

**BALSALL PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Summary of representations received at Regulation 16 stage (Submission)**

In accordance with Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendum) Regulations 2012 (as amended), the following table comprises a summary of the representations received to the Submission Draft Balsall Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

All of the representations summarised below will be considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and making recommendations on the Balsall Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

<b>Representations received to the submission consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner</b>		
<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Support/ Object/ Comment</b>	<b>Summary of Representation</b>
A Hall	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
A McLaughlin, Environment Agency	Comment	<p><b>General</b> River Blythe &amp; Blythe tributary should be shown within the NDP as there may be opportunities to protect and enhance all watercourse corridors.</p> <p><b>Policy H3 Use of Brownfield Land in the Green Belt</b> Notes that paragraph 6.1.17 supports opportunities to redevelop/remediate brownfield land. Any sites that may have been subject to contamination of soils/groundwater should be supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment to demonstrate that any contamination can be safely managed, and take account of the Agency’s Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice.</p> <p><b>Policy BE10 Flooding &amp; Surface Water Drainage</b> Support policy, which could be strengthened by seeking to ensure that all new development is in Flood Zone 1, with other areas only considered using Sequential Test approach, and takes account of the impacts of climate change. Any new development should be set back 8 metres from watercourses.</p> <p><b>Policies NE1 Green Infrastructure and NE2 Blue Infrastructure</b></p>

		Support policies and welcome recognition of importance of green/blue infrastructure.
Berkswell Parish Council	Support / Objection	<p><b>General</b> Welcomes NDP and supports in general, other than for two areas.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Object to the statement in paragraph 1.5 about joint NDP work by a group of residents as it is factually incorrect, as the steering committee was an advisory committee of both Parish Councils, which should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA2 Village Centre Road Safety &amp; Parking Improvements</b> Object to proposals, which should be deleted from NDP, as part of the Balsall Common centre and land subject to the proposals is within Berkswell Parish, the proposals are likely to cause damage to businesses within Berkswell Parish and difficulties with road layouts at the junctions of Green Lane and Meeting House Lane with Station Road, in Berkswell Parish. Berkswell Parish Council was not consulted. The statement in the summary of consultation responses about membership of Berkswell Parish Council is false, as there was no appointed representative on the village centre working group.</p>
C Langton	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
C Townend, Highways England	Support	<p><b>General</b> Supportive of the commitment to sustainable development principles in the NDP. Confirm that the NDP does not raise any matters of particular concern in relation to the safe operation and functionality of the Strategic Road Network.</p>
C Brittain	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>

Councillor K Allsopp	Support	<b>General</b> Support the objectives of the NDP.
Councillor T Dicicco	Support	<b>General</b> Support the objectives of the NDP to protect local character through thoughtful, well-planned and appropriate housing development, particularly defensible boundaries, appropriate housing, more walking and cycling infrastructure, more renewable energy provision, enhancement of green infrastructure, village centre proposals and phased development of High Speed 2 and major housing.
Coal Authority	No Comment	
C Taylor	Comment	<b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected. <b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.
D Ellis	Comment / Support	<b>Vision and Aspirations</b> Do not agree with proposal in paragraph 5.12 for shared space in the village centre, parking could be resolved by a multi-storey car park on the library car park. Welcome proposal in paragraph 5.16 for bypass, justified by growth in traffic beyond pre-motorway levels. <b>Policy H8 Walking &amp; Cycling Infrastructure in Housing &amp; Commercial Developments</b> Reservations about cycle lanes on A452 unless bypass is in place, given traffic levels. <b>Policies BE2 Replacement Dwellings &amp; BE9 Local Parking Standards</b> Fully support intentions. <b>Community Aspiration CA6 Improved Public Transport</b> Welcome, as village poorly served by local transport in evenings and at weekends.
D Barnes, Richborough Estates	Comment	<b>General</b> More clarity on terminology such as major development required. <b>Community Aspiration CA1 New Homes</b> Should be deleted as no specific evidence produced to support claim and would prevent delivery of much needed new homes until later in Plan period. Counter view that would lead to considerably longer period of delivery traffic. A Construction & Environmental Management Plan can be agreed between LPA and developer to address concerns.

	<p><b>Policy H6 Housing Mix</b>  Welcome flexibility within policy which should allow for appropriate responses to site circumstances, although prescriptive requirement for bungalows should be aspiration not policy, as there may not be market demand.</p> <p><b>Policy H8 Walking &amp; Cycling Infrastructure in Housing &amp; Commercial Developments</b>  Support encouragement for walking and cycling, but design of infrastructure will need to reflect appropriate standards, and inappropriate to incorporate different standards/requirements. Focus should be on improving existing routes rather than new routes outside development sites, and requires clarity in drafting.</p> <p><b>Policies BE3 Design &amp; BE4 Responding to Local Character</b>  Policies should recognise need on larger housing schemes to deliver high quality with own character that fits into surroundings, reflecting housing mix requirements and density, rather than perpetuating existing character that might be inappropriate.</p> <p><b>Policy BE5 Design Review Panels</b>  Threshold for use of Panels should be much higher, circa 150 dwellings/5 hectares in line with NPPF requirement that should be for significant projects.</p> <p><b>Policy BE6 Heritage Assets</b>  Largely unnecessary as duplicates national and local policy, should focus on Temple Balsall heritage asset and reflect paragraphs 196/197 of NPPF.</p> <p><b>Policy BE7 Renewable Energy</b>  Welcome comments on high energy efficient buildings, as PV panels not always aesthetically pleasing.</p> <p><b>Policy BE8 Highway Safety</b>  Should echo paragraph 108 on NPPF which refers to significant impacts on transport network and ability to mitigate to an acceptable degree.</p> <p><b>Policy BE9 Local Parking Standards</b>  No evidence to review to determine robustness of survey, and unclear how other evidence identified in NPPF have been considered, so should be deleted. Standard is excessive and will be profligate use of land and hard surfacing of curtilages.  Wording on provision of electric charging points should recognise need for flexibility for communal parking for some flatted developments.</p> <p><b>Policy ECON1 Superfast Broadband</b>  Changes in delivery over Plan period likely so flexibility in policy required.</p> <p><b>Policy ECON2 Home Working</b>  Welcome encouragement for home working rather than requirement.</p> <p><b>Policy COM4 Encouraging Walking and Cycling</b></p>
--	---

		<p>Second sentence of paragraph 2 should be deleted as currently unclear as basis for resisting proposals, and policy redrafted to require use of reasonable measures to promote walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure</b> Quantum and types of trees should be matter for landscaping scheme rather than arbitrary requirement related to parking spaces or floorspace. Paragraph 2 needs redrafting to recognise requirements of British Standards.</p> <p><b>Policy NE5 Minimising Pollution</b> Unclear how unacceptable levels of pollution can be quantified and applied.</p>
D Bell	Support	<p><b>General</b> Plan seems to be a very extensive and comprehensive study reflecting the views of local residents with a view to preserving the pleasant qualities of the existing settlement. New development should reflect local character, provide adequate parking, avoid cramming, utilise brown or partly brown field land and not enlarge village in all directions. Areas south of Kelsey Lane and beyond Balsall Street East are too far from station/shops for housing.</p>
D Harvey	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
David Langton	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
Diane Langton	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new</p>

		<p>dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
Dr I & M Beasley	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b>  The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b>  There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
F Wheeler	Comment	<p><b>General</b>  Support policies that protect residents from change to character of area.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b>  Disingenuous to imply that Berkswell Parish Council unwilling to cooperate in a joint NDP, as it was Balsall Parish Council that withdrew support.</p> <p><b>Process Overview</b>  Paragraph 2.13 incorrect as Berkswell Parish Council not invited to participate in village centre working group.</p> <p><b>Balsall Parish Today</b>  The station only provides 2 trains per hour in each direction with a 20 and 40 minute gap, and the car parking facilities are inadequate, forcing commuters to park on local roads.</p> <p><b>Vision &amp; Aspirations and Built Environment Strategic Objective</b>  Traffic surveys and predictions required before consideration of a bypass, and if necessary, it should be on western side of Balsall Common to avoid worsening congestion around the station.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA2 Village Centre Road Safety &amp; Parking Improvements</b>  Agree principle, but needs rethink, as illustrative plans not feasible unless all traffic removed from village centre, and pedestrians could be at risk. SMBC should take lead on this with input from both Parish Councils.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA3 Village Bypass</b>  Traffic surveys and predictions required before consideration of a bypass, and if necessary, it should be on western side of Balsall Common to avoid worsening congestion around the station.</p>
G Wheeler	Comment	<p><b>General</b>  Support all policies which are typical of NDPs and appear uncontroversial.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA2 Village Centre Road Safety &amp; Parking Improvements</b></p>

		<p>Proposal is impractical, would not achieve its objectives and does not appear to be based on traffic/highway survey. Includes land within Berkswell Parish and has not been agreed or subject to input from Berkswell Parish Council. NDP cannot solve issue of growth impacts, SMBC must take lead on this with consideration of new centre.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA3 Village Bypass</b></p> <p>Do not accept that bypass required as no evidence provided. Possible eastern route suggested in Draft Local Plan which could release unacceptable amount of Green Belt. If necessary, a bypass on the western side of Balsall Common should be investigated. No mention of A46 Relief Road proposal, which would affect bypass, and no evidence HS2 has been consulted on or agreed.</p>
H Winkler, Tyler Parkes on behalf of the Chief Constable of WM Police	Comment	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>Welcome changes from previous iteration of NDP, particularly inclusion of need to promote safe communities in Vision and additional text in paragraph 6.2.18 to Policy BE3 Design.</p> <p><b>Policy BE6 Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>Wording of policy or supporting text should be amended to consider crime and safety issues, 'in appropriate circumstances, favourable consideration will be given to the use of approved 'alternative' materials to replace building materials and artefacts stolen from buildings of historic importance to reduce crime and fear of crime'.</p> <p><b>Policy COM3 Local Services</b></p> <p>Formally request that wording of policy/supporting text is strengthened to conform with NPPG and support infrastructure provision, as follows. 'The timely provision of infrastructure will be required to support new and existing development financed in part, or fully, by funds from CIL and/or S106 agreements. This would include contributions towards Police infrastructure necessary to maintain and improve safety and security to achieve sustainable development growth'. It is essential for maintenance of current service levels that maintaining and improving Police infrastructure is supported from these funding sources.</p>
H Blake	Comment	<p><b>Community Aspiration CA3 Village Bypass Road</b></p> <p>Balsall Common needs a by pass not half of one.</p> <p><b>Policy H7 General &amp; Specialist Accommodation</b></p> <p>There is also a demand for luxury apartments to entice elderly folk living in large houses to downsize. These should be centrally located and offer lift facility.</p>
J Langton	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b></p> <p>The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b></p> <p>There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and</p>

		Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.
J Cairns	Comment	<p><b>General</b> Broadly supportive, but too much emphasis on findings of household survey and significant repetition. More thought required on <b>mechanisms</b> to achieve policy objectives, whether they are realistic and achievable, key priorities and how to protect the green belt or mitigate its loss.</p> <p><b>Overview</b> Statement in paragraph 2.13 re village centre working group is misleading as it failed to involve Berkswell Parish Council.</p> <p><b>Balsall Parish Today</b> The paragraphs (3.22 to 3.24) on community facilities ignores organisations based in Berkswell Parish with members in Balsall Parish area as these are shared by the wider community. Whilst paragraph 3.25 rightly identifies Willow and Grange Parks, the other spaces are small with limited value and are not destinations in their own right.</p> <p><b>Character Appraisal</b> Kelsey Lane traffic lights are 3 way not 4 way as stated in paragraph 4.12.</p> <p><b>Vision &amp; Aspirations</b> Paragraph 5.3 should take a more critical approach to emerging Draft Local Plan housing proposals and recognise Balsall Common as a functioning community overlapping Parish boundaries. Fully agree that major shift in SMBC aspirations for Balsall Common centre as set out in paragraphs 5.12 to 5.14 required.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA2 Village Centre Road Safety &amp; Parking Improvements</b> Applaud principle, but shared space approach potentially dangerous with conflict of through traffic to station and beyond. Requires significant input from SMBC.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA3 Village Bypass</b> Lacks evidence on need for bypass and options for location, although Parish Council should have clear view and should be tested.</p> <p><b>Future Housing Development</b> The strategic objective indicates that Parish Council unwilling to challenge and comment on future Local Plan Review housing proposals.</p> <p><b>Policy H1 Built-up Area Boundary</b> The policy and paragraph 6.1.4 suggest that no housing incursions in the green belt are anticipated which appears to be inconsistent with the emerging Draft Local Plan proposals. Parish Council should set out strategy regarding</p>

		loss of green belt.
J Day, Tyler Parkes on behalf of the Landowners at Wootton Green Lane	Comment	<p><b>Future Housing Development</b> Welcome recognition of Trevallion Stud site as a proposed allocation in the emerging Draft Local Plan in paragraph 1.19, Strategic Objective 1 and paragraph 6.1.2, and agree approach omitting plans of some of the DLP Sites. Suggest that it is made clear that this will involve alteration to the green belt boundary.</p> <p><b>Policy H1 Built-up Area Boundary</b> Whilst the rewording from the previous iteration of the NDP has excluded reference to emerging housing proposals, the policy is not consistent with paragraphs 79, 145 or 146 of the NPPF in relation to development in the countryside/green belt and should be reworded accordingly.</p> <p><b>Policies H2 Infill within Built-up Area Boundary and H4 Use of Garden Land</b> Taken together these policies appear to restrict development within the built-up area to infill development, and criteria a) and b) of Policy H4 are unduly prescriptive and should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Policy H3 Use of Brownfield Land in the Green Belt</b> Should be reworded to exclude accessibility criterion, which is ambiguous, and focus on criteria in paragraph 145 of the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Policy H6 Housing Mix</b> Policy is too prescriptive and fails to take account of viability/land take issues associated with bungalows which are not exclusively occupied by older people downsizing. First sentence of second paragraph should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Policy BE2 Replacement Dwellings</b> Does not differentiate policy between dwellings inside or beyond the proposed built-up area boundary and overly prescriptive. Suggest delete first sentence and criteria a), c) and e).</p> <p><b>Policy BE5 Design Review Panels</b> Policy is too prescriptive and places unnecessary burdens on small and medium sized developments, so should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Policy NE5 Minimising Pollution</b> Welcome revision to wording from previous iteration of NDP, which avoids the potential for sterilising Trevallion Stud due to noise considerations.</p>
L Sawyer	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and</p>

		Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.
L Fenn	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p>
M Keeley	Comment	<p><b>General</b> There are significant errors relating to Meer End, Fen End and Temple Balsall. Oakley is part of Fen End not a separate entity (see references in paragraphs 1.14, 3.3, 4.13 to 4.15, 5.3, Community Aspiration CA6). Paragraphs 3.9, 4.13 and 6.2.1 contain references to many or a high proportion of farms, which is misleading as many are no longer working farms.</p> <p><b>Overview</b> This section references public engagement, which was lacking in rural areas.</p> <p><b>Balsall Parish Today</b> Section 3 on Employment omits the groups of businesses on Table Oak Lane, and paragraph 3.26 is misleading as Harry Williams is buried in Temple Balsall cemetery.</p> <p><b>Character Appraisal</b> Paragraph 4.13 indicates that Fen End is Zone P which is wrong as the centre of Fen End is at the crossroads of Fen End Road and Oldwich Lane East. There is an error in the Character Assessment Zone P Landmarks which should read Fen End Lodge, and in Zone R Landmarks which includes Balsall Cottage Farmhouse and Barn at Balsall Cottage Farm which do not exist.</p> <p><b>Policy BE6 Heritage Assets</b> The Temple Balsall Conservation Area Boundary map is out of date, as the Vicarage is now a Care Facility for the Elderly.</p> <p><b>Policies ECON2 Home Working and ECON3 Encouraging Local Business &amp; Employment</b> Neither policy nor supporting text includes reference to farming.</p>
M Tattum	Comment	<p><b>General</b> Support the policies and aspirations. Evidence based research is extensive and clearly referenced to policies and includes a household survey completed by nearly 40% of households in Balsall Parish and all households in the</p>

		<p>part of Balsall Common within Berkswell Parish.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA2 Village Centre Road Safety &amp; Parking Improvements</b></p> <p>This aspiration was amended to reference Berkswell Parish Council in response to its representation on the pre-submission draft NDP, but despite complying with the suggestion, Berkswell Parish Council is still asking for its deletion which is unreasonable. Concerned that there is a conflict of interest as the same Parish Councillors have a majority on both Parish Councils since the May 2019 elections.</p>
P Boland, Historic England	Support	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>Welcome accommodation of suggestions made in the pre-submission consultation on the NDP. Well informed by reference to the Warwickshire Historic Environment Record and extensive analysis of the historic landscape, including a bespoke Character Appraisal. The emphasis on conservation of local distinctiveness and protection of heritage assets is to be applauded.</p>
R Clare	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b></p> <p>The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b></p> <p>There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p> <p><b>Objection to Solihull Draft Local Plan Site 3 Windmill Lane Balsall Common</b></p> <p>Disappointed that views of large number of objectors overlooked and that instead of replacing site with suggested brownfield land, housing numbers have been increased, disregarding area and situation of village which is at capacity. Concerned about proximity of new housing to existing, need for buffer and protection of hedgerows and wildlife.</p>
S Heard	Support	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>Gives considered support to whole Plan.</p>
S Cooper	Comment	<p><b>General</b></p> <p>Concern about undemocratic nature of process, lack of formal resolutions at key stages and inadequacy of notice for consideration of draft Submission documents. Evidence often inaccurate and misleading, and no legal or professional advice made public. Parts of the NDP outside the scope of neighbourhood planning.</p>
S Clare	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b></p> <p>The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p>

		<p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p> <p><b>Objection to Solihull Draft Local Plan Site 3 Windmill Lane Balsall Common</b> Disappointed that views of large number of objectors overlooked and that instead of replacing site with suggested brownfield land, housing numbers have been increased, disregarding area and situation of village which is at capacity. Concerned about proximity of new housing to existing, need for buffer and protection of hedgerows and wildlife.</p>
<p>T Collard, Avison Young on behalf of L &amp; Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p><b>Vision and Aspirations</b> Welcome inclusion of provision of homes to meet needs of an increasing population and acknowledgement that housing growth should contribute to wider Housing Market Area needs as well as local need. Protection of countryside needs to be balanced with sustainable growth, to ensure that Borough's housing requirement can be met in full. Support aspiration to manage transition of new housing proposals. NDP should align with objectives of emerging Local Plan Review and acknowledge precedence of future Local Plan site allocations.</p> <p><b>Strategic Objective Future Housing Development</b> Support aspiration to deliver housing conducive to maintaining larger rural settlement characteristics, but should recognise settlement's ability to support sustainable extensions/sites in the context of the Local Plan Review evidence base. NDP should be flexible to allow for potential increase in housing numbers/sites.</p> <p><b>Policy H1 Built-Up Area Boundary</b> The Balsall Common boundary does not reflect the proposed allocations in the emerging Local Plan Review, so will be superseded by the Local Plan. NDP should indicate that allocations will form part of the built-up area, that proposals will be expected to comply with NDP policies and that there is a need for additional housing sites to be allocated on green belt land. The proposed boundary should be based on proportionate evidence/justification.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA1 New Homes</b> Support sentiment in aspiration. Robust evidence required for the Local Plan Review to demonstrate that the proposed housing allocations are deliverable and that the construction impacts and traffic generation of the housing together with development of HS2 is compatible.</p> <p><b>Policy H6 Housing Mix</b> The questionnaire data is insufficient evidence/justification for policy on housing mix, which is more appropriately dealt with in the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Policy BE4 Responding to Local Character</b></p>

		<p>Support in principle the criteria in the policy, although a pragmatic approach needs to be taken to their application. Policy should recognise that major housing development could create new distinct character areas, so greater flexibility in styles, materials, densities and building heights required, and that new development can contribute positively to character.. Policy should avoid duplication of policies in the NPPF and Local Plan. Key views, tranquil areas and through routes should be clearly identified to assist implementation.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA3 Village Bypass Road</b> Acknowledge aspiration, but NDP does not give consideration to deliverability or impact on viability of strategic housing allocations.</p> <p><b>Policy BE9 Local Parking Standards</b> Requirement for electric vehicle charging points should recognise that may not be deliverable if it would render a development unviable.</p> <p><b>Policy NE3 Designated Local Green Spaces</b> Object to inclusion of LGS5 Grange Park as neither necessary nor justified, as land is subject to a S106 planning obligation requiring its maintenance as open space in perpetuity. The proposal to develop Grange Farm would protect Grange Park, and NDP should recognise the potential of new development to provided recreational facilities, both on site and through contributions to facilities elsewhere.</p>
V Onions	Comment	<p><b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected.</p> <p><b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to incorporate quality public open space or significant spacing between existing and new dwellings. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes and Balsall Common overall.</p> <p><b>Objection to Solihull Draft Local Plan Site 3 Windmill Lane Balsall Common</b> Disappointed that views of large number of objectors overlooked and that instead of replacing site with suggested brownfield land, housing numbers have been increased, disregarding area and situation of village which is at capacity. Concerned about proximity of new housing to existing, need for buffer and protection of hedgerows and wildlife.</p>
V Ritters	Comment	<p><b>General</b> Support NDP and its policies.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> Paragraph 1.5 is misleading and should be deleted, as the work on a joint NDP was undertaken by a joint steering</p>

		committee of both Parish Councils, with terms of reference agreed by both. Paragraph 1.9 fails to make clear the extensive consultation undertaken on a range of options during the Governance Review, or 58% of residents requested that the Parish boundaries remained unchanged, and should be deleted.
Warwickshire County Council	Comment	<b>Community Aspiration CA3 Village Bypass Road</b> Requests that County Council is consulted at an early stage of development of proposal for a bypass, given its implications for A4177 and A452 corridors, Kenilworth town centre, local traffic on Hob Lane and Cromwell Lane accessing Westwood Heath and Warwick University, and Burton Green, with or without County Council proposals for the A46 Strategic Link Road.
W Wilson	Support / Comment	Broadly support Plan with exception of two issues. <b>Chapter 4 Character Appraisal</b> The Character Assessment for Zone A is not accurate in describing the area as being wholly Elysian Gardens (not 'Fields'). A sizeable area of green belt remains with an area of semi-natural woodland of high ecological value, and very low density housing in parkland setting. This needs to be re-assessed and corrected, as the Character Assessments provide the basis for Policies BE3/BE4 in the Plan, and the area is proposed for development in the Solihull Draft Local Plan. <b>Policy Omission</b> There is no policy to include a green buffer between existing and new dwellings, which has had widespread public support during the preparation of the Plan. A policy such as that in the Berkswell NDP (B1: New Housing - General Principles; 2. Layout and Accessibility; e.) should be incorporated to ensure consistency across sites covered by both parishes, such as Character Zone A/Draft Local Plan Site 3, and Balsall Common overall.
W Heard	Support	<b>General</b> Totally support Plan, which reflects views of Parish residents following household survey, consultation events and focus group input.
White Young Green on behalf of Catesby Estates	Comment	<b>Strategic Objective Future Housing Development</b> NDP should allocate land at Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road, as included in Regulation 14 consultation document, so as to reflect the emerging Local Plan Review (Housing Site 3), up to date evidence and meet the requirements of basic conditions (d) and (e). <b>Character Appraisal</b> Paragraph 4.12 is incorrect as the land at Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road is considered to be in sustainable location, within 1 mile of most local services and is served by public transport on Kelsey Lane. <b>Policy H6 Housing Mix</b> Requirement to accord with Strategic Housing Market Assessment and take account of local need is in accordance

	<p>with basic conditions (a) and (e), but it is unclear what methodology has been used to arrive at housing mix requirements.</p> <p><b>Policy BE8 Highway Safety</b>          Clause b) fails basic condition (a) as contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF and should be amended.</p> <p><b>Community Aspiration CA6 Improved Public Transport</b>          Commentary in paragraph 6.4.17 that development of land at Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road should only be completed when SPRINT bus service provided is inappropriate and fails basic condition (a), as there is no evidence that such services are required solely for the emerging housing proposals.</p>
<p>Solihull          Metropolitan          Borough Council</p>	<p><b>General</b>          Supports and welcomes much of the NDP, subject to the following.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b>          Recommend minor rewording of paragraph 1.1 re authority to ‘prepare’ not ‘make’ a NDP, and becoming a legal document when ‘subject to successful’ community referendum rather than ‘adopted by’. Insert ‘Parish’ before Council in paragraph 1.6 second sentence, and correct dates of adopted Local Plan in paragraph 1.15 to read ‘2011-2028.</p> <p><b>Policies HI Built-Up Area Boundary, H2 Infill within the Built-Up Area Boundary &amp; H4 Use of Garden Land</b>          Policies permit infilling within built-up areas of Balsall Common and Oakley. However, parts of the built-up area of Balsall Common and the whole of Oakley lie within the green belt in the adopted Local Plan 2013 (SLP), so policies are not in conformity with the NPPF/SLP. To rectify this, either the settlement boundaries should coincide with the green belt boundary, or policies should make clear that green belt policy, including the importance of openness, applies to those parts of the settlements in the green belt.          Policy H1 should conform with NPPF requirement to promote sustainable patterns of development and make clear that replacement dwellings should not be materially larger than that replaced. Cross-reference to Policy H6 appears to be an error.          Policy H4 (a) should seek to ‘preserve and maintain’ character, first sentence of paragraph 6.1.19 should state ‘comprising’.</p> <p><b>Policy H3 Use of Brownfield Land in the Green Belt</b>          Paragraph 6.1.15 should make clear that the exclusion of residential garden land from definition only applies in built-up areas.</p> <p><b>Policy H6 Housing Mix</b>          Emphasis on bungalows likely to encourage less efficient use of land. Should make explicit reference to viability/feasibility, as viability testing will be required to ascertain whether level of bungalow provision is feasible, and the higher proportion of 1-2 bedroom dwellings may not be feasible across all sites.</p>

	<p><b>Policy H7 General and Specialist Accommodation</b>          Whilst the encouragement for provision of homes for care workers is welcome in principle, careful thought is required about recruitment and retention issues in this occupational sector to ensure appropriate policy solution. May be more realistic to promote such developments within existing settlements or as part of larger sites, and to encourage developments well-related to existing communities rather than seeking inclusion of homes suitable for families. Rationale for encouraging children’s play areas not clear or justified.</p> <p><b>Policy BE1 Conversion of Rural Buildings</b>          Residential conversions should take account of the accessibility of a site, and clause f) should recognise that not all ancillary development is appropriate in the green belt.</p> <p><b>Policy BE2 Replacement Dwellings</b>          Should recognise green belt restrictions in NPPF limiting replacements to not materially larger than the existing. May be overly prescriptive. In paragraph 6.2.5, improvements to housing stock should be ‘supported’ rather than ‘encouraged’.</p> <p><b>Policy BE3 Design</b>          Fourth paragraph of policy should ‘respect’ rather than ‘enhance’ character, and final paragraph should cross-reference to Policy H4.</p> <p><b>Policy BE4 Responding to Local Character</b>          Whilst clause c) restrictions to height of buildings has been modified, policy could provide greater flexibility on new housing allocations.</p> <p><b>Policy BE5 Design Review Panels</b>          SMBC has no plans to establish such a mechanism, and as this does not provide guidance for determining planning applications, this recommendation should not be formal policy.</p> <p><b>Policy BE9 Local Parking Standards</b>          The off-road parking standard for new dwellings is contrary to SMBC’s evidence based approach and may be in conflict with the NPPF. The Parish Council has referred to evidence of on-street, verge and pavement parking, overflow parking from the rail station and congestion in the local centre. However, a criterion based policy is recommended.</p> <p><b>Policies ECON3 Encouraging Local Business and Employment &amp; ECON4 Rural Tourism</b>          Policy ECON3 should include a clause making clear that proposals outside the built-up area will be subject to green belt policy. Policy ECON 4 should include an additional criterion to cover the sustainability/accessibility of a site.</p> <p><b>Policy COM5 Allotments</b>          Whilst this is in line with Local Plan policy on green space protection, the policy could seek a net increase in provision, given that emerging evidence in the Solihull Open Spaces Assessment indicates a shortage of plots.</p>
--	---

		<p><b>Strategic Objective Natural Environment</b> Could refer to woodlands as well as trees.</p> <p><b>Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure</b> The insertion of 'known' in front of 'veteran trees in Balsall Common' would allow for the recording of additional specimens. The standard for tree planting could result in significant off-site planting, so prioritising suitable sites would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Policy NE4 Biodiversity</b> Minor redrafting of the text of paragraph 6.5.21 is necessary to ensure that the national status of the SSSI is recognised and Local Wildlife Sites should have capital initial letters.</p> <p><b>Policy NE5 Minimising Pollution</b> Whilst this policy has been amended in line with recommended wording from Birmingham Airport in its representation to the Pre-Submission NDP, it is recommended that further consideration is given to the policy and thresholds for unacceptable noise in the context of the Airport Master Plan and the Airport's response to the Submission NDP.</p>
--	--	--