues.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q22	<p>The implementation of Policy P21 must also take into account development viability. The NPPF is clear that plans should be deliverable.</p> <p>The would appear to be no specific evidence base document to test the impact of infrastructure provision or the requirements of the IDP upon the viability of residential development in the Borough.</p> <p>In the absence of viability modelling, policy 21 is unsound as it is not justified or based upon an appropriate evidence base and is not in compliance with national policy.</p> <p>Viability should be referred to in the Policy.</p>
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q22	<p>General approach to policy P21 supported. However, the policy allows for the diversion of funds away from areas with development to other areas of the Borough. All funds raised by development should be spent in the area where they are raised, except in very exceptional circumstances. Within this context such funds include all section 106 payments, all CIL monies, all new Homes Bonus and profit from the sale of Solihull Council land for development. Given the scale of proposed development and the infrastructure issues facing Balsall Common Berkswell Council considers this approach proportionate.</p>
Catesby Property Group [3038]	Miss Sarah Butterfield	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Q22	<p>- accepted that residential development will be liable to pay CIL at the rates set out within the adopted CIL Charging Schedule.</p> <p>- Draft Local Plan Review Policy P21 provides for S106 contributions to be sought from new development in respect of site spe</p>
Chris Crean [3631]			Q22	<p>There is much to support here but it could be much stronger, and there should be an analysis of the use of this policy to mitigate the plans that are being approved. Will the unintended consequences of development out weigh the mitigations proposed and if so should the development not be allowed in the first place.</p>
Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	Q22	<p>We are in agreement with the proposed policies</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q22	The objectives are commendable but we need to ensure that each site produces infrastructure for the settlement. Schools, all weather pitches, better parking and where possible roads that bypass the centre and moves the traffic past.
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q22	Policy 21 does not specifically state that all CIL payments, new homes bonus or the profit on the sale of Council land for housing should be spent in the areas where the housing is built. I strongly believe that such payments received for a development should be allocated to the directly affected community.
Dr Richard Anderson [3552]			Q22	I consider that the policy is inadequate. P21 does not specifically state that all CIL payments, new homes bonus, or profit on the sale of Council land for housing be spent in the areas where the housing is to be built. This is quite WRONG, and the policy should be AMENDED.
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q22	Infrastructure funding for one site, however raised, should be used to cover all costs on that site before payments are diverted elsewhere.
Education Funding Agency (John Pilgrim) [3977]			Q22	There is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to cover the increase in demand for school places that are likely to be generated by major developments in the borough.
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q22	Policy should be clear that pooling of planning obligations would be undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Mr Stuart Field	GVA (Mr Stuart Field) [3813]	Q22	<p>Need for evidence base to test the impact of infrastructure provision or the requirements of the IDP upon the viability of residential development in DLP.</p> <p>Viability assessment needs to be carried out.</p> <p>In the absence of viability modelling, Policy P21 is unsound. Should be amended to state:</p> <p>"Where it is viable to do so, new development will be expected to provide or contribute towards provision of: ..."</p>
Highways England (Mr A Slack) [2007]			Q22	<p>Need to work jointly to consider additional evidence of the transport implications of the proposed developments on the areas identified. This will enable us to agree the implications of proposed development traffic upon available existing and planned capacity of the SRN and inform the development of any future transport schemes required.</p> <p>In order to aid this understanding and ultimately assess the requirement of any schemes necessary to be included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, we need to agree with you an assessment of planned development traffic impacting the SRN.</p>
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q22	CIL payments for local development should be focussed in the local area for locally requested and agreed infrastructure improvements.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q22	The underlying reasoning that developers should contribute to mitigating impacts and supporting infrastructure development is sound. The method used to calculate those impacts and contributions should be robust, and where there is uncertainty should err in favour of the community rather than the developers.
John Parker [4422]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q22	Agree in principle.
Judith Parry-Evans [3846]			Q22	If Balsall Common is to grow by 55%, all funds raised by development, and more, should be spent to directly benefit Balsall Common.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q22	<p>This will not work unless developers are bound by law to contribute certain specific services to the development process.</p> <p>With regards to infrastructure it really depends on the size of development. But we agree that there must be greater emphasis on green, social, physical and digital infrastructure as part of a planned development, but again should be written into law that a development must have a minimum amount in accordance with its size.</p> <p>Cross-boundary usage of facilities and services needs to be considered and financial support provided.</p>
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q22	CIL payments for local development should be focussed in the local area for locally requested and agreed infrastructure improvements.
Minton [4420]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q22	Agree in principle.
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q22	<p>I support the general approach but object to the diversion of funds away from areas taking development to those not taking development. The policy should be modified to state that preference for spending of money will be given to those areas taking housing.</p> <p>The Policy should make reference to the New Homes Bonus paid by central government, again giving preference to spending allocation to those areas taking the housing.</p> <p>Similarly money raised by SMBC selling land in communities for housing will be spent in the community taking the houses.</p>
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q22	You do not state that CIL payments, new homes bonus or profit from sale of Council land for homes should be spent on the areas you are building houses. This should be the case, as these are the areas that are being affected.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q22	Yes.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q22	on the whole agreed. BUT "pooling" of contributions is important. Balsall Common will remain an attractive place provided it gets its fair share - not more, not less. in the past funds from land sales have been spent elsewhere, as have commuted sums which should be spent in the village - at this rate it will become a small town and should be treated as such.
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q22	The wording is not string enough. The first sentence reads 'will be expected to'. This is too 'woolly' and should be enforceable by replacing these words with one simple but mandatory word 'MUST' I agree with the statement regarding infrastructure and mitigation measures being provided in a 'timely manner' but the interpretation of this is open to debate. How eill thus be monitored and enforced?
Mr David Ellis [3205]			Q22	The wording is not strong enough. The first sentence reads '...will be expected to'. This needs to be replaced by one simple mandatory word 'MUST'! I agree with the statement re infrastructure and mitigation measures but question the meaning of 'timely' in its current context. This expression is open to debate as to its meaning. How will this be monitored AND enforced?
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q22	The words are great! I've yet to see much benefit to community in my locality of CILs or Section 106 payments on developments recently undertaken! All these challenges are "catch all" how can you request coherent answers when you already canvassed answers last year (Issues and Options consultation Nov 2015) my answers were largely ignored.
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q22	all proceeds from sale of land/payments from developers must be ploughed into the affected communities and not into SMBC coffers or permit funding to support other outside areas.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q22	I agree with the policy but am not optimistic that it will be enforced.
Mr Karl Peter Childs [4302]			Q22	Unclear where the cost of improved infrastructure requirements will be funded from? What proportion would come from developers levies, grants and other sources and how much from Solihull Ratepayers?
Mr Keith Tindall [3020]			Q22	The policy is too weak, and will allow developers to circumvent it. In its present wording it is ineffective and open to interpretation, and must be strengthened to avoid ambiguity and abuse.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]			Q22	<p>Given the major impact on local infrastructure, all monies received by SMBC from the development should be reserved solely for use in the locality impacted by the development.</p> <p>When designing the infrastructure plan, it should be acknowledged that Balsall Common will already be extensively impacted by HS2 construction works in the period 2018 to 2026.</p> <p>This needs to be considered when designing infrastructure plans and phasing of development build.</p> <p>As a minimum there should be no commencement of any Barratts Farm development work until such time as the HS2 works are completed</p>
Mr Matthew Stewart [3110]			Q22	S106 does not work, affordable housing that has been developed under s106 is often re-sold or rented at full market value
Mr Michael Fairbrother [3686]			Q22	<p>SMBC should ensure that all or most of the CIL payments, new homes bonus, profit on sale of land etc is spent in the settlements where the homes are built.</p> <p>There has to be rigorous oversight of developers as they will minimise their outlay on infrastructure and walk away.</p>
Mr Paul Joyner [3573]			Q22	As stated previously - the delivery of HS2, bypass and 800 homes on the Barratts lane site in Balsall Common will be a logistical and phasing nightmare, submitting existing residents to many years, if not decades of continuous development on their doorsteps
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q22	Any money received for homes built in Balsall Common must be spent for the benefit of the residents of Balsall Common.
Mr Roger Monkman [3585]			Q22	Development funds accumulated from the sale of land should be ring-fenced so that Balsall Common and not other areas under development, benefits from its own environment restructure.
Mr Stephan Jones [3562]			Q22	All CIL payments, new homes bonuses and profits from council land sales should directly benefit the area where the houses are built only

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr William Cairns [3206]			Q22	Any CIL monies arising from developers in a local area should be spent on that local area. An attempt by Solihull Council to retain monies and spend elsewhere is in effect taxing one area to support another. It is effectively compensation for where the damage to the environment has been caused and where the payments can have best effect to offset the negative impacts of those developments. The money must stay in the community where it has been generated.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q22	Support.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q22	All monies received for development should be spent in the areas where housing is built, and not diverted elsewhere within the Borough.
Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]			Q22	All money received for developments in Balsall Common should be spent for the direct benefit of Balsall Common residents
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q22	consider that CIL or other funds associated to development should only be diverted to other parts of the borough in exceptional circumstances (ie where the needs of the areas being impacted by the development have been compensated sufficiently)
Mrs Emma Harrison [3578]			Q22	Planning decisions have to take into account other factors rather in addition to policies in this plan, including but not limited to emerging issues, socio-economic factors, value for money considerations and prioritisation among different needs, impact of any decision on other areas and ensuring that all implications of proposed developments are fully understood and can be properly addressed.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q22	But must be enforced
mrs jacqui gardner [3687]			Q22	Policy does not specifically state that all CIL payments will be spent in the areas where the housing is built. I think the council should categorically state that the CIL payments received will DIRECTLY benefit the areas where the housing is built.
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q22	Given the major impact of Site 1 on local infrastructure, all monies received by SMBC from the development should be reserved solely for use in the locality impacted by the development. When designing the infrastructure plan, it should be acknowledged that Balsall Common will already be extensively impacted by HS2 construction works in the period 2018 to 2026.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q22	I agree that there are many areas to address such as schools, healthcare provision, shops, parking. I hope by now these areas have been acted upon and draft plans made. Solihull hospital should be offering 24hr A&E. A town growing in such a capacity needs better care and policing.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Mary Hitchcock [4671]			Q22	Use developers approved by the community. Profit should stay in the area.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q22	CIL payments for local development should be focussed in the local area for locally requested and agreed infrastructure improvements.
Ms Judith Tyrrell [3310]			Q22	I don't believe measures to mitigate impact will materialise, and if they do are unlikely to benefit Balsall Common. The physical, social and green infrastructure to the south east of Balsall Common is being built over with little idea of any "infrastructure and mitigation measures", let alone in a timely manner i.e included in the Local Plan! I don't believe the cumulative impact of developments has been accounted for - particularly the works site proposed for HS2 in Balsall Common. West Contributions secured through planning obligations may be pooled to address need or cumulative impacts arising from more than one development proposal.
Natural England (Andrew Stubbs) [3862]			Q22	Agree with Policy P21. Suggest as part of the monitoring considerations, indicators should monitor the effect of the plan on biodiversity, not biodiversity per se. Ideally indicators for other aspects of the natural environment should be used as well. It would be helpful if the indicators used for the SA/SEA could also be used to monitor the plan.
Oakmoor (Sharmans Cross Road) Ltd [4084]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q22	no comments

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q22	<p>The first two bullet points should be caveated by the word 'appropriate'. Further, a third bullet point should be added 'contributions will reflect the viability of the development'.</p> <p>Developers should only contribute to changes to infrastructure required to facilitate their development.</p> <p>Should not used for upgrades that are required to facilitate natural growth, e.g. digital infrastructure.</p> <p>Emphasis and onus should remain on the local authority to provide/enable adequate services and infrastructure.</p>
Persimmon Homes Central (Jodi Stokes) [2553]			Q22	<p>Housing delivery should be monitored annually to ensure that output is in line with trajectory.</p> <p>Should be a commitment to achieve trajectory numbers as per the adopted plan.</p> <p>Measures should be put in place to allow for release of additional land for development if targets fail to be met for 3 years in a row.</p> <p>Would be prudent to include a large buffer and include reserve sites in the plan to avoid slow land release if plan is reviewed.</p>
Peter Bray [4040]			Q22	<p>I agree with developers paying towards infrastructures etc. All CIL payments, new homes bonus or the profit on the sale of Council land for housing should be spent in the areas where the housing is built. I would not support SMBC diverting some of the money elsewhere in the Borough.</p> <p>I support this policy with a heavy heart because this policy of asking the Developers to give something for planning permission is one road to more expensive houses. More expensive properties are the cause of the rental time bomb and the drop in home ownership.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Wreford [3412]			Q22	Policy should be amended to require developers to contribute to overall infrastructure requirement of the community in which they are developing - if the scale of development proposed drives a need for additional road / bypass infrastructure as well as additional school places, then full cost of all additional infrastructure should be levied across all of the proposed sites in the Local Plan for that locality. CIP should be assessed based on the future development value of the sites, not that at the date of planning application. SMBC should establish an entitlement to CIL based on actual site values achieved.
re West Mercia Police [684]	Ms H Winkler	re West Mercia Police (Ms H Winkler) [1910]	Q22	Disappointed that reference to the West Midlands Police has been removed from the supporting text for Policy P21. The proposed supporting text in the Draft Local Plan Review does not include the Police within the list of those bodies the Council will be working in partnership with. Whilst it is accepted partnership working is 'not limited' to those listed, the Chief Constable formally requests that reference continues to be made to the West Midlands Police in the supporting text for Policy P21, similar to the wording in the adopted Local Plan.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q22	22-YES
Richard Lloyd [2616]			Q22	Policy P21 should be clearer about spending all "planning gain" within the affected communities. In addition, all new developments should only be approved following agreement of a detailed strategic site plan agreed within the community.
Ron Shiels [4424]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q22	Agree in principle.
Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q22	Agree in principle.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q22	Under this section there is a recognition that to deliver the Local Plan there is a need to work in partnership with Voluntary sector organisations such as ourselves; we are hopeful that this can happen by understanding the positive impact of our Horticulture, Conservation and Sports project and works with us to maintain the service.
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q22	Policy should be clear that pooling of planning obligations would be undertaken in accordance with the CIL Regulations.
Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]			Q22	The requirements of Policy P21 should be explicitly recognised as factors that can affect the viability of a development and be taken into account in, for example, the establishment of the appropriate level of affordable housing which can be supported by a residential scheme.
Stonewater [3271]	Ms Donna Savage	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Q22	Agree in principle.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q22	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Note obligations should be in line with national guidance and 3 statutory tests.</p> <p>Agree with review of CIL as part of viability work for Submission Version.</p> <p>Suggested addition to policy:</p> <p>Allow for negotiation on some developer contributions and the mechanisms for doing so, e.g. a standardised viability assessment undertaken by the District Valuer or individually appointed Chartered Surveyor.</p> <p>Would ensure robustness of policy to ensure development is not threatened by viability, and therefore would reinforce the principles of sustainable development.</p>
Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Annie English) [1901]			Q22	Agree.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q22	<p>Developers should pay towards the infrastructure of the proposed site and local area. This does not mean merely a road from Hall Meadow. Balsall Common needs a new play ground to cater for children and teenagers of all ages. The village also needs a leisure centre, cycle routes, open spaces, nature reserves, improved train services, additional subsidized bus services linking communities from Kenilworth, Warwick University and Solihull. Funds from developers should go to the immediate area rather than a pot to be spent elsewhere.</p>
Question 23 General Commnets				
Alan & Anita Heath [4628]			Q23	<p>If permission for the Barretts Lane site is given please consider the access to the new site to be a feeder Road off the current island positioned at the junction of Station Road and Hall Meadow Drive and taking it through to at least Kelsey Lane. This would not only eradicate any further problems along Meeting House Lane but also complete the extension to Hall Meadow Drive which would provide a complete bypass to Balsall Common Centre if it were extended to the island at the junction with the A452 and A4177.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Alan Kirby [3615]			Q23	Endorse with our full support the KDBH NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM response to the Solihull Draft Local plan and question point of giving residents more say if the Forum's views are to be ignored.
Amrit Teja [4784]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Andrea Baker [3471]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2
Andrew Baynes [3855]			Q23	<p>The Draft Local Plan is driven by a statutory requirement to deliver one. However, it is a tawdry document, that will deliver great profit to developers. What it won't deliver, particularly from a Shirley perspective, is an improved quality of life.</p> <p>Instead, the future it promises is of increased congestion, increased demand for services, banal high-density development. It offers little in the way of vision, of improvement - certainly to Shirley.</p> <p>Opportunities for change aren't being seized; instead we're offered piecemeal nibbling away at open space and distinctiveness. A shabby little plan of pusillanimity.</p>
Andy & Rachel Bennett [4580]			Q23	<p>Dissatisfied with consultation process.</p> <p>Only small number of residents were notified by letter.</p> <p>Most of us only new in January 2017.</p> <p>Very short period of time to respond.</p> <p>Docimant is large and difficult to read and understand.</p> <p>Unfriendly online portal.</p>
Andy Wilson [3394]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Angela Chandler [3319]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Angela Lane [4769]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Angela Miller [3453]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Anne Hazlewood [4775]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]			Q23	<p>Comments in relation to site 9 cover the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - case for a new Arden Centre for Community Learning (remodelling of existing school is not viable; site is tightly constrained and offers minimal scope for further expansion and growth) - creation of better community facilities (sports centre with swimming pool, gymnastics/fitness centre) - funding for the new ACCL (wholly private funding not an option; land swap and private developer finances) - features of the proposed new housing development (high-medium density on current school land; lower density on land currently in GB) - Green Belt considerations
Arden Cross Consortium [4651]	Mat Jones	Turley Associates (Mat Jones) [2634]	Q23	<p>The Employment Land Review and Strategic Housing Market Assessment suffer from the lack of any substantive assessment of the implications of supergrowth for the purpose of evidence to support the current LPR.</p> <p>The Accessibility Mapping Report has not undertaken a correct assessment of Site 19. A reappraisal using available information is required.</p> <p>Disagree with some of the Sustainability Appraisal scores. The sustainability benefits of Site 19 are not recognised. Comments on the sustainability appraisal should be reflected in the next iteration of the document.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Arden Wood Shavings Ltd [3899]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q23	The Local Plan Review evidence base generally supports the allocation of site 6 but underestimates its benefits within a sustainable settlement with services and facilities in easy reach, which offers planning gain from removal of the existing use, firm defensible Green Belt boundary following physical features with visual enhancement potential. The SHELAA suitability assessment does not accurately reflect the site's suitability, as there is no known contamination/landfill, no explanation is provided re ground conditions or bad neighbour constraints and it is not a builders yard, and the EA flood map shows only 1% of the site within zone 3.
Ayaz Mahmood [4485]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Balsall and Berkswell Football Club (Mr James Aspinall) [3643]			Q23	difficulty using online portal
Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]			Q23	The rural aspect of the Borough is one of its main attractions and why many choose to live here, with Solihull MBC's motto being 'urbs in rure' to emphasise this. However, there is a danger that large scale development of the type proposed for Balsall Common and Berkswell in the rural east of the Borough risks making it a less attractive area to live, and this must be of major consideration in the Local Plan.
Balsall Parish Council (Sheila Cooper) [2500]			Q23	The Accessibility Study is flawed. The conclusion that Balsall Comm has medium to high accessibility and therefore suitable for growth is not justified. The phasing of development in Balsall Common needs to be considered after HS2 construction. It would be wilfully negligent of the Council to fail to manage the growth by phasing new housing in Balsall Common before 2026.
Barratt Developments [3775]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q23	Critically, the Council's evidence, particularly in relation to economic growth underestimates the level of housing required to support the likely change in employment.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Barratt Developments [3775]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q23	Have commissioned an alternative SHMA, with alternative figure of at least 25,023 dwellings for plan period.
BC BARRAGE (BC Barrage) [3479]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2. There are flaws, anomalies and incorrect scores in the SHELAA, Green Belt Assessment, Accessibility Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
BDW and Gallagher Estates Ltd [3602]	Mr J Kirby	GVA (Mr J Kirby) [3600]	Q23	Council should identify reserve/safeguarded sites, which can be brought forward /released in certain circumstances. large scale sites will risk the deliverability of the local plan and further risks the DLP not being able to achieve the housing in a manner which ensures a rolling five year supply over the plan period.
Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Proportionate evidence not provided in support of the proposed allocations or rejection of other sites. Evidence base is open to challenge, due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes in site assessments. Some crucial evidence base documents are still outstanding. Object to the misleading assessment of their submitted site in the SHELAA, the omission of the site from the pro-forma in appendix C of the interim Sustainability Assessment. There is no overarching commentary for each site. All relevant information has not been considered. Decisions have been made which may subsequently be flawed.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]			Q23	<p>The scoring system and parcel boundaries for the Green Belt assessment are flawed and the findings in relation to site allocation 1 and 3 is questionable.</p> <p>The Parish Council has given a revised scoring for the parcels relating to site 1.</p> <p>The SHELAA includes a number of inaccuracies in respect to site 1 including HS2 that will be a future bad neighbour.</p> <p>There is a lack of firm proposals to establish long term and durable Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>An holistic study of Balsall Common should be undertaken.</p> <p>Phasing of housing building needs to recognise HS2.</p>
Bethan Jackson Baker [4495]			Q23	<p>The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.</p>
Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Archie Taylor) [4157]			Q23	<p>see letter</p> <p>The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption by HS2 and no housing development should take place at the same time as the HS2 construction</p>
Canal & River Trust (Anne Denby) [3983]			Q23	<p>Any development at potential site allocations should; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network.</p> <p>Wording changes suggested to paragraph 265 of the plan regarding freight movements on the canal network.</p> <p>Wording changes suggested to paragraph 338 to refer to canal corridors rather than canal cuttings.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cannock Chase District Council (Clare Eggington) [2371]			Q23	Lack of HRA in evidence base.
Catherine Langton [3384]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]			Q23	Various wording suggestions / alterations to the text.
CGA Taylor [4250]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Chris Crean [3631]			Q23	Policy P9 has much to say about climate change BUT where is the monitoring and reporting on the performance the council within the last plan and what is the direction of travel for the borough? The plan supports the expansion of the airport BUT fails to recognise that the aviation sector is a contributor to climate change. How are those emissions factored into the monitoring and reporting within this plan for example. Why have no minimum standards been set to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as mentioned in the sustainability appraisal?
Colin Davis [3352]			Q23	Solihull Council have lost residents trust on new development the consultation is too difficult to complete

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>In relation to reduced portion of SHELAA Site 64:</p> <p>Misleading assessment of site in SHELAA report;</p> <p>Inaccurate and misleading accessibility mapping scores;</p> <p>Misleading interpretation of site in GBA.</p> <p>Misleading interpretation of site in Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Not included in interim sustainability assessment for consideration as Rural Exception Site. Should be included in SA.</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>DLP fails to meet NPPF requirements for Duty-to-Cooperate:</p> <p>Much of necessary evidence has not been completed (contrary to Para. 182).</p> <p>None of evidence available at Cabinet meeting when Members supported consultation.</p> <p>Evidence includes numerous inaccuracies.</p> <p>Evidence difficult to interpret as different numbering systems and boundaries.</p> <p>Official evidence published after 5th December on website.</p> <p>Calls into question how robust site choices were made.</p> <p>Representors unable to make fully informed comments.</p> <p>SHELAA Site 64 omitted from Interim SA.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Lack of options to give local communities involvement and choice when considering potential housing sites, contrary to NPPF and neighbourhood planning. Proposed strategy will result in over-dependence on large housebuilders.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Proportionate evidence not been provided in support of Council's proposed housing allocations or to justify the rejection of other sites which perform equally well. Much of the submitted evidence is subject to challenge due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes made during site assessments.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Accessibility Mapping: Should be corrected to include an assessment of sites 153 & 154, forming part of proposed Site 9, currently omitted from the appraisal.
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Site Selection Topic Papers- Brief overview of officer views on where it is appropriate to direct development does not make detailed reference to evidence material and it does not provide information specific to sites selected for allocation compared to those site areas rejected.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Many of rejected sites from SHELAA:</p> <p>Do not have existing viable community or recreational facilities,</p> <p>Moderate to low value to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt,</p> <p>Relatively sustainable,</p> <p>Less landscape impact,</p> <p>Partly brownfield/previously developed land,</p> <p>Perform better when judged against Council's guiding principles (p.35 of DLP).</p>
Cosmic Fireworks Directors Retirement Fund [4530]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Council not provided the public with necessary annual monitoring information for an objective assessment to be made of the success of the affordable housing policy, including the effectiveness of the Rural Exception Sites policy.</p> <p>Localism Act requires Councils to publish this information direct to the public annually in the interests of transparency.</p> <p>Should form critical evidence feeding into the DLP.</p>
Councillor A Hodgson [2010]			Q23	<p>Flood risk prevention. There are still challenges in this respect in Solihull. Many residents in Shirley South have problems relating to flooding that is affecting their gardens, as well as issues on the land at Site 13. If some of the proposed developments were to go ahead then they would have significant effects on the water table in the area, both in terms of run-off and drainage. The Local Flood Risk Management Strategy from April 2015 doesn't factor in surface water</p>
Councillor D Bell [2235]			Q23	<p>general comments on the need to phase development. Also view that development on greenbelt is favoured.</p>
Councillor J Tildesley [2119]			Q23	<p>see letter</p> <p>particular comments on Town Centre and Site 18.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Councillor K Macnaughton [2177]			Q23	Consultation Online Portal I did try to use this to submit this response but found this very confusing indeed and impossible to use. This facility needs significant review for future consultations.
Councillor K Meeson [2178]			Q23	comments on B'ham housing need.
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q23	concerned about loss of playing/sports fields across a number of sites that are in the DLP
Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]			Q23	the consultation process and Online portal is difficult to engage with for most people due to the size/details and technical information of the documents and scope of the consultation.
Councillor S Holt [2514]			Q23	Given GB land is attractive for developers, propose a new designation called 'urban fringe' to act as a buffer between traditional urban land uses and open land in the Green Belt. Development could be allowed provided it maintained the visual openness of the land. The present designation of GB is too inflexible.
Councillor T Hodgson [2532]			Q23	Design standards must be required to meet the highest possible energy efficiency levels both to reduce carbon emissions and reduce costs for consumers. Issues including flooding need to be carefully considered when considering sites and appropriate engineering solutions provided in areas liable to flooding. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity should be a key thread throughout the plan.
Darren Abreu [4794]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
David Langton [3382]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
David Munton [3378]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
David Acton [3396]			Q23	see letter
David Harvey [3379]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
David Miller [3454]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
David Shaw [4772]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
David Smith [4043]			Q23	Concern about the limited distribution of information out by the Council regarding the proposals.
Denise Williams [4620]			Q23	<p>Not clear from the rep as to whether proposed allocation 9 Knowle is supported or not.</p> <p>However, comments on the provision of school places in the settlement is highlight as below:</p> <p>I would like to highlight the need for increase in primary education proposed in Items 4, 8 and 9.</p>
Derek Forsythe [4121]			Q23	<p>Carry out a traffic flow survey in the Dickens Heath, Majors Green and Tidbury Green areas</p> <p>Consider retaining the Amenities Area behind Badgers Estate</p> <p>Encourage Centro to extend the Whitlocks End Railway Station Car Park asap.</p> <p>Co-ordinate SMBC and BDC development plans</p> <p>Ensure Richborough proposed plan for the Sports Hub has adequate parking spaces for those who will use the facilities.</p> <p>Consider constructing a Park and Ride facility in a strategic location in order to limit the traffic flow through urban areas.</p> <p>Developers should be required to fund necessary improvement to existing highways, new roads and pavement lighting.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Derek Forsythe [4121]			Q23	In relation to Sites 4 and 13. In addition to your Draft Local Plan, a further report, dated 16th Dec, has been issued by The Planning Inspectorate (Government) which looks at the pro and cons of housing development in the BDC area up to 2030. It refers to an additional 7000 properties for which they have land for 4700 only. The remainder may be built on Green Belt land. It does mention Wythall amongst other neighbouring areas (in Section 66 (Policy BDP5B) citing "large scale" settlements"
Diane Langton [3380]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Diane Mahmood [4490]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]			Q23	Sites 4 and 13 conflict with the original masterplan and vision for Dickens Heath village. Should be a specific policy to protect character and setting of Dickens Heath village, and limit further expansions.
Dinah Edwards [4129]			Q23	The phasing of all 3 allocations for Balsall Common at same time as Riddings Hill and HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement, with insufficient time to plan for necessary infrastructure and facilities, contravening intent to manage growth.
Dominic Griffin [2558]			Q23	Balsall Common is in the wrong location to supply the housing needs of the borough. Accommodation and jobs need to be planned together, which is all to the West of the M42
Dominique McGarry [4414]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Donald Lowe [4783]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Linda Parsons [3849]			Q23	<p>Some acceptable aspects but I have concerns that the Green Belt intrusions for housing are only needed because there is a drive for commercial development for office/retail on land which could be used for housing eg Blythe Park/central Solihull. There is already office space in the area which is underutilised.</p> <p>Does Solihull really need more office/retail at the expense of the Green Belt? I think not. More change of use of existing commercial properties would be preferable to concreting over farmland and ruin of villages. Missed opportunity...Pity.</p>
Dr Anna Griffin [4206]			Q23	support the recommendations from BARRAGE
Dr Carrie-Anne Johnson [4289]			Q23	<p>The proposed addition of up to 1350 houses to Balsall Common, representing a sizeable increase in population (>25%), will have a significant impact on the character of the village. It will remove the local distinctiveness of the area, characterised by its open countryside setting, sense of remoteness, distinctive fieldscapes and woodland assets. All of this is in direct conflict with the statement (DLP paragraph 86) that "the local distinctiveness of the area... ..will have been protected".</p> <p>The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.</p>
Dr Deborah Hope [3133]			Q23	<p>Affordable housing is simply not affordable for houses in Central Solihull and Knowle. As the business development areas appear to be around Blythe Valley and the NEC/JLR/HS2 Hub-these areas would be better areas for housing, more likely to really be affordable, and nearer to points of employment (transport infrastructure links, not related just to cars, could be more easily integrated). Consider forming new villages that have their own centres, facilities and identity- which would provide an enhanced environment.</p> <p>Buses should be very frequent; cycles lanes- joined up, safe and have priority over cars. Not just a line in the report.</p>
Dr I G Beasley [4055]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr P Johnson [2408]			Q23	<p>The LRP needs to address and currently does not</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Improving the management of the planning application process 2 A process to learn from large scale plans already being done badly 3 Training in Change Management to be able to deliver the scope of allocation 9 if it does not want everyone to leave and take their rates with them 4 Improved due diligence of what developers are planning to do and then managing them
Dr P Johnson [2408]			Q23	<p>The monitoring process does not include any monitoring of whether the process of approving planning applications under the LRP is fit for purpose or needs improving.</p> <p>The planning process does not take adequate action to seek input and support of people before approving a proposal by taking on board their input and once it is approved there is no feedback on how well a particular application went and whether lessons could be learnt to improve the process. There is evidence from current developments that shows this process to be badly needed</p>
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q23	<p>Interim Sustainability Appraisal is difficult to follow but the NF would make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not clear why the finding from the first ISA in relation to negative impacts of car borne travel become plusses in the preferred option in ISA2. - site allocations do not appear to perform well against Objectives 9,10,11, 12, and 13. - unclear why some parcels have been assessed and other not. several independent parcels have been assessed together which distorts the results. - Scenario B, ISA2 assesses impacts on communities as all broadly positive. It is not clear how this can be concluded

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Dr Paul Banks [4656]			Q23	<p>- Strong adverse reactions to recent developments in respect of housing layout, density and lack of parking.</p> <p>- Opportunities for smaller house builders should be considered as they may offer alternative designs and layouts.</p> <p>- lack of meaningful engagement</p>
Dr. Christine West [3709]			Q23	Solihull is a Conservative Council and should abide by the manifesto. "Peston On Sunday" (ITV Feb 5); Gavin Barwell (housing minister) stated emphatically that no green field site should be built on unless every brownfield site had been examined in detail, and then, and only then, would "a nibble into the green belt" be sanctioned by the Government. What is proposed for Balsall Common is not a nibble but a huge bite, and therefore we have every confidence that a representation to government would be successful. More than a million people watched this programme.
Earlwood & Forshaw Heath Residents Association (Jennifer Buckley) [4439]			Q23	<p>Blythe Valley was never meant to be for housing, but employment.</p> <p>See legal challenges to future developments.</p>
Education Funding Agency (John Pilgrim) [3977]			Q23	<p>It is suggested that the Local Plan sets out the mechanism through which sites for new schools will be identified and secured. This is particularly important for sites not forming part of comprehensive mixed use schemes.</p> <p>Support a Planning for Schools Development Plan Document (DPD). The DPD provides policy direction and establishes the Council's approach to providing primary and secondary school places and helps to identify sites which may be suitable for providing them (including on Green Belt/MOL), whether by extension to existing schools or on new sites.</p>
Elaine Kell [4771]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Ella McGarry [4246]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Emma Lawrence [4249]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Environment Agency (Martin Ross) [4669]			Q23	The Sequential Test should be applied to the allocation of sites, with all development steered to Flood Zone 1 in the first instance. A Level 2 SFRA is required where developments are proposed in Flood Zones 2 or 3 and should be undertaken for any sites put forward for allocation prior to the next stage of the plan. The SFRA should consider the latest climate change allowances published in February 2016 and should inform the application of the Sequential Test. Areas in Flood Zone 1 could be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3 under the climate change scenario.
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q23	<p>Interim Sustainability Appraisal is difficult to follow but the NF would make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not clear why the finding from the first ISA in relation to negative impacts of car borne travel become plusses in the preferred option in ISA2. - site allocations do not appear to perform well against Objectives 9,10,11, 12, and 13. - unclear why some parcels have been assessed and other not. several independent parcels have been assessed together which distorts the results. - Scenario B, ISA2 assesses impacts on communities as all broadly positive. It is not clear how this can be concluded
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strong adverse reactions to recent developments in respect of housing layout, density and lack of parking. - Opportunities for smaller house builders should be considered as they may offer alternative designs and layouts

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Estelle Palmer [4334]			Q23	<p>- Lack of meaningful engagement with the NF.</p> <p>For example, there seems to have been little involvement in any of the studies or workshops associated with the Council's evidence base.</p> <p>- The NF has put in a lot of time and effort into trying to understand</p>
Extra MSA [3892]	Sue Manns	Pegasus Group (Sue Manns) [3891]	Q23	<p>Concern that future growth levels have been underestimated (805 jobs per annum). Risk of under-providing for future households and business if the correct level of growth is not adequately planned for and delivered. E.g. Likely increase in commuting and flows on the highway network.</p> <p>Important to maximise highway safety, including provision of a MSA to serve an already established and significant gap in Service Area provision.</p> <p>Proposed Solihull Services on the M42 near to Catherine de Barnes by EXTRA represents an actual investment of Â£79 million (2017 figures).</p>
Father Peter Thomas [2991]			Q23	<p>Jaguar/Land Rover site will employ up to 3000 people. This has no mention in the local plan and will generate a minimum of 1000 vehicle movements twice a day using an already overloaded road network through Balsall Common. This is before adding the potential of 300 vehicle movements twice a day from the Frog Lane development alone. Majority of traffic movements to employment from the surrounding area are northwards. Further housing on the south side of Balsall Common will increase the traffic flows where roads are already identified as being congested. Need to consider effect of HS2 construction and traffic.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Federated Scrap Ltd [4624]	Patrick Downes	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (Patrick Downes) [2613]	Q23	<p>Tests of soundness:</p> <p>Not positively prepared - does not meet objectively assessed housing needs for the HMA. Solihull needs to contribute to the overspill to ensure sustainable development can take place and to support the region's economy.</p> <p>Green Belt review should release land for future plan periods up to 2050.</p> <p>Not justified - does not test reasonable alternative as it does not meet the housing requirements of the wider HMA.</p> <p>Not effective - does not meet cross boundary objectives since it fails to fulfil the uptodate objectively assessed needs of HMA.</p> <p>Not consistent with national policy - inadequate housing provision.</p>
G S Oliver [4773]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Chelmer Model for Solihull.</p> <p>Inputs in model include:</p> <p>Household formation rates used in the DCLG 2014-based household projections.</p> <p>Labour market activity rates</p> <p>Unemployment rates from Annual population survey</p> <p>Adjustments to above for Solihull</p> <p>3% vacancy rates</p> <p>Scenario 1 is just the demographic projection and is similar to PBA SHMA.</p> <p>Scenarios 2 and 2a include Cambridge Econometrics future workplace projections. Markedly different results from Experian model and Scenarios 2 and 2a increase households by ca. 12k and 8K respectively.</p> <p>Policy off, therefore does not include 2011-2014 shortfall, any other uplifts or HMA contribution.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>SHELAA has a number of flaws, including:</p> <p>Local planning policy is irrelevant to SHELAA as plan being reviewed.</p> <p>751dpa figure is less than in the DLP.</p> <p>Council should do more than just Call for Sites.</p> <p>Absolute constraints inappropriate.</p> <p>Scoring system for housing too generalised.</p> <p>Concern with suitability criteria, e.g. suitability of location is predetermining the plan.</p> <p>Availability scoring too conservative.</p> <p>Number of anomalies in the assessments, e.g. LWS</p> <p>Densities and build out rates too optimistic.</p> <p>Windfall allowance too generous.</p> <p>SHELAA provide evidence that sufficient available land in Solihull to meet significant housing needs.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Review of SHMA:</p> <p>OAN for wider HMA should be calculated.</p> <p>Ideally should split Birmingham overspill proportionally between neighbours.</p> <p>Future projections and migration patterns should not be based on recession.</p> <p>Should apply 3% vacancy rate.</p> <p>Should frontload any 2011-2014 shortfall.</p> <p>Should deliver more housing South of A45 as locus of market pressure.</p> <p>Should not confuse market signal uplift with HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Data used in Experian model is out-of-date and outputs too pessimistic in projecting job numbers.</p> <p>Solihull will continue to have overheated housing market if insufficient housing allocated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gallagher Estates [4343]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Review of unmet housing need in HMA and duty to cooperate</p> <p>Birmingham shortfall of 37,900 dwellings.</p> <p>Policy TP48 in Birmingham Development Plan places responsibility on Birmingham to ensure unmet housing needs arising in the City are met by other LPAs in the HMA.</p> <p>Test of effectiveness of Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>GBHMA Strategic Growth Study to be commissioned.</p> <p>Democratic deficit in process of how Study's findings will be published, considered and included in Local Plans.</p> <p>Council need to be clear about weight of Study in progressing Local Plan.</p> <p>Lack of credible evidence to support 2,000 contribution.</p> <p>OAN is underestimated.</p>
Georgina Joyce [4627]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Gill Corns [4448]			Q23	<p>Interim Sustainability Appraisal is difficult to follow but the NF would make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not clear why the finding from the first ISA in relation to negative impacts of car borne travel become plusses in the preferred option in ISA2. - site allocations do not appear to perform well against Objectives 9,10,11, 12, and 13. - unclear why some parcels have been assessed and other not. several independent parcels have been assessed together which distorts the results. - Scenario B, ISA2 assesses impacts on communities as all broadly positive. It is not clear how this can be concluded.
Gill Corns [4448]			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strong adverse reactions to recent developments in respect of housing layout, density and lack of parking. - Opportunities for smaller house builders should be considered as they may offer alternative designs and layouts.
Gill Corns [4448]			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of meaningful engagement with the NF. <p>For example, there seems to have been little involvement in any of the studies or workshops associated with the Council's evidence base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The NF has put in a lot of time and effort into trying to understand
Gill Jennings [3877]			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the development will be in conflict with Challenges E & J in the DLP

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
<p>Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]</p>			<p>Q23</p>	<p>Do not find the DLP sound or legally compliant.</p> <p>In particular with regard to following:</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>OAN assessment</p> <p>Spatial Strategy</p> <p>Policies P4, P5, P10, P15, P17.</p>
<p>Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]</p>			<p>Q23</p>	<p>Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>Not simply a question of consultation, but effective cooperation.</p> <p>Key issue likely to be unmet need of 37,900 homes from Birmingham.</p> <p>Plan notes that discussions have taken place, and 2,000 figure to help meet the shortfall, but does not evidence these discussions of plans for future ones.</p> <p>Lack of MoU, joint Green Belt or SHELAA or SHMA methodologies.</p> <p>DLP does not meet requirements of Legal Compliance.</p>
<p>Gladman Developments (Mat Evans) [4458]</p>			<p>Q23</p>	<p>Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>An iterative process to inform plan-making.</p> <p>Given the need to finalise issues on Green Belt Review and OAN, and the need to further consider the HMA shortfall, it is highly likely that the SA will require significant revisions.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q23	<p>Sustainability Appraisal- Object to some sites being grouped together and others not. Results in different findings for different sites which is unfair. Impacts would be different if individual sites were assessed.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment- Assessment is too broad and does not look at individual sites or potential for mitigation. The same assessment and pressures often apply equally and offer little to the site selection process.</p> <p>Topic Papers- Too broad and no real justification why sites were selected or rejected. Insufficient weight given to other evidence base. Site selection not transparent and does not reflect the opportunity presented by Site 59.</p>
Golden End Farms [3913]	Mr David Green	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Q23	<p>Green Belt Assessment - Too broad and misleading. No attempt made to recognise different characteristics within refined parcels. This should be acknowledged or smaller parcels used. Specific issues regarding SHELAA site 59 and disagreement with the Green Belt scores for this site.</p> <p>SHELAA - Concerns about errors in the detailed assessment of Site 59 including contamination, biodiversity and heritage issues.</p> <p>Accessibility Assessment - Contains errors which score Site 59 incorrectly. If amended, the site is the highest scoring site in Knowle/Dorridge area.</p>
Heidi Becker [4066]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Helen Blyth [3350]			Q23	Will the council have in-built stipulation or clauses to any prospective buyers of these new homes that they can only be purchased by people that are not property owners already?
Helen Young [3390]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Highways England (Mr A Slack) [2007]			Q23	<p>Further details will be required to consider the implications of the levels of planned growth upon the SRN so as to ensure the potential transport implications of developments are considered.</p> <p>M42 J4 will be affected and a cumulative assessment of proposals will be required to allow full consideration of the impacts. This will need to take account of the potential for a Motorway Service Area.</p> <p>Need to consider potential impacts on J5 including developments in Solihull Town Centre arising from the masterplan.</p> <p>Need to work together to consider additional transport evidence required.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q23	<p>Supergrowth assumptions contd:</p> <p>Significant concern that evidence presented in SHMA does not align with wider strategy and policy based approach in DLP or other Council documents.</p> <p>UKC Hub supergrowth form part of a wider strategy of supergrowth at sub-regional level, e.g. WMCA Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). 'Economy Plus' aims to create 500K additional jobs by 2030, and calls for significantly greater housebuilding than currently provided in Plans or being delivered across West Midlands HMAs.</p> <p>No justification has been provided for why the ELR, Para. 5.16 'does not consider the SEP scenarios in detail.'</p> <p>Modern Industrial Strategy also names Midlands Engine.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q23	<p>Shortfalls in Evidence Base.</p> <p>SHMA and ELR:</p> <p>Analysis of Experian forecasts and alternative baseline forecast by Oxford Economics within the ELR show a different picture between as to the relationship between jobs and population growth.</p> <p>SHMA appears to recognise these uncertainties noting this needs to be kept under review, acknowledging that job growth may be higher and the labour market in the FEMA may tighten.</p> <p>Suggests notably different labour-force behaviour assumptions in each of forecasts.</p> <p>DLP does not adequately reflect this uncertainty in proposing a more flexible approach to housing provision.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q23	<p>Supergrowth assumptions:</p> <p>SHMA includes job forecasts from UKC HS2 Interchange Station Growth strategy Strategic Outline Case (May 2015). Assumes a total net growth of 11,900 jobs within Solihull, with 5,336 up to 2033.</p> <p>Appears to contrast significantly with DLP justifying text on the scale of ambition for the area and significant costs of infrastructure.</p> <p>Experian labour force behaviour changes do not reflect acknowledgement in ELR that supergrowth jobs will be concentrated in professional and private services.</p> <p>Experian model assumes a significant increase in net in-commuting to Solihull to satisfy job growth. Unclear whether implications for Birmingham have been considered.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Land [3900]	Ms Kathryn Young	Turley Associates (Ms Kathryn Young) [2186]	Q23	<p>Should consult on revised draft SPD for 'Meeting Housing Needs' alongside the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Would be beneficial to development industry to understand SMBC's approach to expenditure of financial contributions collected. Specifically how such contributions will be spent and whether expenditure will be tied to locations in proximity to the contribution development site or focused in specific geographic locations across the Borough.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q23	<p>Landscape & Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Review by Barton Willmore of the land North of Main Road, Meriden have been submitted as an alternative to the Council's evidence base.</p> <p>Access and transport appraisal by Mode Transport Planning of the land North of Main Road, Meriden have been submitted as an alternative to the Council's evidence base.</p>
IM Land [3900]	Mrs R Best	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs R Best) [2448]	Q23	<p>Green Belt Assessment: limitations due to parcel size/arbitrary boundaries. Purpose 1 contains development so 2 not 3. Alternative site assessment: relates to settlement, well-contained, no historical impact, firm defensible boundaries.</p> <p>Constraints: MSA for coal not relevant, should be removed.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment: high level broad area limited sensitivity impact, strongly influenced by settlement.</p> <p>SHELAA: no explanation for reduction for bad neighbour constraint and rural settlement applies to all larger settlements, whilst Site 10 fails to take account of potential LWS.</p> <p>Topic Paper 4: alternative site/safeguarded land perform better than Site 10 and evidence supports greater capacity of Meriden.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Critique of ELR contd:</p> <p>Agree with using an economic forecasting model to calculate need, further consideration also needs to be given to historic rates of take-up and/or market drivers in validating future need.</p> <p>ELR concludes there is a 'notional oversupply' of employment land.</p> <p>Over-stated and not adequately justified.</p> <p>Concern this conclusion is misleading, fails to fully acknowledge market signals and potential demand generated from major projects both in Solihull and wider region.</p> <p>Methodology of translating employment forecasts to floorspace and land is not considered to be robust or appropriate.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>HS2 is a once in a generation scale of infrastructure investment; expected to represent a significant 'boost' to commercial market in the HS2 area and beyond.</p> <p>Preferred baseline scenario is unlikely to take into account the potential growth in online retailing and e-commerce as a driver of logistics demand, nor does it robustly assess the impact of demand from major projects and investments across the wider sub-region. Consider forecasts underestimate actual levels of demand across Solihull over plan period.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Shortfalls in Evidence Base.</p> <p>SHMA and ELR:</p> <p>Analysis of Experian forecasts and alternative baseline forecast by Oxford Economics within the ELR show a different picture between as to the relationship between jobs and population growth.</p> <p>SHMA appears to recognise these uncertainties noting this needs to be kept under review, acknowledging that job growth may be higher and the labour market in the FEMA may tighten.</p> <p>Suggests notably different labour-force behaviour assumptions in each of forecasts.</p> <p>DLP does not adequately reflect this uncertainty in proposing a more flexible approach to housing provision.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Supergrowth assumptions:</p> <p>SHMA includes job forecasts from UKC HS2 Interchange Station Growth strategy Strategic Outline Case (May 2015). Assumes a total net growth of 11,900 jobs within Solihull, with 5,336 up to 2033.</p> <p>Appears to contrast significantly with DLP justifying text on the scale of ambition for the area and significant costs of infrastructure.</p> <p>Experian labour force behaviour changes do not reflect acknowledgement in ELR that supergrowth jobs will be concentrated in professional and private services.</p> <p>Experian model assumes a significant increase in net in-commuting to Solihull to satisfy job growth. Unclear whether implications for Birmingham have been considered.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>West Midlands Land Commission (WMLC) was set up in 2016 to help West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) unlock land for development.</p> <p>WMLC published a report to WMCA in Feb 2017 which sets out a number of mechanisms to improve developable supply of land in West Midlands.</p> <p>Acknowledge this report does not represent policy or necessarily inform policy, it does identify scale of some of challenges faced in Region and SMBC need to understand consequences it may have on DLP.</p> <p>Findings of report suggest additional 50,000 homes required in West Midlands over and above Local Plan requirements.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Critique of ELR contd:</p> <p>Inappropriate to conclude on the market balance for industrial and logistics land until such time that market drivers, the employment yielding potential of major projects, the needs of the supply chain and the wider than local need for sites in Solihull are more accurately addressed in the informing evidence and land requirements calculations being relied upon to draft Policy P3.</p> <p>Need to update evidence to reflect the above for next version of the Plan.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Supergrowth assumptions contd:</p> <p>Significant concern that evidence presented in SHMA does not align with wider strategy and policy based approach in DLP or other Council documents.</p> <p>UKC Hub supergrowth form part of a wider strategy of supergrowth at sub-regional level, e.g. WMCA Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). 'Economy Plus' aims to create 500K additional jobs by 2030, and calls for significantly greater housebuilding than currently provided in Plans or being delivered across West Midlands HMAs.</p> <p>No justification has been provided for why the ELR, Para. 5.16 'does not consider the SEP scenarios in detail.'</p> <p>Modern Industrial Strategy also names Midlands Engine</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Should consult on revised draft SPD for 'Meeting Housing Needs' alongside the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Would be beneficial to development industry to understand SMBC's approach to expenditure of financial contributions collected. Specifically how such contributions will be spent and whether expenditure will be tied to locations in proximity to the contribution development site or focused in specific geographic locations across the Borough.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Critique of Employment Land Review:</p> <p>Only published in January 2017, post-dating publication of the consultation version of the DLP.</p> <p>Obvious disjoint between evidence base and policy; lack of detail on OAN for Employment Land within justification text under Policy P3.</p> <p>Absence of employment land requirement means we are unable to judge the adequacy of the supply of identified employment land, e.g.</p> <p>sufficient scale/flexible portfolio of sites/land to accommodate varied future demand.</p> <p>Need for 22.6ha of employment land in ELR relies solely upon baseline Experian forecast.</p>
IM Properties [279]	Ms Angela Reeve	Turley Associates (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	Q23	<p>Critique of ELR contd:</p> <p>Evidence fails to adequately reflect the local and sub-regional economic vision and ambition for growth. Need to fully acknowledge Solihull's role within wider functional economic market area and identified plans for investment and job growth. Should consider above baseline growth to accord with PPG, such as strategic aspiration of the GBSLEP and WMCA and needs of different industrial sectors.</p> <p>Agree that HS2 interchange business land should be treated as separate from local supply; however do not agree that there will be no positive uplift with regards to employment growth and subsequent additional demand for land.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Ivor Jones [4037]			Q23	No explanation has been given to the fact that a grossly disproportionate number of houses are proposed to be built in Berkswell / Balsall Common in an important and sensitive Green Belt area compared with elsewhere in Solihull borough. Such as Dorridge, Knowle or other villages to the South. There is a very strong perception in the Berkswell / Balsall Common region that Solihull MBC have abandoned the Greenbelt and consciously discarded their own policies and values and have lost what trust they had as a result.
J Plain Jones [4931]			Q23	Safeguard the undeveloped 'belt between Knowle / Dorridge / Bentley Heath and the M42. Housing to allow for green spaces, keeping the village feel of Knowle.
James Langton [3383]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
James Burn [2910]			Q23	Please note, the question asked is "Please specify if you support or object", and the answers available to give are "Yes/No".
Jason Edwards [4655]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Jayne Cashmore [3679]			Q23	SHELAA assessment for Oakwood House, Lavender Hall Lane call for sites reference 36 includes two mistakes, and should be corrected. The summary of availability contradicts the positive assessment under the availability criteria, and should read 'Site performs well against availability criteria', and the summary of achievability indicates moderate marketability/viability, unlikely to come forward within 5 years, when an application has already been discussed with the Parish Council and is likely to be submitted within a few months.
Jean Fleming [3444]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Jeanette McGarry [4247]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Jenny Woodruff [3967]			Q23	No. It is clear that a lot of effort has gone into the draft proposals and that managing the wide range of potentially conflicting objectives will not be simple.
Jill Hubbleday [4462]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Joanne Jones [4515]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Joelle Hill [4425]			Q23	<p>Seek reassurance that Council will protect as many green spaces as possible including hedges and trees on existing roads to maintain the Urbs in Rure motto.</p> <p>Make protecting green spaces however small a priority. Even a hedge can enhance a road that might otherwise experience busy traffic.</p> <p>They enhance the experience of living in the Borough and can alleviate pollution.</p>
John & Ashi Bentley [4236]			Q23	I wish this facility to be returned to supporting local area field sporting activities.
John & Janet Taylor [4595]			Q23	Does the Council intend to construct a by-pass, and if so, will it be on the line of the previously proposed route utilising Hall meadow Road?
John Rawlins [4232]			Q23	Why does Solihull Council think it is acceptable to concentrate circa 41% of their new housing requirements in the Shirley South area? Have any brownfield sites even been considered
Jon Preussner [4258]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Jordan Whitcroft [4093]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Judith Dean [4222]			Q23	Support the barrage representation
Judith Parry- Evans [3846]			Q23	<p>Balsall Common originated from several hamlets and farms and benefits from the character these provide, with over 20 listed cottages, farmhouses, inns, barns, some dating from the 17th century, as well as a Grade 2* windmill. These add hugely to the street character of Station Road, Meeting House Lane, Frog Lane, Balsall Street East etc. Description in Borough Portrait as suburban cul-de-sacs with a station on the Birmingham/London rail line is not its dominant character and should not be presented in this way.</p> <p>Constraints mapping should include playing pitches on the Frog Lane site and nature reserve on Riddings Hill.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Julian Crook [4311]			Q23	I could not work out how to submit these comments via your Online Portal, which I found very confusing to use, so I hope my comments will be taken into account in the format attached.
Julie Burrows [3773]			Q23	concern on tenure and type of build. who would have access to the housing and whether the plans will deliver housing for older people to downsize into?
Karen Munton [3377]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Karen O'Rourke [3697]			Q23	It is such a shame that the land cannot be used in a sporting capacity and I understand that Solihull Council formally minuted that they would not sell the freehold of grounds used for sport.
Karin Chessell [4284]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Ken Hazlewood [4774]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q23	<p>Interim Sustainability Appraisal is difficult to follow but the NF would make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not clear why the finding from the first ISA in relation to negative impacts of car borne travel become plusses in the preferred option in ISA2. - site allocations do not appear to perform well against Objectives 9,10,11, 12, and 13. - unclear why some parcels have been assessed and other not. several independent parcels have been assessed together which distorts the results. - Scenario B, ISA2 assesses impacts on communities as all broadly positive. It is not clear how this can be concluded

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q23	- strong adverse reactions to recent developments in respect of housing layout, density and lack of parking. - Opportunities for smaller house builders should be considered as they may offer alternative designs and layouts.
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]			Q23	lack of meaningful engagement with the NF. For example, there seems to have been little involvement in any of the studies or workshops associated with the Council's evidence base - The NF has put in a lot of time and effort into trying to understand the issues and concerns that matter to local residents and businesses and trusts that the Council will take note of these and respond positively to this objection.
Landowner Land at Birmingham Road Meriden [4529]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Formally request that Appendix C of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Strategic Employment and Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) be corrected to remove reference to our Client's site being a Local Wildlife Site to be retained and enhanced. Formally request that the reference in the SHELAA to 'contaminated land/ landfill site' be corrected.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Site Selection Topic Papers- Brief overview of officer views on where it is appropriate to direct development does not make detailed reference to evidence material and it does not provide information specific to sites selected for allocation compared to those site areas rejected.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>In relation to SHELAA Site 1017:</p> <p>Misleading assessment of site in SHELAA report;</p> <p>Inaccurate accessibility mapping scores;</p> <p>Green Belt scores should be assessed for site itself and not wider area.</p> <p>Misleading interpretation of Landscape Character Assessment.</p> <p>Misleading interim sustainability assessment.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>DLP fails to meet NPPF requirements for Duty-to-Cooperate:</p> <p>Much of necessary evidence has not been completed (contrary to Para. 182).</p> <p>None of evidence available at Cabinet meeting when Members supported consultation.</p> <p>Evidence includes numerous inaccuracies.</p> <p>Evidence difficult to interpret as different numbering systems and boundaries.</p> <p>Official evidence published after 5th December on website.</p> <p>Calls into question how robust site choices were made.</p> <p>Representors unable to make fully informed comments.</p>
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Lack of options to give local communities involvement and choice when considering potential housing sites, contrary to NPPF and neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Proposed strategy will result in over-dependence on large housebuilders.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Proportionate evidence not been provided in support of Council's proposed housing allocations or to justify the rejection of other sites which perform equally well. Much of the submitted evidence is subject to challenge due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes made during site assessments.
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Many of rejected sites from SHELAA: Do not have existing viable community or recreational facilities, Moderate to low value to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, Relatively sustainable, Less landscape impact, Partly brownfield/previously developed land, Perform better when judged against Council's guiding principles (p.35 of DLP).
Landowners Wootton Green Land Balsall Common [4524]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Accessibility Mapping: Should be corrected to include an assessment of sites 153 & 154, forming part of proposed Site 9, currently omitted from the appraisal.
Leighton Jones [3252]			Q23	Comments I have attempted to respond to these proposals through the preferred process, but found it very difficult and confusing, certainly NOT user friendly. They drive the responder to focus on a limited number of potential factors to the detriment of a reasonable analysis. I have managed to make some comments, but gave up in the end. Please use a better method in future.
Liam Sawyer [4768]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Linda Whitcroft [4092]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Lindsay Preussner [4256]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Lioncourt Strategic Land [3843]	Robert Gardner	GVA (Robert Gardner) [3700]	Q23	<p>GVA - OAN for Solihull on behalf of Lioncourt Strategic Land</p> <p>Broadly agree with following in SHMA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 2014 household projections are demographic starting point. * 10% market uplift * Vacancy Rate (2.3%) * 62dpa for 2011-2014 shortfall <p>Disagree with SHMA and recommend following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Experian model too constrained. Cambridge Econometrics unconstrained model preferred. Additional economic needs uplift required. * HMA contribution should be based on % HMA employment growth or commuting links with Birmingham. * Housing requirement range from 914 to 1317dpa.
Lorna O'Regan [3648]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Louis Burns [4069]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
M J Beasley [4051]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Malcolm Edgington [3885]			Q23	IT IS ABOUT TIME SOLIHULL COUNCIL STARTED LOOKING AFTER LOCAL RESIDENTS EVERY OBJECTION THAT IS EVER RAISED GETS OVER TURNED LOOK AT PARK GATE TRAFFIC CHAOS, SHOPS HALF EMPTY LOOK AT SHIRLEY HIGH ST CHARITY SHOPS BANKS BUILDING SOCIETIES NO LOCAL SMALL BUSINESSES ALL AS A RESULT OF SOMETHING THE LOCAL RESIDENTS NEVER WANTED ASDA THE MAJORITY OF CUSTOMERS TRAVEL IN FROM OUTSIDE THE AREA THEY TRAVEL STRAIGHT BACK OUT AGAIN NEVER SUPPORTING LOCAL BUSINESSES
Mantisson Limited (Mr Malcolm Priest) [3760]			Q23	Arden Triangle
Mark & Nathalie Fitch [3336]			Q23	When considering the new school facilities we would like to see broader community needs to be considered, e.g. flexible, divisible spaces with high quality resources. This may include auditoriums that could support local groups, provide local cinema and other youth projects. This may allow the release of other smaller village facilities by consolidating into a community space that has sufficiently regular use to support additional services, e.g. a cafe, or community advice services.
Mark Hathaway [3330]			Q23	Your website was very unclear on what I should do to object and how can I attend varies meetings of objections when like most people are at work when the are scheduled to happen.
Mark O'Regan [3470]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mary Jones [3702]			Q23	The density and design of the development would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties and I feel would inevitably lead to a loss of light and privacy for some of these residents.
Matthew Becker [3402]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Matthew Quinn [4344]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Melanie Hughes [4657]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Meriden Parish Council (Mrs B Bland) [2043]			Q23	Improving links with primary and secondary health care is key in all the policies including social care.
Merrill Flood [3878]			Q23	increased air pollution and a loss of sporting grounds are also given as reasons for opposing this site.
Michael & Lynda Beasley [4291]			Q23	<p>Disproportionate allocation of homes in Balsall Common has not been justified.</p> <p>Dorridge, Knowle, Chadwick End, Fen End etc. are in less sensitive and less pressured areas of Green Belt.</p> <p>Strong perception in the Balsall Common area that Council has abandoned the Greenbelt and discarded their own policies and values.</p> <p>Have lost local trust.</p> <p>Appears land belonging to us has been erroneously included in Site 1. Should this development take place, we would expect a barrier to be put in place to protect livestock.</p> <p>Area will already suffer from increased noise, pollution and loss of Green Belt due to HS2.</p>
Michael Cooper [4131]			Q23	see detail in letter
Michael Watkinson [3576]			Q23	I cannot see that adequate consideration has been given to providing accommodation for the elderly. Despite the difficulties that care homes are having at present, I would recommend that a major care home provider is approached to see if they would support such a provision in the enlarged village (care home, not nursing home).

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Miss Emma Sewell [3704]			Q23	<p>In light of the above, I would request</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A re-assessment is made 2) an holistic view is taken as to where housing is best located, with due consideration to be given to the re-use of PDL sites in preference to "greenfield" as well as congestion hot spots 3) phasing must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2 4) infrastructure to support any significant expansion must be identified and planned for alongside any development. 5) SMBC consults on ALL PDL SITES, 6) Site 2 is removed from the Draft Local Plan
Miss Margaret Bassett [3798]			Q23	<p>No mention in DLP of dog-walking facilities. High dog ownership in Solihull. Lack of facilities in urban spaces</p>
Miss Mary Bree [3165]			Q23	<p>In principle I agree but I have many concerns some of which I have commented on. The scale of this document means that it is difficult to take in all the detail. Having attended meetings and read up on bits I am concerned about the impact on Shirley, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley. I don't think we can cope with the additional volume of traffic and I think it makes sense to put houses near jobs to reduce the need for commuting.</p>
Moushumi Moran [4619]			Q23	<p>Not clear from the rep as to whether proposed allocation 9 Knowle is supported or not.</p> <p>However, comments on the provision of school places in the settlement is highlight as below:</p> <p>I would like to highlight the need for increase in primary education proposed in Items 4, 8 and 9.</p> <p>During recent years local development has been substantial and whilst Local Authority Schools in the area have been increased to meet demand St George & St Teresa has not. We have been forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings in our school.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr & Mrs Dan & Mary Hitchcock [3105]			Q23	<p>general comments on Balsall Common infrastructure including suggestions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -a swimming pool. -new businesses linked to the area. -market the jubilee centre for sale. -a new facility equal to the Grove Road family renewal centre. -a cinema showing classic films. <p>Bring the south up to the standards of what is available in the north.</p> <p>The plan already seems far advanced.</p>
Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	Paul Watson	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	Q23	Green Belt Assessment - does not recognise in its scoring the potential benefits of a strategic policy approach.
Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	Paul Watson	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	Q23	Accessibility Study - look only at opportunities and constraints presented by existing infrastructure, rather than by potential improvements that could be delivered alongside new development.
Mr Adam Weber [3072]			Q23	<p>Site 4 conflicts with the original masterplan and vision for Dickens Heath village.</p> <p>Should be a specific policy to protect character and setting of Dickens Heath village, and limit further expansions.</p>
Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]			Q23	There are significant errors in the SHELAA and Green Belt Assessment which need to be redone. Barratt's Farm grows mostly wheat so is grade 3 not grade 5 land, whilst Lavender Hall Farm is used for materiel lay down or is scrub, so is 5 not 4 agricultural land classification. There are no defensible boundaries to allocations 1 & 3 contrary to the NPPF. Using a footpath to split BA04 from RP54/55 is contrary to the NPPF. It should all be BA04. And lots more!
Mr Bob Holtham [3530]			Q23	The Landscape Character Assessment for Area 3, Knowle and Dorridge Fringe, is incorrect as it aggregates a number of very different landscape types as more moderately performing when some of the individual plots have historic hedgerows and veteran trees, encompass existing footpath and watercourse networks of higher landscape value, and are contiguous with current high performing areas.
Mr C Edwards [4622]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr C Gledhill [4812]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr Callum Hall [3365]			Q23	In summary, it has not been made clear why existing infrastructure (dual carriageways) and the major source of work and transport flows (HS2 stations, Birmingham and motorways etc) have not led to housing being proposed in areas where this access is ideal. Instead, growth for Balsall Common is proposed at the opposite side of the village, maximising the pressure on the village's traffic capacity. Access to bus routes should not be a restriction on housing developments as you can simply change the bus routes to suit.
Mr Charles Ayto [3030]			Q23	There seems to be no appreciation of the areas around Earlswood which should be included in the Draft Local Plan consultation. I appreciate Earlswood straddles both Solihull and Stratford local authorities, but Earlswood could accommodate limited additional expansion without affecting the nature of the area.
mr chris leigh [2943]			Q23	I have a question, is the land that used to be Catchems Nursery to be built on? I live at 5 waste lane (CV7 7GF) and this land is directly behind our house but I can't tell from the map whether it is to be built on or not.
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q23	Should be an inset study for Balsall Common. Work should be started on the Balsall Common Bypass as soon as possible
Mr D Deanshaw [2226]			Q23	as former chairman of the village plan in Balsall Common, I have some carefully thought through views. they consist of 960 words. these will be sent by email to

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr D Edmonds [4808]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr D Eustace [4791]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr D Perks [3399]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr Dan Salt [3134]			Q23	It is highly destructive. It destroys important natural habitat currently in balance. It destroys residents sense of place and belonging. It destroys important heritage countryside. It destroys the economic wealth of current residents; aspirational house locations along the edges of the proposed development sites in Balsall Common are going to be negatively affected. Will residents find themselves in a scenario mortgage providers revalue homes based upon the scale and impact on current plots? Hugely diluting the equity value of some houses, i.e. the source of economic support for later life or the pension plans of others? Profoundly destructive.
Mr David Bird [3484]			Q23	Where green belt land is to be used then the existing mature native trees should remain along with mature hedgerows and where possible controlled waters such as ponds, streams etc should be left open acting as wildlife corridors and not diverted through underground drainage pipes, such actions will reduce the impact to the local wildlife.
Mr David Roberts [2570]			Q23	A lot of the same questions were asked in the scope, issues and options document of 2015. Answers have largely been ignored.
Mr Derrick Walker [4780]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr F J Jackson [4219]			Q23	consider that the council has failed in delivering its duty towards the residents within the parish boundaries by not writing to them/sending them the DLP directly.
Mr G Wilkinson [4788]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr G Frost [4809]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q23	In Balsall Common there will be enormous upheaval over the next 5 - 10 years caused by the building of HS2. It is unreasonable to ask the residents to endure the additional disruption from building 1150 houses and associated services. Whatever Local Plan and NDP is finally agreed for housing development it should not be started until HS2 is completed and its effects fully evaluated. There should be no release of Green Belt land until then

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]			Q23	All the identified land in Balsall Common is Green Belt, although the plan says non-Green Belt first. The 1150 homes would likely be exceeded as a result of windfall development.
Mr H Keene [4806]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr Ian Snelling [2938]			Q23	A detailed & impressive draft Local Plan for Solihull that has identified the issues & opportunities in a positive, realistic & balanced way.
Mr J Allen [4072]	Shaun Richards	Cerda Planning Ltd (Shaun Richards) [4082]	Q23	Criticise the generalised methodology of the Green Belt Assessment which means that all sites in a refined parcel are 'tarred with the same brush'. This means that smaller parcels within them which may not possess the characteristics which are most prevalent within the wider parcel are effectively scored incorrectly. Suggest revised scoring for Grove Farm, Knowle (site 5).
Mr J Stanley [4786]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr John Addy [3308]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr John Outhwaite [3785]			Q23	Re the consultation document: Firstly, the document is very long, there is no summary and it is full of jargon. In my opinion it fails the "plain English" test. It is full of obfuscation which makes it quite difficult to understand what is being proposed. If the Council really wishes to have meaningful consultation with council tax payers then there needs to be simpler communication.
Mr John Wilson [3890]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr K Millican [4779]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr M Trentham [2114]			Q23	Generally in support of the Draft Plan with exceptions detailed in previous answers. I am a member of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum, whose submission I have read. It seems to me a totally negative document, and frankly downright rude in parts, bearing in mind all the hard work put in by the Councillors, Council officers and outside contractors involved. Sadly the Forum seems to have become a NIMBY campaigning organisation, which is not the purpose of such Fora. They are supposed to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan which is consistent with Council Policy - not campaign against it.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Michael Hunter [3086]			Q23	relocation of the sports facilities to new location is not supported, neither is loss of the "akamba centre'
Mr P Phillips [4798]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr P Greasley [4813]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr R Vernon [4801]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr R A Smith [4782]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr R E Green [4789]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr Richard Drake [3541]			Q23	Disappointing that the emphasis is on Greenbelt and PDL sites as well as a new settlement have been ignored/dismissed
Mr Roger Cook [2962]			Q23	Do not sacrifice the character of Knowle village in order to meets the needs of vested interests, developers, landowners and the Council who appear to be seeking to secure development through the easiest options available i.e. taking large tracts of land in Green Belt without seriously considering other options and alternatives
Mr S Catton [3935]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Proportionate evidence not provided in support of proposed allocations or rejection of other sites.</p> <p>Evidence base is open to challenge, due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes in site assessments. Some crucial evidence base documents are still outstanding.</p> <p>Object to the misleading assessment of sites 29 and 210 in the SHELAA, the inaccurate accessibility mapping scores and the misleading interim Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>There is no overarching commentary for each site.</p> <p>Would challenge the Green Belt Assessment scores for Knowle site allocations.</p> <p>All relevant information has not been considered. Decisions have been made which may subsequently be flawed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mr Steven Webb [2960]			Q23	General comments on the use of green belt, taking developers interests in to account and question about council grants for building on green belt and if so is this a conflict of interests.
Mr Surinder Teja [3298]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr T N Walton [4817]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mr Terry Grove [3698]			Q23	Whilst supportive of the development of Arden Academy I feel that Academy's plans have now become overly ambitious - probably based on local landowners seeing that by being 'supportive' of the school they can take the opportunity to unlock their investment and make a 'quick buck' in what is currently Green Belt land.
Mr. ronald handfield [3028]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs E A Seal [4814]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs G Elson [4816]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Irene Thompson [4127]	Mr Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]	Q23	Consider the inclusion of their site (CfS 82) as part of parcel Aecom76 in the Sustainability Appraisal as being unfair. The SHELAA is referenced is support of the above view.
Mrs J Bliss [4803]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>In relation to evidence on SHELAA Site 19:</p> <p>SHELAA rates site as Category 1 and we agree.</p> <p>Should not be included in overall Broad Area assessment for Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Disagree with Landscape Character Area assessment regarding this site.</p> <p>Accessibility can change over time.</p> <p>Not included in interim sustainability assessment.</p> <p>Should be included in SA.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Lack of options to give local communities involvement and choice when considering potential housing sites, contrary to NPPF and neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Proposed strategy will result in over-dependence on large housebuilders.</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Proportionate evidence not been provided in support of Council's proposed housing allocations or to justify the rejection of other sites which perform equally well.</p> <p>Much of the submitted evidence is subject to challenge due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes made during site assessments.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Many of rejected sites from SHELAA:</p> <p>Do not have existing viable community or recreational facilities,</p> <p>Moderate to low value to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt,</p> <p>Relatively sustainable,</p> <p>Less landscape impact,</p> <p>Partly brownfield/previously developed land,</p> <p>Perform better when judged against Council's guiding principles (p.35 of DLP).</p>
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>DLP fails to meet NPPF requirements for Duty-to-Cooperate:</p> <p>Much of necessary evidence has not been completed (contrary to Para. 182).</p> <p>None of evidence available at Cabinet meeting when Members supported consultation.</p> <p>Evidence includes numerous inaccuracies.</p> <p>Evidence difficult to interpret as different numbering systems and boundaries.</p> <p>Official evidence published after 5th December on website.</p> <p>Calls into question how robust site choices were made.</p> <p>Representors unable to make fully informed comments.</p> <p>Interim SA does not include assessment of SHELAA Site 19 as a Rural Exception Site.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Accessibility Mapping: Should be corrected to include an assessment of sites 153 & 154, forming part of proposed Site 9, currently omitted from the appraisal.
Mrs A Curtis [4518]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Site Selection Topic Papers - Brief overview of officer views on where it is appropriate to direct development does not make detailed reference to evidence material and it does not provide information specific to sites selected for allocation compared to those site areas rejected.
Mrs A Wildsmith [3486]	John Cornwell	John Cornwell [3485]	Q23	Appendix C 'Schedule of Allocated Sites' should be amended to include allocation of residential land at Site 20. Either: - 6.4ha, 150 dwellings, Dunstan Farm (see letter for more detail). OR: - 33ha, 700 dwellings, Land north and east of JLR Logistics and Operations Centre (see letter for more detail).
Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]			Q23	More bungalows to be built to a high standard and give good garden space so the senior couples in big 4 bed houses can move on freeing up houses for young families.
Mrs Anna Walters [4777]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs B Stanley [4785]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Beverley Willacy [4442]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs C Cavigan [4810]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs C A Bennett [4766]			Q23	Understand the need for more housing, the required infrastructure to support this must be paramount in the planning. Need to meet local requirements should take priority over Birmingham overspill.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs C A Preece [4744]			Q23	Why was the land on the old CEGB site wasn't utilised for affordable and rental homes instead of elderly property, and a petrol station? Would be better use of non Green Belt land.
Mrs Catherine Kent [3473]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Debra Wood [3856]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Mrs DENISE HACKWORTH [2903]			Q23	Firstly can I please say how difficult the process of forwarding a response on the above plan has proved to be. I am certain that most people will have given up trying to use the online portal and the complexity of all the items which have been included in the draft, far too many items for us all to digest and give appropriate responses to.
Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]			Q23	I have attempted to respond to Solihull Council's draft housing plan using the online portal this afternoon. However, I have found the website to be very confusing and circular in nature. I could not access the online form for responses, despite clicking on hyperlinks for 'direct access to the online form'. As a result, I am emailing the key points that I wish to make instead. However, I would be grateful if the Council would review the approach that it takes to consultations in the future and consider the accessibility and clarity of its webpages.
Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [3326]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]			Q23	Over the next 10+ years there will be enormous upheaval in the Borough caused by the building of HS2. It is unreasonable to ask the residents of Balsall Common/Berkswell to endure the additional disruption from building 1150 houses and associated services. Whatever Local Plan and NDP are finally agreed for housing development it should not be started until HS2 is completed and its effects fully evaluated. There should be no release of Green Belt land in this area until then

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Gillian Dale [3490]			Q23	<p>The White Paper on Housing being released tomorrow categorically states Green Belt should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. Where is the honest evidence for this in the Development Plan for Balsall Common? Why are brown field sites not being built on? When can I expect a response to my query?</p> <p>Why make leaving comments so complicated? I believe its to put people off.</p> <p>Gillian Dale</p>
Mrs Gillian Tonkys [4787]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs H Brookes [4795]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]			Q23	I have tried to voice my objections via the online portal but I have found this to be very difficult, hence this email I will detail my objections. Additionally, my house backs on to the site known as Site 13 (back of Langcomb Road and the Baxters estate). I understand that I have the right to formally respond, but the documents sent to me prior to Christmas was so poorly written that it has been thrown away as it was seen as having no importance.
Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs J Carpenter [4796]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs J E Smith [4781]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs J Vernon [4797]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Jane Starling [3207]			Q23	With regards to the Arden Triangle site, I accept that if we must have more houses, then by all means include a new school or two as part of the deal, as this will benefit so many more people than the Football Club proposal. Please only grant permission for as few new houses as would be needed to fund the new school and ensure that as little new greenbelt as possible is taken

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Jean Walters [2569]			Q23	Site 4 conflicts with the original masterplan and vision for Dickens Heath village. Should be a specific policy to protect character and setting of Dickens Heath village, and limit further expansions.
Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]			Q23	Object to description of Hockley Heath in the borough portrait as unflattering and inaccurate, as there is only 1 school, and does little to highlight role as an important stepping stone between town and country and as a gateway into Solihull. Green belt or rural exception sites should only be included in proposed final phases of plan period to afford them maximum protection.
Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]			Q23	When designing the infrastructure plan, it should be acknowledged that Balsall Common will already be extensively impacted by HS2 construction works in the period 2018 to 2026. This needs to be considered when designing infrastructure plans and phasing of development build. As a minimum there should be no commencement of any development work on Site 1 until such time as the HS2 works are completed.
Mrs K Drakes [4793]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]			Q23	I moved to B90 to a semi rural location to enhance my healthy lifestyle. I walk and cycle locally enjoying the benefits of open spaces. Unfortunately, your draft plans show a very unequal development in Solihull further developing the urban area of Shirley. I know part of your plan is for accessibility to transport and community provision but taking away, health, safety, well being and increasing pollution and congestion in one area does not seem fair. solihull has a lot of rural land. Please consider sharing the developments equally throughout the borough.
Mrs L Keene [4800]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Lorraine Horlor [3498]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Louisa Jakeman [2552]			Q23	It feels to me that SMBC is scared of another judicial challenge of housing numbers and has used that as a tail to wag the dog. The Spatial Strategy foresees most of the economic development taking place in Solihull town centre, Lode Lane / Elmdon, the HS2 interchange and the Airport / NEC area. However, much of the new housing allocation sites are in the villages of the south of Solihull in places that score badly for accessibility, sustainability and effect on environment and living conditions.
Mrs Louise Kindon [3630]			Q23	I have found your website relating to the consultation documentation extremely difficult to navigate. Some of the links do not seem to work. One has to wonder if this is to make it as difficult as possible for people to comment on the proposals. I do hope not!
Mrs M Edmonds [4804]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q23	There is a very strong perception in the Balsall Common area that Solihull MBC have abandoned the Greenbelt and consciously discarded their own policies and values and have consequently lost what trust they had as a result.
Mrs Melanie MacSkimming [3782]			Q23	It also appears from the draft local development plan consultation information booklet that land belonging to Lynda Beasley (Wyer) and Michael Cooper has been included in the proposed Barratt's Farm development. We assume this error will be rectified. In the event this development does proceed we would expect a barrier to be put in place to protect livestock on the above mentioned fields.
Mrs N Walton [4818]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs P Green [4790]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs P Phillips [4799]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Pam Marsden [4802]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs Pamela Forrest [3618]			Q23	Online portal too difficult to use.
Mrs Pamela Frost [4807]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Mrs Rita Perks [4805]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Mrs S Larkin [4948]			Q23	Pleased to see a focus on reducing inequalities and considerations around climate change.
Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and quality of life and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]			Q23	<p>Flaws in the evidence base. SHELAA sites are scored incorrectly and some information is inaccurate.</p> <p>Accessibility report. Balsall Common and sites 2 and 3 are given an inaccurate accessibility assessment.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal - Assessment of Balsall Common sites and alternative sites are inaccurate.</p> <p>Green Belt Assessment - Issues taken with scoring of refined parcels. Some proposed allocations are considered to have comparable scores or perform better in Green Belt terms than some suggested alternative site allocations.</p> <p>Development of Balsall Common sites will occur at the same time as HS2 and Riddings Hill, putting additional strain and disruption on the settlement.</p>
Ms Ellen Darlison [3307]			Q23	I have just spent over an hour registering and endeavouring to fill out the incredibly cumbersome online form for the above only to find that next to none of it has saved. So, whilst I wanted to respond in the way suggested I am having to redo it via email. I did hear complaints about the form from others but thought it was due to their technical limitations - I realise now its due to SBCs limitations!
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Ms Linda Fenn [3135]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Myran Larkin [4296]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nadia McGarry [4240]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
National Exhibition Centre (Mr P Thandi) [2402]			Q23	see comments in letter about need for DLP to include reference to potential re-location of Airport passenger handling terminal/facilities
National Grid [369]	Robert Deanwood	Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK (Robert Deanwood) [4663]	Q23	We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation
Neil Jackson Baker [4668]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Neil Sears [3923]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Nick Larkin [3514]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q23	<p>Interim Sustainability Appraisal is difficult to follow but the NF would make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not clear why the finding from the first ISA in relation to negative impacts of car borne travel become plusses in the preferred option in ISA2. - site allocations do not appear to perform well against Objectives 9,10,11, 12, and 13. - unclear why some parcels have been assessed and other not. several independent parcels have been assessed together which distorts the results. - Scenario B, ISA2 assesses impacts on communities as all broadly positive. It is not clear how this can be concluded

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q23	- strong adverse reactions to recent developments in respect of housing layout, density and lack of parking. - Opportunities for smaller house builders should be considered as they may offer alternative designs and layouts
Nick & Lynne Harris [4321]			Q23	- Lack of meaningful engagement with the NF. For example, there seems to have been little involvement in any of the studies or workshops associated with the Council's evidence base. - The NF has put in a lot of time and effort into trying to understand
Nikki Burns [4068]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Norman McKeown [4113]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	In relation to ShELAA Site 1013: Misleading assessment of site in SHELAA report; Inaccurate accessibility mapping scores; Agree with low Green Belt score of 4 out of 12; Landscape Character Assessment is too broad; Misleading interim sustainability assessment.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>DLP fails to meet NPPF requirements for Duty-to-Cooperate:</p> <p>Much of necessary evidence has not been completed (contrary to Para. 182).</p> <p>None of evidence available at Cabinet meeting when Members supported consultation.</p> <p>Evidence includes numerous inaccuracies.</p> <p>Evidence difficult to interpret as different numbering systems and boundaries.</p> <p>Official evidence published after 5th December on website.</p> <p>Calls into question how robust site choices were made.</p> <p>Representors unable to make fully informed comments.</p> <p>SHELAA Site 1013 omitted from Interim SA.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Lack of options to give local communities involvement and choice when considering potential housing sites, contrary to NPPF and neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Proposed strategy will result in over-dependence on large housebuilders.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Topic Papers - Brief overview of officer views on where it is appropriate to direct development does not make detailed reference to evidence material and it does not provide information specific to sites selected for allocation compared to those site areas rejected.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Many of rejected sites from SHELAA:</p> <p>Do not have existing viable community or recreational facilities,</p> <p>Moderate to low value to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt,</p> <p>Relatively sustainable,</p> <p>Less landscape impact,</p> <p>Partly brownfield/previously developed land,</p> <p>Perform better when judged against Council's guiding principles (p.35 of DLP).</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Proportionate evidence not been provided in support of Council's proposed housing allocations or to justify the rejection of other sites which perform equally well.</p> <p>Much of the submitted evidence is subject to challenge due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes made during site assessments.</p>
P Benton & T Neary [4506]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>Accessibility Study Mapping -</p> <p>Should be corrected to include an assessment of sites 153 & 154, forming part of proposed Site 9, currently omitted from the appraisal.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd (Mr N P Barlow) [2299]			Q23	<p>Potential expansion of Birmingham Airport to east of A452:</p> <p>Would prefer a second runway to utilise Site 20.</p> <p>Expansion to East would further jeopardise the Green Belt, the River Blythe SSSI and ornithological flyway, Packington Hall (Grade II* listed) and the listed Capability Brown Park, along with having to move circa 30 million tonnes of domestic waste at Packington Landfill.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>No national policy supporting a second runway</p> <p>No prepared economic business or environmental case in public domain</p> <p>No coherent plan for removal of 30M tonnes of waste</p> <p>Removal of 1000s of trees</p> <p>Increased noise impacts</p> <p>Water management in area.</p>
Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsey [4654]			Q23	Disagree with the findings of the Green Belt Assessment for Knowle.
Paul Deane [3120]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Paula Thomas [4556]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Peter Bray [4040]			Q23	<p>The comments above are my comments alone but I support 100% the response submission from Berkswell Parish Council. I believe their recommendations are genuine and to the point from people who know the area better than remote consultants. They listen to the community.</p> <p>My major recommendation to SMBC is to read their submission in full and implement their recommendations especially their recommendations on site locations.</p> <p>It is not too late to make amends and improve SMBC's standing in the community.</p>
Peter Butler [4234]			Q23	lease should revert back to the council as the current owners are not abiding by the conditions of the agreement
Peter Lowe [4776]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Phil Chessell [4287]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Philip Colclough [3572]			Q23	<p>- entirely inappropriate to use parish (council) boundaries as arbitrary measures for building proposals</p> <p>- Why has there been no development in or directly adjacent to Berkswell village in over 30 years?</p> <p>-This is nothing more than SMBC expediency which</p>
Philip Wood [4552]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Philippa Lowe [4778]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Raymond Evason [4229]			Q23	can you tell me how much green belt land will be lost?,and can I ask the councillors of dickens heath,majors green,wythall,and Bromsgrove,as well as Solihull, to try aggressively to reduce the amount of houses and the impact this will have on the area,many thanks
Rebecca Clare [3956]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Rentplus [3150]	Meghan Rossiter	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Q23	consultation response and Affordable Housing Statement
Richard Coles [3499]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]			Q23	There should be a detailed Balsall Common village centre study in conjunction with the neighbourhood plan to identify space that might help to ease both present and future congestion issues even with a bypass built. The employment evidence base fails to recognise that small yards and storage/workshop sheds are needed by so many businesses.
Richard Evans [2640]			Q23	23-I refer to my previous comments about the purpose of greenbelt and attach a document which I think is self explanatory. (Green Belt and its purpose)
Richard Onions [4280]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and quality of life and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Ron Edwards [4237]			Q23	I would like to know if Solihull Council still intend to honour their agreement in 2013 to uphold the covenant that the grounds should only be used for sport and they would not sell the freehold.
Ruth & Jonathan Noone [4756]			Q23	Call for Sites approach seems opportunistic. Would expect Council to already have specific 'what if and their consequences' plans. Need a full evidence base approach to plan-making. Concern about development 'trade-offs'. What is the relevant legal due process and remedy if the new Plan or parts of it are rejected again?
Sally Anne Coles [3500]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sarah Ravenscroft [4478]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.
Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	Mr Miles Drew	GVA (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	Q23	<p>GVA - OAN for Solihull on behalf of Schools of King Edward VI</p> <p>Broadly agree with following in SHMA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 2014 household projections are demographic starting point. * 10% market uplift * Vacancy Rate (2.3%) * 62dpa for 2011-2014 shortfall <p>Disagree with SHMA and recommend following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Experian model too constrained. Cambridge Econometrics unconstrained model preferred. Additional economic needs uplift required. * HMA contribution should be based on % HMA employment growth or commuting links with Birmingham. * Housing requirement range from 914 to 1317dpa.
Sean Whitcroft [4091]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Severn Trent Water Limited [502]	Alban Henderson	GL Hearn (Alban Henderson) [4649]	Q23	For SHELAA site 168, the site plans at Appendix 10 of the SHELAA inaccurately suggest the BVP site and the site do not share a common boundary.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Sharon & Thomas Seery [4648]			Q23	We look forward to hearing from you in the near future to confirm receipt of our email and how Solihull Metropolitan Council will proceed to meet the needs of families with school age children in our parish.
SILHILL FOOTBALL CLUB (MR PHIL HAYNES) [3612]			Q23	I have tried and failed to access the online response facility for responses to the Draft local Plan despite having registered for the purpose.
Simon Taylor [4550]			Q23	<p>Summary of comments and point I would emphasise the most, is that the current proposed Draft Local Plan is imbalanced with an uneven distribution of new homes proposed for the Dickens Heath/South Shirley area, yet with no new homes proposed for Dorridge or East of Solihull in the M42 corridor.</p> <p>This imbalance appears unacceptable, and a fair Draft Local Plan would be one which allocated new housing sites broadly equally amongst the different regions/villages.</p>
Simon Clare [3953]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Solihull Mind (Mr Nicholas Woodman) [3502]			Q23	<p>We have attached 4 documents to support our submission; 1. Overview of the service and issues.</p> <p>2. Photographs showing the changes to the site - from an overgrown and derelict field to the current infrastructure and growing, conservation, leisure and sports activities that now make up the service - which we have achieved over the past 20 years.</p> <p>3. Change.org petition signatures and comments.</p> <p>4. A brief overview of the type of views expressed in response to the petition by service users, family and friends, mental health professionals and local people.</p> <p>We hope these will demonstrate the value of our current service.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q23	<p>Green Belt around Sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 is too narrow and vulnerable to coalescence between settlements.</p> <p>Require more qualitative assessment of Green Belt.</p> <p>Refer to statements on Green Belt in Housing White Paper consultation.</p> <p>Necessary technical assessments, especially for connectivity and facilities are not currently available. These are needed to comment on the infrastructure requirements to ensure the proposed sites are deliverable and will not cause undue harm.</p>
Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]			Q23	<p>Green Belt around Sites 4, 11, 12 and 13 is too narrow and vulnerable to coalescence between settlements.</p> <p>Require more qualitative assessment of Green Belt.</p> <p>Refer to statements on Green Belt in Housing White Paper consultation.</p> <p>Necessary technical assessments, especially for connectivity and facilities are not currently available. These are needed to comment on the infrastructure requirements to ensure the proposed sites are deliverable and will not cause undue harm.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>SHELAA Employment Site 80, Land at Wyckhams Close.</p> <p>SHELAA identifies that 47% of site is impacted by overhead buffer. Indicative Masterplan submitted for St Francis Group excludes overhead buffer and HS2 safeguarded land.</p> <p>Several discrepancies between SHELAA Site 80 and Allocation 19 in SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal. E.g. SHELAA Site 80 entirely in Flood Zone 1 and has no biodiversity or heritage concerns.</p> <p>Allocation 19 has only been assessed as housing and not an employment site in SHELAA. Inaccuracies in measuring amount of Grade 1-3b land. Impact of Allocation 19 on SSSIs in vicinity has not been assessed.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Review of SHELAA</p> <p>SHELAA has a number of flaws, including:</p> <p>Local planning policy is irrelevant to SHELAA as plan being reviewed.</p> <p>751dpa figure is less than in the DLP.</p> <p>Council should do more than just Call for Sites.</p> <p>Absolute constraints inappropriate.</p> <p>Scoring system for housing too generalised.</p> <p>Concern with suitability criteria, e.g. suitability of location is predetermining the plan.</p> <p>Availability scoring too conservative.</p> <p>Number of anomalies in the assessments, e.g. LWS</p> <p>Densities and build out rates too optimistic.</p> <p>Windfall allowance too generous.</p> <p>SHELAA provide evidence that sufficient available land in Solihull to meet significant housing needs.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson- Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson- Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Review of SHMA:</p> <p>OAN for wider HMA should be calculated.</p> <p>Ideally should split Birmingham overspill proportionally between neighbours.</p> <p>Future projections and migration patterns should not be based on recession.</p> <p>Should apply 3% vacancy rate.</p> <p>Should frontload any 2011-2014 shortfall.</p> <p>Should deliver more housing South of A45 as locus of market pressure.</p> <p>Should not confuse market signal uplift with HMA shortfall.</p> <p>Data used in Experian model is out-of-date and outputs too pessimistic in projecting job numbers.</p> <p>Solihull will continue to have overheated housing market if insufficient housing allocated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Review of unmet housing need in HMA and Duty to Co-operate:</p> <p>Birmingham shortfall of 37,900 dwellings.</p> <p>Policy TP48 in Birmingham Development Plan places responsibility on Birmingham to ensure unmet housing needs arising in the City are met by other LPAs in the HMA.</p> <p>Test of effectiveness of Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>GBHMA Strategic Growth Study to be commissioned.</p> <p>Democratic deficit in process of how Study's findings will be published, considered and included in Local Plans.</p> <p>Council need to be clear about weight of Study in progressing Local Plan.</p> <p>Lack of credible evidence to support 2,000 contribution.</p> <p>OAN is underestimated.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
St Francis Group [554]	Michelle Simpson-Gallego	Pegasus Group (Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [2508]	Q23	<p>Pegasus Chelmer Model for Solihull.</p> <p>Inputs in model include:</p> <p>Household formation rates used in the DCLG 2014-based household projections.</p> <p>Labour market activity rates</p> <p>Unemployment rates from Annual population survey</p> <p>Adjustments to above for Solihull</p> <p>3% vacancy rates</p> <p>Scenario 1 is just the demographic projection and is similar to PBA SHMA.</p> <p>Scenarios 2 and 2a include Cambridge Econometrics future workplace projections. Markedly different results from Experian model and Scenarios 2 and 2a increase households by ca. 12k and 8K respectively.</p> <p>Policy off, therefore does not include 2011-2014 shortfall, any other uplifts or HMA contribution.</p>
Stan Lewis [3879]			Q23	<p>In the Draft Local Plan Timetable document, (http://www.cgra.org.uk/documents/draft_local_plan_timetable.pdf), the statement is made that 'Sports Ground is currently unused'; this statement is misleading as there are many amateur and local sports clubs and persons who would wish to utilise the land for sporting purposes but are prevented from doing so even though the land is designated for sports use only.</p>
Stephen Joyce [4242]			Q23	<p>The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Stoford Properties [4587]	Mark Sitch	Barton Willmore (Mark Sitch) [3902]	Q23	<p>Employment Land Review:</p> <p>Should have assessed Birmingham's demand, supply and suitability of locations to meet the demand for employment land.</p> <p>Consequently we feel that the ELR has underestimated the need for employment land on both a local and wider West Midlands context.</p>
Stratford on Avon District Council (John Careford) [4666]			Q23	<p>Appendix E: Draft Green Infrastructure Opportunities Map</p> <p>SDC notes the identification of Earlswood Living Landscape and supports the principle of enhancing the biodiversity of this area. However, SDC would reiterate the previous concerns of local residents about how any such improvements were implemented.</p>
Sue Dilworth [3373]			Q23	<p>The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q23	<p>Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>JAM Consult Ltd have reviewed the Council's Sustainability Appraisal, and find it flawed in a number of ways:</p> <p>Gaps and out of date information in baseline data, including GBA and SHMA.</p> <p>SA Framework flawed, objectives unclear.</p> <p>Compatibility assessment not been carried out.</p> <p>SA methodology not explained in terms of PPG definitions.</p> <p>Separate Site Assessment methodology is not explained.</p> <p>Fails to consider reasonable alternatives that could deliver the necessary levels of development.</p> <p>SA and Site Assessment Methodology need to be reviewed urgently.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q23	<p>Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>LDA Design undertaken review of Atkins (2016) Green Belt Assessment technical paper).</p> <p>Find it flawed in relation to proposed site for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purposes 4 and 5 of Green Belt are not applicable - Purpose 1: Tidbury Green is ribbon development and not a built up area. - Purpose 2: Green corridor along River Cole could prevent Tidbury Green merging with Wythall. Terry's Green already separated by Clowes Wood and Earlswood Lakes. - Purpose 3: Character of site is strongly enclosed by hedgerows and trees.
SUMMIX (FHS) DEVELOPMENTS LTD [4455]	Mitchell Barnes	Framptons Planning (Mitchell Barnes) [4454]	Q23	<p>General comments:</p> <p>Does not provide evidence on how DLP will achieve sustainable development.</p> <p>Housing sites are driven by political acceptability rather than any objective assessment of the situation.</p>
Susan Lo [4208]			Q23	support the recommendations from BARRAGE
Taylor Wimpey [579]	Ms Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q23	<p>Generally supportive of DLP as it currently stands with some minor suggestions put forward.</p> <p>Wholly supportive of Site 9 and are committed to bringing this site forward at the earliest opportunity, following adoption of the Local Plan, should this be found sound.</p> <p>Agree with evidence that justifies release of this site from the Green Belt.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Terry Corns [4446]			Q23	<p>Interim Sustainability Appraisal is difficult to follow but the NF would make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not clear why the finding from the first ISA in relation to negative impacts of car borne travel become plusses in the preferred option in ISA2. - site allocations do not appear to perform well against Objectives 9,10,11, 12, and 13. - unclear why some parcels have been assessed and other not. several independent parcels have been assessed together which distorts the results. - Scenario B, ISA2 assesses impacts on communities as all broadly positive. It is not clear how this can be concluded.
Terry Corns [4446]			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strong adverse reactions to recent developments in respect of housing layout, density and lack of parking. - Opportunities for smaller house builders should be considered as they may offer alternative designs and layouts.
Terry Corns [4446]			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of meaningful engagement with the NF. <p>For example, there seems to have been little involvement in any of the studies or workshops associated with the Council's evidence base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The NF has put in a lot of time and effort into trying to understand

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>In relation to SHELAA Sites 16 and 17:</p> <p>Support SHELAA report ranking of Category 1 for both of the sites, and comment that sites could be appropriate for residential use and make an appropriate extension to the existing settlement;</p> <p>Accessibility mapping scores could be improved if sites merged with proposed allocation 16;</p> <p>Support GBA score.</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment is more favourable than some of proposed housing allocations.</p> <p>Not included in interim sustainability assessment.</p> <p>Site should be included in SA.</p>
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>DLP fails to meet NPPF requirements for Duty-to-Cooperate:</p> <p>Much of necessary evidence has not been completed (contrary to Para. 182).</p> <p>None of evidence available at Cabinet meeting when Members supported consultation.</p> <p>Evidence includes numerous inaccuracies.</p> <p>Evidence difficult to interpret as different numbering systems and boundaries.</p> <p>Official evidence published after 5th December on website.</p> <p>Calls into question how robust site choices were made.</p> <p>Representors unable to make fully informed comments.</p> <p>SHELAA Sites 16 and 17 omitted from Interim SA.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Lack of options to give local communities involvement and choice when considering potential housing sites, contrary to NPPF and neighbourhood planning. Proposed strategy will result in over-dependence on large housebuilders.
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Proportionate evidence not been provided in support of Council's proposed housing allocations or to justify the rejection of other sites which perform equally well. Much of the submitted evidence is subject to challenge due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes made during site assessments.
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Accessibility Mapping: Should be corrected to include an assessment of sites 153 & 154, forming part of proposed Site 9, currently omitted from the appraisal.
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Many of rejected sites from SHELAA: Do not have existing viable community or recreational facilities, Moderate to low value to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, Relatively sustainable, Less landscape impact, Partly brownfield/previously developed land, Perform better when judged against Council's guiding principles (p.35 of DLP).
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Site Selection Topic Papers- Brief overview of officer views on where it is appropriate to direct development does not make detailed reference to evidence material and it does not provide information specific to sites selected for allocation compared to those site areas rejected.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
The Client [4521]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>SHELAA - evidence on SHELAA Ref. 1009 is misleading as potential LWS was rejected in 2002.</p> <p>Ecology Study - Recommends resurvey to LWS standard, however, Solihull not yet commissioned such surveys in this year. Therefore priority sites have not yet been identified.</p>
The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]			Q23	<p>For the DLP to be found sound, it is recommended that the Council reconsiders the following matters:</p> <p>The assessment of OAHN within the context of the Greater Birmingham HMA;</p> <p>The assessment of Housing land supply against a higher housing requirement;</p> <p>The justification and viability testing of the proposed increase to 50% affordable housing provision;</p> <p>Excessiveness of requirements proposed in Policies P7, P11 and P15.</p>
The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]			Q23	<p>Support the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Forum response.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>In relation to SHELAA Site 209:</p> <p>Misleading assessment of site in SHELAA report with regard to availability, achievability and suitability;</p> <p>Site performs less well in terms of combined Green Belt score with 4 out of 12.</p> <p>LCA covers too broad an area.</p> <p>Inaccurate accessibility mapping scores;</p> <p>Misleading interim sustainability assessment.</p>
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	<p>DLP fails to meet NPPF requirements for Duty-to-Cooperate:</p> <p>Much of necessary evidence has not been completed (contrary to Para. 182).</p> <p>None of evidence available at Cabinet meeting when Members supported consultation.</p> <p>Evidence includes numerous inaccuracies.</p> <p>Evidence difficult to interpret as different numbering systems and boundaries.</p> <p>Official evidence published after 5th December on website.</p> <p>Calls into question how robust site choices were made.</p> <p>Representors unable to make fully informed comments.</p> <p>Interim SA looks at larger area and not SHELAA Site 209 in particular.</p>

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Lack of options to give local communities involvement and choice when considering potential housing sites, contrary to NPPF and neighbourhood planning. Proposed strategy will result in over-dependence on large housebuilders.
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Proportionate evidence not been provided in support of Council's proposed housing allocations or to justify the rejection of other sites which perform equally well. Much of the submitted evidence is subject to challenge due to omission of sites within reports and mistakes made during site assessments.
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Many of rejected sites from SHELAA: Do not have existing viable community or recreational facilities, Moderate to low value to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, Relatively sustainable, Less landscape impact, Partly brownfield/previously developed land, Perform better when judged against Council's guiding principles (p.35 of DLP).
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Accessibility Mapping should be corrected to include an assessment of sites 153 & 154, forming part of proposed Site 9, currently omitted from the appraisal.
Tidbury Green Golf Club [4509]	Laura Pohl	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Laura Pohl) [3934]	Q23	Site Selection Topic Papers: Brief overview of officer views on where it is appropriate to direct development does not make detailed reference to evidence material and it does not provide information specific to sites selected for allocation compared to those site areas rejected.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss C Kirby) [2531]			Q23	see comments in letters
Tracy Jolly [4770]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Undisclosed Client [4645]	Paul Rouse	Savills (Paul Rouse) [4647]	Q23	Criticisms of the Employment Land Study. It does not correlate with regionally based economic studies and strategic plans. Its conclusions on land supply are damning, and on employment need it woefully misses the point, paying no regard to the principal objectives of the SEPs and HS2 Growth Strategy. It is entirely unclear how the ELR has been utilised by the Council in the preparation of the Draft Local Plan Review as there appears to be little correlation between the two.
Valerie Bennett [4600]			Q23	I would like to think that the proposal is to leave enough space between Woodloes Rd and the new houses, so that we don't feel on top of each other and that we will not be staring at a brick wall of flats or similar tall buildings. I hope the plan involves some greenery in the form of hedges bordering the proposed estate, similar to that on Monkspath estate.
West Midlands HARP Consortium [3204]	Meghan Rossiter	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Q23	Welcome SHMA. Welcome non-inclusion of private rented sector in affordable housing need. Concerned that income to be spent on rent is set at 35%. Should be 25%, or 386 dwellings per year.
William B Gibbs [4369]			Q23	The phasing of any development in Balsall Common must recognise the impact and disruption of HS2.
Wythall Parish Council (Miss Kerie Harris) [1943]			Q23	Need to ensure cooperation with Bromsgrove District Council and Worcestershire County Council with regard to cross boundary impacts from proposed developments.
Yasmine Griffin [3739]			Q23	The thoughts and opinions of Solihull residents are not being heard and respected and the needs of Balsall Common are not being addressed.

Name	Agent Details		Question	Representation Summary
Zoe Speed [4472]			Q23	The phasing of all allocations in Balsall Common at the same time as HS2 will place intolerable strain on settlement and must recognise impact and disruption from HS2.