

Analysis of responses to the 1st draft NDP consultation

<p>Please write any further comments about the draft NDP or suggestions for amendment in the space below.</p> <p>[Where people made two or more comments these have been separated out and put in the appropriate category where a number appears in front of a comment that was written by the respondent indicating their “point number”]</p>	<p>Comment category</p>	<p>Consideration Most comments have been grouped into categories, numbered 1 to 35. The action/response sometimes relates to all the comments in that numbered category.</p>	<p>Changes to NDP</p>
<p>1. Not enough detail to support policies.</p>		<p>The 1st draft plan document is 61 pages long with comprehensive justification for each draft policy. The four staffed, public events together with access on the PC website and public committee meetings of both the NDP and PC were all intended to provide as much access to information and questioning as possible.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Why is returned to Stratford - can't you sort it within BPC?</p>		<p>The Stratford Communication Unit was used for impartial data collection</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>"Stories" spelt wrong on housing policies!</p>		<p>Accepted</p>	<p>Corrected in Draft Plan</p>
<p>Let's try and Balsall Common/Berkswell as a village!</p>		<p>The 1st draft NDP seeks as its vision “that Berkswell Parish will remain a pleasant place in which to live and bring up families.....”. Hence the NDP is seeking to achieve what the comment suggests.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Address removed</p>		<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

Next time could you make the map on page 4 a lot smaller? I could still read parts of it with my daughter's microscope		The map is on an OS base and provided at A4, but the parish extends over a large area. Larger printed maps have been provided at public events.	No change
Balsall Common has changed since 1964 and not for the better, it was a village but now an 'overcrowded town', lost its community spirit also		The 1st draft NDP seeks as its vision "that Berkswell Parish will remain a pleasant place in which to live and bring up families.....". That includes that part of Balsall Common within Berkswell Parish. Balsall PC are also preparing a NDP which could address this.	No change
Balsall Common is no longer a village sad to say, I have been a resident since 1964		The 1st draft NDP seeks as its vision "that Berkswell Parish will remain a pleasant place in which to live and bring up families.....". That includes that part of Balsall Common within Berkswell Parish. Balsall PC are also preparing a NDP which could address this.	No change
Let's protect for the future		The 1st draft NDP seeks as its vision "that Berkswell Parish will remain a pleasant place in which to live and bring up families....." The draft policies are intended to protect the future as far as possible, within the scope of an NDP.	No change
Are sufficient funds available to pay for all the proposed development plans		Noted.	The introduction to the local infrastructure plans in appendix 5 to be changed to clarify that further work will be required after adoption of the NDP on viability and prioritisation of residents' infrastructure suggestions
Very biased in favour of Berkswell, no surprise!		The draft Solihull Local Plan Review proposes that the majority of new homes in Berkswell Parish will be in Balsall Common. The Berkswell side of Balsall Common has the only site scheduled for housing development in the 2013 Solihull Local plan and this is adjacent to the	No change

		<p>Drs surgery on Riddings Hill. Over 60% of Berkswell Parish residents live in Balsall Common. Most of the objectives and Policies B1, B3, B4, B7, B8 and B9 are primarily focused on management/planning of new development in Balsall Common.</p> <p>Policies B2, B5 and B6 concern rural Berkswell Parish and policy B10 applies across the whole parish.</p> <p>The Berkswell Parish NDP cannot address issues in Balsall Parish by law.</p>	
No comment as not long lived in the area (8 months)		Noted	No change
Should the NDP included mitigation for major infrastructure (e.g. HS2) or mineral extraction to preserve the current rural environment.		These issues are specifically out of scope of a NDP. HS2 Ltd has an extensive mitigation programme agreed as part of the Environmental Statement. Solihull Council planning conditions set mitigation and restoration conditions for mineral extraction	No change
Objection 6 - we do not need to provide transport tracks for horse riding. This is archaic.		Objective 6 is about the promotion of safe links. Horse riding is an activity enjoyed by many and the promotion of a safe link onto the existing horse riding trail (Kenilworth Greenway) is an appropriate objective. The safe links are intended to be shared and not restricted to horse riders	No change
What areas are being designated for building with what type of properties and how many are planned		The issue of land designated for housing development is an issue for the Solihull Local Plan review. Details were on display at the Issues and Options consultation and are shown in appendix 2 of the 1 st draft NDP. The planning	No change

		guidelines for Housing mix are shown in policy B1 of the 1 st draft plan.	
I support your objectives but if our experience with the silver birches development is representative SMBC will just ride roughshod of resident's desires		The planning policies in an NDP must be considered by the SMBC planners and planning committee when a planning application is made. The Government is consulting on changes to the National Planning Policy Framework to strengthen the consideration of policies within a NDP	No change
How far can we ensure that the "ideals" in the plan are enforceable against the developers?			No change
When can I have my husband and conservatory back?		Noted	No change
Nice photos of our estate. We like it too.		Noted	No change
Berkswell it would appear want to keep the Berkswell parish clear of building and push the building needs to Balsall.		Not accepted. The 1 st draft NDP makes no recommendations for site selection. Changes to the Green Belt are a strategic matter and can only be done through a Green Belt Review by the local planning authority (SMBC). The majority of new homes proposed for development in Balsall Common by SMBC are in Berkswell Parish.	No change
Need to designate additional local green space	1	1 st Draft policy B3 provides a specific policy on green space per 1000 residents. Local Green Space designations have to meet specific criteria set out in the NPPF.	No change

Designate Lavender Hall Park as protected local green space.	1.1	<p>Lavender Hall Park is one of 15 green flag parks within Solihull Borough. As such it already has a high degree of protection from development.</p> <p>It was not considered appropriate to seek additional protection in line with advice in National Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	No change.
Are the park (Riddings Hill) and other green spaces protected? Would not want Hornets sports ground designated if the park is lost!	1.1		No change
I would also like to protect Lavender Hall Lakes as green space	1.1		No change
1. Lavender Hall Park needs to be designated as local green space if it isn't already.	1.1		No change
Lavender Hall Lane park/green space and dog walking space must be protected. It is our green	1.1		No change
Would also like to see existing park area opposite Hornets Sports Ground designated as local green space.	1.1		No change
I note the proposal to designate 2 green spaces, but the park behind the Riddings Hill development and between Green Lane and Lavender Hall Lane is not included in the proposal. Is that because that park is already designated a local green space? If not I think that park should also be designated a local green space.	1.1		No change
I support the designation of the green spaces above but am unclear whether the park at the top of Green lane is a designated green space? I firmly believe it should be.	1.1		No change
I think the park area and green park on lavender hall lane should also be a designated green area. It seems bizarre to	1.1		No change

<p>only protect the land that the Hornets use for training and the small area by the church when we should also and equally so be protecting areas for children and adults to meet, play and enjoy in a safe environment outside of the football arena. This fits with the Governments agenda on fighting obesity in young children encouraging and offering a park for children to undertake activity. It also encourages community cohesion.</p>			
<p>My view is that in addition to the allocation of Meeting House Lane Recreation Ground and Lavender Hall Football Club as public green space, we should include the existing park that runs from Lavender Hall road to station road and sits between Riddings Hill and the Kenilworth Road.</p>	1.1		No change
<p>The Lant off Meeting House Lane should also be a local green space if not already.</p>	1.2	<p>The Lant sports ground falls mainly within Balsall Parish. The part within Berkswell parish primarily comprises car parking, a club house and tennis courts.</p> <p>This was a single representation and there was not evidence of overwhelming public support for protecting the area as Local Green Space.</p> <p>On balance the parish council did not feel it appropriate to designate this area (as compared with the large green area within Balsall Parish) as Local Green Space.</p>	No change

As I directly overlook Barratts Lane Farm (Sunnyside Farm) and consider it to be vital to my wellbeing, I would love the field/s immediately behind me to be designated as local green space. Is that utterly unrealistic?	1.3	The address was supplied for this comment and the land concerned is part of very extensive farm land. There is not the evidence to designate the area as Local Green Space within the NPPF criteria. However, the PC recognises the concern and the provision of policy B1 might address the concern and there will be further opportunities to make representations on the masterplan and any future planning applications.	No change
Balsall Common has now got very busy and crowded. The schools are oversubscribed, traffic congestion is on all roundabouts	2	Doctors, schools, telecoms, flood prevention, existing highways etc are major infrastructure issues. The comments made in this section are about major infrastructure which falls out of the scope of an NDP. One comment links flooding and drainage. Drainage is covered within draft policy B1. Water management is to be included within the objectives of the 2 nd draft of the NDP following comments from SMBC. The parking in central Balsall Common is primarily within Balsall Parish and hence out of scope. Parking on new housing developments is covered in draft Policy B8. Parking at Berkswell Station is covered under draft policy B7 Policies B8 and 9 cover cycling safety/provision to some extent.	No change
			No change
Need to protect this region, to retain rural British heritage. The village atmosphere is being lost. The infrastructure cannot support constant building.	2		No change
Wherever possible, infrastructure/services should be a first phase of any development e.g. schools, doctors.	2		No further change
The NDP does not include information on how the increased number of residents will be catered for by the already oversubscribed medical centre and both primary and secondary schools.	2		No change.
3. Speed calming near Lavender Hall Park? They use it as a race track.	2		No change.
If Solihull Council decide to build on land behind us (Rod Addenbrookes land currently!), I hope that they will address issues of flooding and drainage. We have at the moment severe flooding issues from adjacent farmland and the council at the	2		No change.

moment have not addressed this despite several phone calls.		
There is a limit to the amount of people an area can support. Roads, schools, parking, doctor's etc. have to be expanded and upgraded to cope with more people and vehicles. This, so far, has not been addressed. Overcrowding in these facilities just breeds frustration and stress because nothing works smoothly, and it can breed resentment and hostile protests at progress.	2	No change.
I have ticked your boxes, but it is a bit like voting for "motherhood and apple pie". Where are the extra schools/doctors etc going to go?	2	No change.
What about doctor's surgery, surely, we will need another one? Allow people who live in the parish's to be able to have a choice to live here.	2	No change.
Any increase in housing must not swamp the existing facilities such as schools, doctor's surgery etc. and any increase should be limited and spread over a period of time. Balsall Common is a pleasant environment and any development must recognise and maintain this.	2	No change.
The vision and objectives are a reasonable "wish list" but I am not sure about the planning policies because there seem to be inherent contradictions. The building of 800 houses will have a massive effect anywhere, let alone in a place trying to keep a measure of rural charm. There could be an extra 1,600 cars in the village and maybe 3000 adults and children. A huge infrastructure is necessary.	2	No change.

<p>What is the purpose of a green belt? It should not be easy to convert green belt status without a very detailed support plan and a contingency arrangement with teeth if the support plan fails to be implemented.</p>		
<p>Promise of extra amenities be built before houses are built i.e. schools, shops, community projects etc. Example of bad promises: Banner Brook - where is the school? And where are those children going - Balsall Primary - talking overflow is causing strains on local amenities - traffic on roads. Jaguar traffic! Road capability! Councils turn a blind eye - attitude. Kenilworth Road - Balsall Common. New houses look great but: road link from new estate to the old people's home congested - islands needed not junctions. Village Parking! Cycle paths - need marking on paths as dual with give way to pedestrians. Community pensionable age free clubs and care! In a green area (The Legion Balsall Common wasted room, car parking etc.) Water feature needed - in a park area, incorporated a stream/brook, ducks etc.</p>	2	No change.
<p>I think an alternative bypass should be considered as Hallmeadow Road would get more congested than Kenilworth Road due to station and doctors. Kenilworth Road would become a rat run. Need to get traffic from A45 to just past Fen End due to JLF traffic. Feeding this traffic though Balsall Common via Kenilworth Road or Hallmeadow Road is not robust long-term solution! Parking near stations needs to be addressed prior to any work commencing on HS2. If additional</p>	2	No change.

parking is not found any future housing developments near the station will inherit overflow parking problems.		
As a resident of Balsall for fifty years, I am now going to need public transport, the taxi bus is no longer available to the area and the bus from Balsall is too far to walk to. As a pensioner, I've got a bus pass which is no good if the taxi bus is not available. If this is not going to be replaces - what about taxi fare vouchers?	2	No change.
There is no mention of schools in all of this plan.	2	No change.
School provision?	2	No change.
Investment in schools in line with expected housing growth.	2	No change.
Recognise need to grow key services to match demand growth - e.g. schools particularly when house building expands.	2	No change.
We feel that the village has enough new housing and doesn't need any more. We do not have the correct facilities in the village to cope with 1000 more houses	2	No change.
		No change.
'By-pass' road surgery is an enlarged car park for the station - not intended for that purpose / A policy of more development but no extra infrastructure spells disaster for any vision objectives (same applies in Balsall Common village centre. Already Balsall Common will become a ghost town in shopping area as occupants are moving out. I believe it should be a united council (work together) protecting the interest of all residents		No change.

What's happening about the long-proposed bypass - original route - Hallmeadow Road, becoming a serious need	2	No change.
There is no provision for care in our community or disabled residents' young or old i.e. autistic or Asperger's our son is living 10 miles away.	2	No change.
Given the mess on our pavements caused by unsightly grey Virgin Media boxes, there should be something controlling these when others follow suit. Especially where they take space on footpaths or are located right outside a house in line of sight. Street furniture and unnecessary road signs also need control. The increase in takeaway and restaurants with inadequate flues causing smell. Young people housing should be located near schools and transport/doctors. The issue of drainage needs addressing in built up areas. As does the chaos caused by delivery lorries to shops, causing danger. Cycleways planned give links to Kenilworth, but none shown for Knowle/Solihull which is useful for more banking and shopping. I realise Berkswell village is nearer towards Kenilworth but those of us on the Balsall Common side look towards Knowle and Solihull also. Children attend the sixth form college in Solihull, plus the restaurants and entertainment. I see nothing about sustainability in housing design and this should be something this generation insists upon.	2	No change.
This may not be included in the draft NDP but people find pavements are not usable when	2	No change.

workmen are carrying out roadworks people which includes children and OAP's to have to use the road to make headway which puts them in danger from traffic. I am disabled so this makes it more difficult for me and other people with disabilities, hope you find this is something you can look into thank you		
Extremely concerned regarding schooling and medical centre facilities.	2	No change.
Waste no more time on the Parish boundary issue and agree how to visit on Solihull, paying attention to our needs for proper services.	2	No change.
Serious thought must also be given, regarding an increase in population due to increased housing, to extra provision of medical and educational facilities.	2	No change.
If further housing is built then there needs to be more amenities e.g. schools, gym, supermarket, activities for teens.	2	No change.
Increase in appropriate infrastructure is essential.	2	No change.
Increase in infrastructure required.	2	No change.
Any development must be matched with improved infrastructure.	2	No change.
One should look to how to improve medical and education facilities because to encourage people to walk to our facilities is not encouraged.	2	No change.
I find the plan a logical control to inevitable expansion. My main concern is the supporting services and extra traffic, not mentioned in the document.	2	

I would like to see more focus on improving public transport i.e. buses and number of trains to/from Berkswell.	2	No change.
Local infrastructure needs to be improved and extended if new housing is scheduled, e.g. better bus services.	2	No change.
It's not clear to me what influence the Parish Council has over the draft objective number 12, improving the shopping facilities, but it would be good for some oversight of the types of businesses that are encouraged, or even allowed, to foster. There seems to be an increase in estate agents and national chain convenience stores (how many do we need?) but lack of any variety meaning much of the time one has to leave Balsall Common to shop.	2	No change.
Unfortunately, local businesses do not meet the needs of the local population. I tried for about 9 months to change my hours at work in Balsall Common. They were not flexible at all. I now have to commute to Warwick. Every adult in this area has to have a vehicle - there is not enough provision made for this - either at home or up the village - we require way more parking. We also need way more facilities. The Dr's Surgery - fully booked for about 2 weeks last time I checked - it's disgusting. We also need more leisure facilities - how about incorporating a leisure centre? Think of the people without access to a car. 1 bus an hour still to Coventry and Solihull??? Still no bus to Kenilworth? How about Cannon Park? These are our nearest shopping centres. If Balsall and Berkswell	2	No change.

are going to expand, something has to change - ok rant over.		
There is no comment about providing schools and increased facilities for new residents. Berkswell PC cannot rely on the Heart of England School without making a commitment to support it and provide funds for expansion. /	2	No change.
The village is already suffering due to increased housing at the Elysian Gardens development; any further development would mean that we would need increased health facilities, and schooling for this "village".	2	No change.
Please limit housing development. Infrastructure overcrowded, doctors, school, parking at shops, drains not big enough.	2	No change.
I accept most of the proposed planning policy but still feel that all residential buildings work in Balsall/Berkswell needs to be backed up by improved infrastructure such as a new school, leisure facilities and improved transport links for the growing population.	2	No change.
Whilst I don't oppose more housing I think the infrastructure needs to come first. The village centre and current amenities don't adequately support the residents we have now.	2	No change.
I would only underline that with over 1000 houses planned, the population of the whole of Balsall Common looks set to rise from 7000 to over 9000 - an increase in the order of one	2	No change.

<p>third. This will inevitably require some attention to the infrastructure serving both Berkswell and Balsall Parishes - retail, health, education and transport in particular. Are shopping facilities being incorporated into the new development? Local roads are congested at the moment, especially in peak periods. How are all these people going to get around? Cycleways and footpaths are mentioned but many people will inevitably resort to private transport. What provision is there for more public transport at a reasonable cost to persuade residents to use it? In common with areas across the country, it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain health advice locally; how will all the new residents, together with those existing, be served? There is no mention of education facilities in the plan - almost certainly because these are planned separately. However, it is important that, if families are to be attracted to, and feel comfortable living in, the new housing on a sustainable basis, adequate education facilities are provided? Is there spare capacity at the two schools serving Balsall Common or do we need to provide for additional spaces so local pupils do not have to travel to facilities outside the settlement? Some, but I suspect not all, of these (retail, health, education and transport facilities)</p>		
--	--	--

might be funded from the infrastructure levy but provision for them in the NDP and the local plan will still be needed.			
Any further development within the boundaries must be accompanied with the suitable road, medical and educational facilities. None of the current ones can cope with the existing demand let alone further residents. Security and safety of residents are also declining, and given the proposed developments we need a reinstated 24-hour police presence. .	2		No change.
I agree with most of the issues raised in the plan however without considering another school, leisure facilities etc for the growing community, I'm concerned the impact of these will be overlooked.	2		No change.
Re. No.B4: I might support depending on conditions. I.E. extra parking available for use with main park.	3	The park & car park is owned by SMBC and out of scope of NDP	No change.
For me the Hornets Sports Ground is imperative. Just go there on a Saturday morning to see.	3	It is true that LGS designation provides the equivalent protection to Green Belt status. The Meeting House Lane recreation ground is currently green belt and its designation as LGS will meet the stated desire of 97% of Berkswell Parish respondents and 92 % of total survey respondents for this site to be protected as Local Green Space into the future.	No change.
With regard to LGS designation of the MHL recreation ground, this only provides the equivalent of green belt status protection for the field, which is already in place. The owners will cause delay to the NDP if they contest this designation. LGS designation	3		No change.

does not assure future public access for recreation. It might be more effective to provide a more specific planning formula for the area, type, and location of green spaces in relation to future population and the distance from dwellings.			
The Hornets Sports Ground is well used and relatively new so don't take this away from them!	3.1	The designation of the land used by the Hornets as Local Green Space will not change its use as a sports field.	No change.
Is the Hornets ground really public green space?	3.1	It meets the definition in the NPPF. The designation of the land used by the Hornets as Local Green Space will not change its use as a sports field.	No change.
Strongly supportive of Green Spaces designation for the Triangle (and "Catholic field".)	3.1	Noted	No change.
There is a great need for smaller houses for retired older people in the area. The land on Meeting House Lane is ideal for this purpose and is close to most amenities.	3.2	We assume that this first comment is about the designation of the recreation ground next to the church as Local Green Space. If that is the case it is covered by the response below. If it is about the types of housing that is covered by housing mix under policy B1	No change.
It is vital to protect the local green spaces for young people's play area - also for walking for all residents. Remember open spaces, trees and bushes are our oxygen.	3.2		No change.
There is precious little recreational ground in and around the village. We need to preserve what little we have.	3.2	We note these supporting comments which are in addition to the survey results which indicate that 97% of Berkswell Parish respondents and 92% of total respondents support the designation of this area as Local Green Space.	No change.
The land next to the Catholic Church must be retained as local green space. It is surrounded by mature trees with protection	3.2		Further justification has been added to the relevant table noting the site's significance in terms of tranquillity and wildlife value.

orders, has a well-used public footpath and is valued by many just because it looks nice. It is used by many dog walkers and in the summer by all kinds of people when the sun comes out. Since it is no longer regularly mowed the "hay field" effect is an added bonus.			
I feel very strongly that it is important to protect the green spaces mentioned to continue the rural feel of the area, which is what attracted so many of us to live here in the first place;	3.2		No change.
I feel very strongly that it is important to protect the green spaces mentioned to continue the rural feel of the area, which is what attracted so many of us to live here in the first place;	3.2		No change.
The green spaces within the parish are very important to the village and local community and should be protected.	3.2		No change.
Strongly supportive of Green Spaces designation for the (Triangle and) "Catholic field".	3.2		No change.
The land in Meeting House Lane is private and people only walk that way as there is a public right of way across the field as are	3.3	Refer to planning consultants' detailed response to the objection from the landowner.	No change.

many others around the village which we also used.		Local Green Space designation can be used for land in private ownership and public access is not one of the criteria in the NPPF.	
The recreation ground is private land held by the local diocese; I am opposed to stealing private land and forcefully designating it a public space. The church should choose what to do with this land.	3.3	The Meeting House Lane recreation ground is currently green belt and its designation as LGS will meet the stated desire of 97% of Berkswell Parish respondents and 92 % of total survey respondents for this site to be protected as Local Green Space into the future.	No change.
#3 - I understand that the land is owned by the diocese and that money generated by development would be well spent. Also, there are many green spaces in the immediate vicinity, why single out this field?	3.3	The PC considers that the evidence compiled supports the designation of the land as LGS whether or not it is privately owned.	No change.
The recreation ground on Meeting House Lane is little used and never has been! And the slide and other equipment removed - so it is ideal for a housing development.	3.3	Further justification has been added to the relevant table noting the site's significance in terms of tranquillity and wildlife value.	No change.
1. The recreation ground in Meeting House Lane is rarely used. Balsall Common has 2 parks which are well used. The land could be built upon as it is very central to the village and easy safe access to the schools.	3.3	The land adjacent to the church is shown as "Playing Field" on the latest OS map base. It is known locally as a "recreation ground."	No change.
The land adjacent to the Catholic Church is private land owned by the Arch Diocese of Birmingham. If there is to be a development in Barratts Farm, there is a good case for further meeting. The needs of this growing community with possible provision for the elderly. There are already designated "green spaces" in the village - Lavender Hall, The Lant, Hornets Playing Field, Willow Park - Frog Lane. The Catholic Church allowed usage on an annual basis of this land to help and benefit the community. It would now appear you are trying to penalise them for their good intention. It is private land and not	3.3	The NDP supports appropriate new housing including a mix of house types and sizes to meet local needs in line with SMBC's planning policies.	No change.

a "playing area" as it appears on Google Maps - this is incorrect.		
Field on Meeting House Lane would make a good area for development as there is housing all along this road already.	3.3	No change.
I would rather these plots be used than further invasion into green belt around the perimeter of the village.	3.3	No change.
The land next to the catholic church on Meeting House Lane is private land, it is owned by the church, you have no right to dictate what happens to it, I support the main features of your NDP, but you need to drop your proposal regarding the land belonging to the church	3.3	No change.
I support retaining the existing sports ground on Meeting House Lane but not the green space next to the catholic church unless it is used regularly by community groups.	3.3	No change.
The Catholic Church field is private land. Can you make it a recreation ground?	3.3	No change.
The incorrectly designated 'recreation ground' next to the catholic church is actually owned by the Roman Catholic Arch Diocese of Birmingham. Berkswell parish council has NO right to designate private land as a communal recreation ground. Access to this land has been graciously provided by the catholic church to residents who wish to make use of the existing public footpath that runs along the side of this land. As such, I do not recognise Berkswell parish council's assertion that this	3.3	

<p>be recreation ground just because the public are allowed to exercise their dogs on it by the catholic church.</p>			
<p>I am frankly astonished at the misleading wording of the third part of Q4. There is NO 'recreation ground' next to Blessed Robert Grissold Church (it has a name, it is not simply 'the Catholic church') on Meeting House Lane; the land next to the church is private land, owned by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Birmingham. Berkswell Parish Council is well aware of this fact, as they tried this particular trick of trying to get private land designated as a public amenity several years ago, and were unsuccessful. As far as I am aware, the Archdiocese never intended for this land to become simply a 'recreation ground'; it has always been earmarked for some kind of development (when Blessed Robert Grissold Church was first built I believe there were suggestions of building a Catholic school on this land, for instance). That the residents of Balsall Common have been allowed to access this land (beyond the public footpath) up until now is by the generosity of the Archdiocese and does not signify that this private property is in any way a public area. It would be a shame if the Archdiocese had to fence off the area entirely to emphasise that it is private</p>	<p>3.3</p>		<p>No change.</p>

property, simply to protect it from the self-interest of Berkswell Parish Council.		
Q4 Land next to the Catholic Church: This question is invalid and misleading. The land belongs to the Archdiocese of Birmingham, and the NDP and surveys should have made this clear to residents.	3.3	No change.
Your NDP is misleading if not dishonest in not explaining that the Meeting House Lane land is actually privately owned, there are notices at the entrance to tell you so, and public access is only currently available, by kind permission of the owners.	3.3	No change.
The land off Meeting House Lane is NOT a recreation ground; it is a private field which has a public footpath running through it. It has been tenanted from time to time by The Football Club.	3.3	No change.
I particularly object to the policy relating to local green spaces (B4). I strongly disagree with the designation of the area to the side of the Catholic church in meeting house lane as recreational ground. The land is private and such a designation would have implications for the church. I note that the policy labels it as 'recreational ground' which is as least inaccurate if not misleading. Both parish Berkswell and Balsall Parish councils have	3.3	No change.

made assumptions about the ownership and use of land, either designating it for leisure or for development. To propose any plan like this it need to be accurate.			
B2: I'm sure the locals of Berkswell Village may not see a need for affordable housing. I also think that were such housing to be built that it would be in high demand. B2 to me is the most questionable.	4	The removal of land from Green Belt can only be undertaken by Solihull Council and not proposed in a parish led NDP. In its Local Plan Review Solihull Council is not proposing to release land for housing development in or around Berkswell village.	No change.
It is essential to retain the character of the village of Berkswell - the village and adjacent land should be preserved, and apart from redundant farm buildings (e.g. Village Farm) there should be no further local development.	4	There is a provision that can allow a NDP to provide affordable housing through a rural exception site. The PC could not find the necessary evidence to support a site allocation for a rural exception site during its issues and options consultation. However, in the event that such a need is identified in the future policy B2 provides planning guidance on how such affordable housing should be provided.	No change
Although I support the majority of the proposed planning policies I do support some limited development of small scale, one or two houses in the conservation area where this has little impact on the village. Otherwise the village will continue to become a retirement village	4		No change
All of the development is in the Balsall Common area and NOTHING even mentioned in Berkswell itself. Whilst we support as much protected green space as possible everywhere, it seems Balsall Common is to become the town, take all of the development, host HS2 and generally be the scapegoat for all types of building whilst Berkswell gets off Scott free. This isn't really a	4	The draft plan recognises that 30% of housing within Berkswell village is already let under some form of social rent. Other policies in the NDP aim to protect local landscape character and built heritage (eg B3 and B5).	No change

<p>'Berkswell NDP' but a 'Balsall NDP' probably worth rebranding as such.</p>		<p>Further information about the consultation process and number / rates of responses is provided on the NDP website.</p>	
<p>In Section 6.6 it states '61 respondents'.....but this figure is meaningless to the reader as it doesn't indicate of how many in total – it might be better to say the percentage of total respondents as I have no idea how significant '61' is. For example in section 9.3 and in many other sections in the draft plan percentages of respondents (and often specifies if the respondents are Berkswell or Balsall residents) are used. I feel a consistent approach should be used throughout the plan.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Some responses seem to have misinterpreted Policy B2 and consider that affordable housing is not supported in Berkswell village in the NDP. However Policy B2 sets out that Small-scale affordable housing development (of 1 to 2 homes) in Berkswell Village will be supported subject to criteria.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Plan does seem to have 'protect Berkswell village at all costs' feel and allocates development just to Balsall Common which seems unfair.</p>	<p>4</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>I would support selective development of quality housing in Berkswell Village. The village needs younger people, but there is nowhere for them to love. The NDP makes reference too1/2 house developments being supported. That does not work on a cost basis, with land purchase being so costly. The type of small development at Village Farm as an example Warks, with a minimum number of new housing supporting the renovation of old buildings, which are run down, ugly and do nothing for village life.</p>	<p>4</p>		<p>No change</p>

Draft policy B2 causes me concern. I am not surprised residents in Berkswell Village don't see the need for modestly priced housing but were such housing to be built, I feel sure the uptake would be substantial. What is wrong with 3 bed semi-detached houses with gardens and parking spaces?	4	No change
Where are the Council Housing projects? - That is the only way we are going to get affordable rents, to enable the young to save for deposits.	4	No change
In your draft you want to provide types of property to attract young people but in B2 you state there is not a need for affordable housing "outside Balsall Common". How damned selfish N.I.M.B.Y of Berkswell is this?	4	No change
Be Policy B2. Berkswell Village is not a suitable area for social/affordable housing - agreed.	4	No change
I am supportive of the planning policies B1, B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, B8, B9 and B10. I do not believe B2 is desirable or appropriate. The village needs a diverse community and will not thrive without that diversity	4	No change
B2 - I believe there is a need for social/affordable housing, not only in Balsall Common but in Berkswell Village too. We need young people to be able to afford to live in both villages, I support all other planning policies	4	No change
Housing should be made more affordable for residents who were born in Balsall Common/Berkswell. Both my children have excellent, well paid jobs however would not	4	No change

be able to purchase a property within these areas		
I support the overall principle of this plan, however the classification of social rental in order to fabricate a 30% figure smacks of a 'we don't want anyone else who can't afford the homes here to be able to move here' spin. I would very much like to see efforts made to encourage more young families to the village. I understand the desire to not have more 'council housing', however an element of shared ownership or designated lower cost houses for owner occupiers. These do not need to be the ugly style of 60s council housing but could be perfectly affective.	4	No change
I don't support draft policy B2. Every area should have affordable housing for young people, nurses, carers etc. The country is crying out for affordable housing for our young people and Berkswell is no exception. Berkswell residents should be ashamed of this policy!!	4	No change
Also, cannot understand why Berkswell village does not need social/affordable housing - it is needed in all areas to get good social mix.	4	No change
I support the majority of the proposed planning policies and strongly support some limited development within Berkswell village. The village needs to be allowed to grow to ensure its ongoing improvement. Developers should be small scale but are needed.	4	No change
B2 to not provide for social housing when it is obviously needed is wrong. There should be social housing in Berkswell Village. /	4	No change

I disagree with policy B2. I see no reason why Berkswell village should not have a local need for social (affordable) housing. The draft policy simply wants to ignore an ongoing problem of affordable housing for young people	4		No change
As a resident of Balsall Common, your draft policy B2, local needs housing in Berkswell, if I'm reading it correctly, seems to be a bit NIMBY, ie you are happy for social/affordable housing to be in Balsall Common but not in Berkswell. Is there really no need for this type of housing in the more rural area of Berkswell?	4		No change
I generally support the policy but question why there is no provision being made for affordable housing in Berkswell village. The implication of this is that what is OK for Balsall village is not OK for Berkswell village.	4		No change
I am concerned that bias may not have been eliminated in the survey assessing need for social/affordable housing outside Balsall Common as respondents who may need this type of housing may not have responded to the survey	4		No change
Hardly any property being built in Balsall and Berkswell affordable in particular for housing objective 1 (young) /	5	The current Solihull Local Plan (December 2013) provides that 40% of housing on new housing developments in the plan (e.g. off	No change

Although I support in principle, the Draft NDF Objectives under housing Objective 2, whilst high quality housing design is commendable it also suggests high costs. I see no reference to providing housing for people on low incomes, particularly the young. Housing Objective 1 does mention property to attract young people. High quality must equate to higher, or high price which would exclude most young people. A broad spectrum of housing is required, albeit thoughtfully designed.	5	Hallmeadow Road) shall be affordable in accordance with the Government definition. The draft new Solihull Local Plan increases that figure to 50%. The parish council saw no need to set a target % for affordable housing given that it is defined within the Solihull Plan	No change
Affordable housing is most important; we do not want any more of these expensive houses being built in Balsall Common. I don't think cars parking in Ashley Drive is a problem. I always park there when I use the train. I have not seen any dangerous parking.	5		No change
I don't know where you think the young are going to find first time affordable property? So, there is going to be land between the existing railway line and that of HS2 which will be presumably unsuitable for agricultural use, and I suggest that this is used for the construction of 1 and 2-bedroom flats/multi-storey at an affordable cost around £100k or less. I would also suggest a "static home park" like that in Windmill Lane, is built in this space.	5		No change
2. Thought it was very telling that Berkswell is against any social/affordable housing - not in my back yard eh! Where do our children find suitable affordable houses?	5		No change
Social/affordable housing is required everywhere - Berkswell included.	5		No change

I agree entirely with the contents of draft policy B6 but cannot understand why the owner of the redundant buildings situated on Barretts Lane had been denied a number applications to build a house there. This would indeed optimise the visual impact	5	No change
Youngsters born and bred in the village can't afford to live here we need council houses again as before or starter homes that are affordable	5	No change
Housing objective 1 and draft policy B2 may not be compatible. Young people may need very cheap or rental accommodation (affordable social)	5	No change
Your proposals not to allocate land to social/affordable housing negates objective!	5	No change
I do not believe there is any requirement for social/affordable housing.	5	No change
I think that social housing needs to be included in any new developments.	5	No change
The mixed aspects of new developments i.e. first-time buyer, rental social housing, downsizing needs must be enforced at each stage.	5	No change
I note that you cover Berkswell Village Housing needs in Draft Policy B2, however you do not take into consideration in the NDP the affordable housing needs in Balsall Common. Balsall Common has seen many housing developments recently yet none are affordable to many of those who were born, grew up in Balsall Common and still live with parents even though they are in their 30s.	5	No change

Any housing development in Berkswell parish should include provision for social/affordable housing.	5		No change
We would support any plans to ensure not just those with money can afford to buy a house here, so reasonably priced starter homes or aesthetically pleasing semi-detached looking houses that are in fact maisonette flats rather than high rise flats for example.	5		No change
I refer now to Barrett's Farm where Solihull plan the greatest number of houses B7 is crucial, and since railway parking is already impossible, this should be done before any new development	6	The PC notes the general support for improved parking at Berkswell Station. It is the responsibility of the rail franchisee (currently West Midlands Trains) to provide the car parking. Regrettably, Berkswell station is not on the list of stations where West Midlands Trains are required by the franchise agreement to improve parking.	No change
5. The apparent lack of increased parking around the station is worrying. I seem to recall mention of car park closure once work on HS2 starts - what is the anticipated implication of this? The expansion of the village means that many people live at a significant distance from the station.	6	The PC is not practically or financially able to provide improved parking at the station. The 1 st draft plan provides acceptable planning solutions in the event that a body wishes to provide improved parking at the station. It is noted that some respondents do not support a multi-story car park. The 1 st draft plan contains a planning policy that deems 2 storey car park as acceptable. Having reviewed this, the PC still considers that a 2-storey car park would be one acceptable option on or as an extension to the current station car park. In reaching this view	No change
There is no circular buses service to and from the station therefore people are forced to use their cars. The lack of planned car parking for the station raises concerns that the station could be closed. Whilst I appreciate that Berkswell has retained its rural nature, Balsall Common is very much a commuter village for Birmingham, Coventry, and London. This is certainly why the new houses would attract buyers but there needs to be some	6		No change

assurances that the things that are attracting these houses will not be downgraded as a result of HS2. This could result in subsequent reduction in house prices. Police Presence is also important. This has been downgraded recently. One only has to look at the car park behind the library to be alerted to some of the consequences. There has been evidence of significant substance abuse in this area.		the council notes that the current car park is adjacent to a car dealership on one side and the west coast mainline on the other. The new HS2 line will be close by and will dominate the area whereas a 2-storey car park will be screened from view by the current trees, the WCML and HS2 and on balance it would be an acceptable solution.	
Do not agree to a multi-story car park at station - not in keeping with area and surrounds.	6	The NDP also supports walking and cycling as part of measures to alleviate pressures from public car parking.	No change
Some of the draft policies have been in discussion for years, particularly B7 and the linking of the greenway to Station Road, but very little (apart from re-surfacing of the station car park) seems to happen	6		No change
B7 essential - multi-storey over current car park? Also use of land alongside Hallmeadow road adjacent to railway.	6		No change
Could the land next in between the doctor's surgery and Riddings Hill be used for additional parking for Berkswell Train Station? There are a number of vehicles parking on Hallmeadow Road, causing a great deal of congestion.	6		No change
Could the land between the doctor's surgery and Riddings Hill be used for additional parking for Berkswell Train Station? There are numerous users of the Train Station parking	6		No change

their vehicles on Hallmeadow Road, causing a great deal of congestion!		
More parking especially at the station is urgent.	6	No change
The parking for Berkswell Station is becoming a serious issue. Many of the local roads have cars parked along them by users of the railway station. Therefore, making driving along more dangerous especially as these roads are the main access to the Health Centre for Balsall Common. What this will be like once more houses are built in the vicinity I dread to think!!! In recent weeks, I've noticed more roads are having cars parked on them.	6	No change
The car parking at Berkswell Station should be dealt with as a priority.	6	No change
and certainly no multi-storey car parking at the station	6	No change
Parking at Berkswell Railway Station should also be increased by the provision by the provision of two-tier parking which can be provided much more cheaply than a multi-storey design. This will alleviate parking in Hall Meadow Road. This parking should be paid for by any developers building in the vicinity of the station and must be provided before any such development takes place and should be for the sole use of railway users. Overflow station parking should also be included on any development in close proximity to the station at the developer's expense.	6	No change
Whilst I appreciate more housing is required in the vicinity of Balsall Common, adequate	6	No change

parking must surely be allocated in railway station etc. before any expansion is commenced as the village is already saturated from lack of sufficient parking and safety concerns prevail.		
Berkswell Station car parking: is utterly inadequate. Consequently, Hall Meadow Road has become an overflow. There is unused land at the rear of the car park which belongs to a rail company and this should be compulsory purchased by Berkswell Parish and the car park enlarged (many rail users travel from other areas outside Berkswell and Balsall as there is no charge).	6	No change
3. Yes, we need more car parking for the station - it's getting ridiculous, lines of parking on the road. However, you must surely realise that the traffic comes into the village from elsewhere because they get free parking - can't see why the adjoining field is not purchased and turned into another car park. Also, the land at the back of the car park at present should be used as additional parking.	6	No change
2. Train travel will peak (if it hasn't already - the increased number of cars parking on Hall Meadow Road coincided with a change to the train timetable) with more using skype, video conferencing as well as more working from home. Cars could continue to park on Hall meadow Road, double yellow lines painted where appropriate (within the vicinity of the traffic island and along Station Road to the brow of the hill). Wooden posts / low metal railings would prevent further destruction of the grass verges. Definitely not a multi-storey	6	No change

carp park - no visual amenity and not in keeping with the rest of the environment.		
Parking near stations needs to be addressed prior to any work commencing on HS2. If additional parking is not found any future housing developments near the station will inherit overflow parking problems.	6	No change
It would appear that the operational service land alongside the station car park and former siding now used as operational storage land could easily be extended as was the case at Tile Hill Station which would not require any additional road infrastructure so B7 would not appear to be looked at closely enough.	6	No change
I do not support a multi-storey car park at the station. I'm sure this will only incur parking charges.	6	No change
Hall Meadow Road is constantly being used as a car park during weekdays (Green verges being parked on and being used as walk ways). Berkswell Station needs urgently improved parking facilities.	6	No change
A pity the opportunity to increase parking for Berkswell Station was not taken when developing Riddings Hill.	6	No change
Increased parking at and around Berkswell Station is desperately required to accommodate those moving to new housing developments in Balsall Common.	6	No change
I fully support extra parking at the station and if possible the centre of Balsall Common.	6	No change
B& - car park for Berkswell station is a very good idea. The area is already developed enough, increasing the housing development, would increase the levels of traffic in the area	6	No change

B7 - A very good idea more car parking for station	6	No change
More parking - station parking a disgrace	6	No change
Where the cars currently park on the road by the GP surgery there are wide green verges which could be removed, and proper parking spaces provided for rail users, all along the road as this is not a busy road and it would alleviate the current parking problem	6	No change
An extension to the railway car park is vital.	6	No change
Concerned with parking at Berkswell train station.	6	No change
Additional requirements for increased cycle storage capacity at Berkswell Station, currently only 8-10 spaces and used to capacity on weekdays. Fully supportive of initiatives to encourage cycling to station. At present, network rail threatens to remove cycles locked outside the full cycle shelter.	6	No change
No multi-storey car park at the train station - encourage people to walk or cycle.	6	No change
Enlarge the station car park.	6	No change
Local infrastructure needs to be improved and extended if new housing is scheduled, e.g. parking at the station	6	No change
Pleased to read proposals to deal with serious parking problems at Berkswell Station.	6	No change
Need to improve parking at the station to alleviate access to GP surgery in Hall Meadow Road	6	No change
The number of commuters using the local train line would also increase and as the	6	No change

current station car park is inadequate this would need to be addressed also.			
I do not support the build of a multi-storey car park at the station - there are existing 'brown' spaces that could be considered and explored ahead of a significant new building that is not in keeping and does not support local residents.	6		No change
It is very obvious that even doubling the car parking facility at Berkswell station would not accommodate the number of people who would prefer to travel by rail to Birmingham or Coventry. The number of vehicles parked on the highway during the working week gives some indication of this, but does not even include many people with mobility issues who would like to use the station, but are deterred by the present inadequate parking situation.	6		No change
We definitely support any plans to improve and extend parking to create a multi-storey car park of some sort at the station.	6		No change
1. The current village centre is congested and dangerous. Recent development on the Co-op car parking area seems to have removed what little scope there was to improve this.	7	Noted.	No change
Before any development commences, it is critical that parking facilities in Balsall Centre are increased and not by the proposal to reduce footpath widths and designate spaces	7	These comments relate to an area which is predominantly outside Berkswell Parish. The objectives of the 1 st draft NDP provide that Berkswell PC will work with Balsall PC on these issues with Balsall PC taking the lead. The Balsall PC NDP is not as far advanced as the	No change

<p>in what is currently the centre of Station Road. An increase in the number of spaces is required. The cost of the increased parking in Balsall Village Centre should be met by any developers building within the village boundary. An investigation into all infrastructure, including all mains services should also be conducted and any increase in supply required as a result must be completed before any development is allowed.</p>		<p>Berkswell NDP but will no doubt move forward in due course. Nevertheless these concerns about Balsall Common village have been sent to Balsall Parish Council for their information and consideration.</p>	
<p>Whilst I appreciate more housing is required in the vicinity of Balsall Common, adequate parking must surely be allocated in areas of the village before any expansion is commenced as the village is already saturated from lack of sufficient parking and safety concerns prevail.</p>	7		No change
<p>Car parking in Balsall Common Shopping area needs a drastic re-think, which may mean demolition of some of the existing shops to create a more efficient traffic flow solution. I know this will be costly, but any other solution would be a "fudge".</p>	7		No change
<p>Car parking adjacent to shopping centre in Station Road would be improved if chevron instead of existing could be adopted as with the present vehicles, one cannot always see approaching traffic.</p>	7		No change
<p>Already congested, parking for station along Lavender Hall Lane is blocking pavements for pedestrian and disabled access. HS2 will also be nearby. Better cycle storage at station may decrease car use to there.</p>	8	<p>Comments on issues 8 and 9</p> <p>These issue relate to existing highways which are outside the scope of an NDP.</p>	No change

Please consider a path and/or cycle lane to safely connect Coventry Road to Broad Lane. Cyclists/runners/walkers risk their lives attempting that stretch of road. Thank you.	8	The NDP has identified some improvements to current cycleways and footpaths to link up with potential new routes from possible new housing development. The PC has already obtained a formal "Assurance" from HS2 that they will connect the current Greenway to Station Road as part of the HS2 project. Other concepts are included as a vision and the PC plans to work with SMBC highways, grant giving organisations and developers to move this vision forward. There is however a limit on what can be achieved with the resources available. The precise details will evolve over time and suggestions can be considered as housing development occurs.	
Please consider a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists and runners to safely navigate the length of road connecting Coventry Road and Broad Lane. It would be a god-send for many people. Thank you very much.	8		No change
We hope the final connection to link Greenway with Station Road get done quickly.	8		No change
Footpath for Windmill Lane from Windmill Park to Kelsey Lane, increased traffic flow to Kenilworth Road has made it dangerous to walk to the bus stop	8		No change
Windmill Lane desperately needs a footpath from Windmill Park to Kelsey Lane (or continue footpath from Hoblane down to Windmill Park) to enable residents to walk safely to the bus stop, especially due to increase in traffic through to Kenilworth Road	8		No change
A path to walk to Balsall Common, I live in Benton Green Lane and there is no safe way to walk. Warwickshire are doing it in Red Lane	8		No change
Please encourage cycling more; I feel we lost out when the Kenilworth Greenway was never completed to Berkswell.	8		No change
Planned cycleways very welcome; particularly extension of Greenway to Station Road allowing easier means to avoid use of the A452 to Kenilworth (too narrow and twisty for	8		No change

safe cycling by even experienced cyclists). Hope HS2 delivers on an acceptable alternative Greenway route.			
The plan should include traffic calming measures. Windmill Lane is currently used as a short-cut through. Balsall Common - with cars travelling at speed, in a residential area.	9		No change
If you want to facilitate the health of people and (children) in Berkswell village, why have you not done something about the volume of traffic and pollution that is caused by toxic fumes, mainly by 4x4s and other vehicles (not driven by residents), but parents who some could easily walk to school..	9		No change
I have particular concerns about any increase in housing development without major changes in the infrastructure. Back Lane has shown a significant increase in traffic since the expansion of Warwick Uni Business Park and increased housing in Banner Brook Park. Speed restrictions are generally not adhered to. Making, what was, a quiet country road, a major 'cut through'	9		No change
Necessity for neighbourhood policy and traffic control.	9		No change
Thank you for your work on the plan. Policy B9. A pedestrian link between the end of Baulk Lane and the station would be very helpful.	9		No change
What about the land at the side of St Peters church, please do not build on this green space. To take my dog or grandchildren, I'm having to walk further and further to get to a bit of grass in this countryside.	10	Issues in category 10 comments These issues relate to Balsall Parish and are therefore out of scope for the Berkswell Parish	No change

<p>This whole development should be made to have as little impact on existing residents as possible. Thought should be made to improve the Balsall Common shopping areas - very run-down disgrace.</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>NDP. This report will be shared with Balsall PC for their consideration.</p>	
<p>Does not include improved rural support for outlying areas - bus route is unreliable from Balsall to Chadwick End leaving gaps in service. This causes us issues attending in both directions for study and work - waiting up to 2.5 hours for service to arrive. Protection of Greenway is important to us as we use this regularly for exercise and gain access to countryside.</p>	<p>10</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>2. Cycle path on Kenilworth Road was created without consultation with residents and has now become an unofficial car park.</p>	<p>10</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>The car parking in the village and at Berkswell Station should be dealt with as a priority.</p>	<p>10</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>I would also like to protect the Holly Lane Playing Fields as a green space</p>	<p>10</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>Whilst I agree with your planning principles, I am sceptical of your ability to enforce them. Personally, I would also like to ensure that the Holly Lane Field is protected, and the station development includes appropriate upgrading of the access roads and does not adversely affect the adjacent lanes.</p>	<p>10</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>REFERENCE LOCAL GREEN SPACES - Proposal: that the public open space between Greenfield Avenue and Dengate Drive, be given Park Status and the area designated Parkland, with clearly defined and protected boundaries.</p>	<p>10</p>		<p>No change</p>

<p>1. I would like a better selection of shops - no more supermarkets - more privately-owned ones if this is possible. There is a need for a good Fruit and Vegetable, the such as "John Richards" (like the one in Kenilworth). Years ago, there was a much better selection of shops as to what we have at the present time. Why do we have to have a Costa Coffee Shop next door to the Deli and why a Tesco Express shop on one side of Station Road and directly opposite "The One Shop"? It does not make sense to me. 2. There is a need for a Zebra Crossing in Station Road. Elderly residents and people with poor mobility find it very difficult to cross the road, especially at the busy times, especially Saturdays. 3. No more restaurants and eating places are needed. 5. More car parking near the shops. 6. There is a need to encourage young people to stay in the village and use the shops.</p>	10	No change
<p>. The comment "Improve the Shopping Area" is puzzling when it is overrun with hairdressers and food outlets, the florist, and drycleaners due to close!</p>	10	No change
<p>Also, more should be done to provide more car parking in the village.</p>	10	No change
<p>New roads needed to take traffic away from main road through Balsall Village - so what is going to happen with this? Playing fields on Holly Lane and also along Frog Lane should remain and not for housing!!! What are the plans for new schools? Well done to all who have worked hard on this plan but there is not enough info/details. When will we see this?</p>	10	No change

Where Holly Lane is open countryside and therefore should be left as it is. Parking is an issue but there are spaces that could be used in the centre - i.e. dentist on Station Road.		
Holly Lane should be left as it is and also along Frog Lane!!!	10	No change
Another priority is parking, especially in Balsall Common. I am surprised there are not more accidents especially outside Tesco's and One Stop.	10	No change
Congestion around Balsall shops needs to be added with additional car parking a high priority. If additional housing is approved, then cannot it be made a requirement that they provide additional car parking for station and village? Balsall is a village not a town and more vehicles come with more housing, congestion will become a problem in a village that is already splitting at the seams on local healthcare and well-being.	10	No change
It would be beneficial to agree the long-term shape of Balsall Common and underground planned changes to Green belt for a generation to avoid piecemeal incisions. It's a shame Balsall Common PC has not managed to enclose in this process. SBC should be lobbied hard for an increased share of CIL. Improved public transport links to other settlements.	10	No change
Ideas about improving access for all are great but will anything ever be done. Development plans are all well and good but action is needed against seeming intransigence of Solihull council. A small example, I have been trying since September 2016 to get a bike	10	No change

rack in Balsall village centre. One was promised, and a blue line has been drawn which is now virtually washed away as council inactivity continues. They have this policy for encouraging cycling but seem inept at providing some very cheap and basic infrastructure. When we first moved here 33 years ago there were cycle racks, but they were taken away		
We have had our fair share of building and new developments in Balsall Common, improved parking for the village shops	10	No change
These policies would work for both parishes	10	No change
I don't trust Balsall PC to completely manage the village centre	10	
There is still no mention of traffic control or calming through the village/Kenilworth Road. Strong consideration on the infrastructure to accommodate the influx of new residents living in the new housing developments. i.e. user-friendly bus service, improved or additional health centre, access to a decent supermarket. Access roads for proposed construction. The Kenilworth Road and surrounding roads will not cope	10	No change
More car park spaces are required in village centre.	10	No change
Working with Balsall PC to improve the shopping area could be by giving access along Green Lane & into underused park as a car park.	10	No change
PARKING-PARKING-PARKING! Car parking around Balsall Common is currently quite difficult. Many new extra houses = extra cars=parking made even worse. If people	10	No change

wish to shop, they will go to where they can park e.g. large supermarkets/shopping malls. This will progressively reduce "footfall" in the local shops, already faced with significant increases in Business rates and/or rents. RESULT - steady reduction in the number of "normal" community shops, further accelerating moves to the larger centres. A bleak downward spiral: Balsall Common becomes a dormitory. Any progress in the study/proposal for a central chevron parking system outside the shops? A noticeable increase in the number of large delivery vans, SUV's, and other light trucks, only raises the parking ante.....			
Find a solution to station car parking. Relieve traffic on A452 Kenilworth Road. Allow small "individual" developments even in green belt to avoid large new estates.	10		No change
I would also want to designate as Local Green Space the playing fields in Holly Lane, Willow Park in Needlers End Lane, and the green spaces around the Kemps Green / Stoneton Crescent estate to protect them from development, particularly the land between Childs Oak Close and Tidmarsh Close.	10		No change
Need to ensure that Balsall common parish NDP aligns with Berkswell's	10		No change
Since we moved to the village 30 years ago, several new housing estates have been built, centred around Balsall Common. Whilst	11		No change

Berkswell has retained its rural character, Balsall Common has expanded as a commuter village for Birmingham, Coventry, and London. The Infrastructure and leisure facilities have not been provided to support this expansion and I can see no binding offers of provision of services to meet not just the current demand but that demanded by another 800 houses.			
3. There are already significant schools in the area apart from the small pool at Balsall Primary none of these schools have easy access to swimming facilities.	11	<p>Issues in 11</p> <p>These comments and suggestions concern local infrastructure whose cost could be met by Community Infrastructure Levy payments by developers or grants from charitable bodies. A list of residents suggestions for such infrastructure from the issues and options consultation is included in appendix 5 of the 1st draft plan. The list has been reviewed against this latest consultation input and does not require modification.</p> <p>However, an outline process for moving these issues forward will be included within the next draft of the plan which will include working with Balsall PC..</p>	No change
4. Residents do not have access to drop in council sports facilities such as swimming pool, tennis courts.	11		No change
Also, the need for additional recreational facilities would be important.	11		No change
I feel that not enough provision is made to increase leisure facilities i.e. swimming etc. in line with extra population.	11		No change
There is a need for more sports facilities, especially all-weather surfaces with floodlights. This kind of thing could come from hotel development.	11		
As an 18 year old - the plan needs to take into account more social areas for young adults, a comprehensive gym and swimming pool facilities.	11		No change
A study of the Solihull Active Booklet emphasises the lack of facilities in the Berkswell Parish for all age groups. One example: -Solihull claims there are lots of	11		No change

activities, facilities and clubs available for people with disabilities in Solihull. Many are free or low cost. This assertion is not true, these amenities are only in the north of SMB, Tudor Grange (TGLC) and North Solihull Sports Centre (NSSC) are inaccessible by public transport.		
Less new housing, more recreation space, improved public right of ways	11	No change
A municipal swimming pool would be a great asset	11	No change
The land off Lavender Hall Lane (the hornets sports ground) is wasted. A municipal swimming pool would benefit most residents from very young to very old.	11	No change
I am concerned that we are lacking sufficient sports facilities in the village, I want to see any CIL funds used on a community sports centre including swimming pool and astro pitches.	11	No change
and it is also paramount to invest for future generations, and for lifestyle, sport and fitness, and social, mental and physical health for us all for years to come.	11	No change
and it is also paramount to invest for future generations, and for lifestyle, sport and fitness, and social, mental and physical health for us all for years to come.	11	No change

We would like to see more youth clubs for teenagers to encourage them not to hang around where they shouldn't.	11	No change
Leisure facilities should be part of plan. Currently no local swimming pool or gym.	11	No change
I support and agree with the content of the NDP as proposed. Under appendix 5: Improving Local Infrastructure - I believe there is significant scope and opportunity to continue to utilise Heart of England School to develop/create additional shared use facilities for students and the wider community.	11	No change
Leisure facilities could be based around hub at existing Lant community Centre and combined with Catholic field, but require upgrade for multisports facilities, improved parking / access	11	No change
I also think that the NDP should emphasise and prioritise the importance of providing new sporting facilities in the area as a condition of further development. In order to add houses we need to ensure that all residents can continue to enjoy a healthy lifestyle - something that will be reduced by additional housing as many of the paths and green spaces that exist currently will be taken away. The plan also talks about traffic management...but it should be noted that a	11	No change

<p>significant number of journeys take place in order to access leisure and health facilities enjoyed at other locations. This will only increase as the size of the population of Balsall Common grows. If the plan can clearly outline the need to develop both indoor (swimming, gym and sport hall etc) and outdoor (4G football, off road biking etc) as well as further invest in existing facilities such as the football club, rugby club, cricket club and others...all clubs can be expected to grow with additional houses and families moving in...Therefore the plan should very clearly express this as a condition of further growth.</p>			
<p>1) Any building here should be on fields where currently there are no footpaths and therefore, no public access. This means no loss to the community.</p>	12	<p>The 1st draft plan provides specific green space per 1000 residents in line with the Solihull Green spaces strategy policy B3.4. This will provide suitable access for the community to appropriate green space designed in an appropriate manner as defined draft policy B3. Requiring existing footpaths to be retained would be overly restrictive and developers might simply choose to use them as tarmacked pavement. The diversion/elimination of public rights of way will in any case require Solihull Council approval and will form part of the creation of acceptable green spaces layout as required by policy B3</p>	No change
<p>B1 does not mention access for cars from main roads, and it should be made clear to the council that narrow toads/lanes (e.g. Meeting House Lane, Barrett's Lane, and</p>	12	<p>Already included in policy B1 1.e.. Position of this requirement to be re-ordered to place it in a more logical position.</p>	No change

Sunnyside Lane) should be avoided for exit/entrance points from new development.			
I would like to see draft policy B1 include mention of housing resizing opportunities for older residents - this seems to be absent?	12	Already included in policy B1 5.a.	No change
I don't see how you achieve integration when you say you will put green space between old and new housing.	12	Lavender Hall Park is used by both the residents of Riddings Hill development which was the development that enabled Lavender Hall park and other village residents who walk to the park down Green Lane in the south or drive and use the car park in the north of the park.	No change
Block Meeting House Lane Off at the church. This "lane" being used as a short cut / rat run. Many people walk, cycle and use horses. The "Lane" has no pavement for most of it. This road should not be used as any kind of access for new developments and traffic calming needs to be included in any future building works within the parish. If Nothing less it should be one way only.	12	Draft policy B1 covers access and this issue is covered in B1.2	No change
I feel it's imperative we have adequate green space, as we will potentially be losing so many fields. Each new development should, where possible, be bordered by a green space to also aid community integrating.	12	This is covered by 1 st draft plan policies B1 and B3	No change
If you put green space between old and new housing, how on earth does this encourage integration and community - seems to me it is a barrier.	12	The green space is as per the Solihull Council green spaces strategy and used for recreation. It can be observed in Lavender Hall Park. It gives both existing and new residents a stake in the new development,	No change
These proposals seem designed primarily to preserve Berkswell as it is and for any housing etc developments to take place	12	The Solihull Plan draft housing proposals propose that about 70% of the new housing in Balsall Common is placed within Berkswell	No change

without Berkswell. There is clearly a need for more housing and each parish village should take its appropriate share		Parish. This comment by the respondent is not true because the Berkswell Parish NDP is silent upon the location of new housing although it clearly shows the SMBC housing proposals for the parish in appendix 2.	
More focus on 2/3-bedroom houses and not the expensive 5 bed executive houses we keep seeing.	12	Housing mix is covered in section 5 of 1 st draft plan policy B1	No change
Prevent over development of plots i.e. 4 bed house into 6 flats.	12	Draft policy B1 section 4 provides a height limitation for new development. Impacts on local character and density of development are also considerations in planning applications (see Policy B3 Built character criterion 3).	No change
As much green space as possible should be kept and any housing should be in keeping with current properties and sympathetic to the area and surrounds as they currently are - sprawling mass housing estates is not appealing to those of us who have chosen to buy a property in a semi-rural setting with countryside all around (preserving our countryside is important).	12	Covered by policy B3 landscape character paragraph 4. This section will be moved to Policy B1 to integrate with other green space requirements	No change
Allow significantly more small developments rather than larger estates	12	SMBC determine the land released from greenbelt for housing and hence the size of the land areas. Draft NDP policy B1 Layouts and Accessibility provides policies to ensure that layouts are broken up into areas of about 250 properties broken into character areas of about 20 homes. To promote community cohesion and security	No change
We do not need any more traffic on Meeting House Lane, it is already proving to be dangerous to pedestrians	12	Access to new developments is covered by policy B1 Layouts and accessibility	No change

Definitely concerned about any discussion on access is developments on over busy Meeting House Lane	12		No change
Houses need to be built in the area for both young people and existing residents who wish to downsize. These should be affordable not the high prices of most of the new builds. If too many areas are designated green belt where are new houses going? If there isn't a Neighbourhood plan the council can impose one on the area which most likely will be to the detriment of the residents. Not in my backyard is not an option.	12	The green space allocation in developments will be in line with the SMBC green spaces strategy. The quantity of affordable housing is defined in Solihull policy as 40% in the current plan and proposed as 50% in their draft plan	No change
I fully support efforts within the plan to retain green spaces and protect wildlife within the local area. It is vital that the rural nature of Berkswell and Balsall Common is preserved and that we do not irrevocably damage precious local habitats. It is very important to me and too many local residents that any new development is undertaken in a way that is sympathetic to the current character of Berkswell and Balsall Common and that plenty of green space is retained and landscaping undertaken so that we do not become an urban sprawl	12	Covered by draft policies B1 and B3	No change
One of the most important things to my family, neighbours and me is that access to new developments and the impact on the local	12	Covered by draft policy B1	No change

road network is carefully thought through and managed. It is vital to the safety and wellbeing of existing residents that access to new developments is from suitable main roads and not smaller residential roads and lanes. I am particularly keen that Meeting House Lane where I live does not have an access point on it to the Barretts Farm development.			
Electric charge points for cars on new housing estates also	12	This issue is covered in draft policy B1.4.c	No change
Policy B3 if area of Barratts Lane open to flooding, get developer to make a feature - c/f NEC..	12	Covered by policy B1 Landscaping and Drainage	No change
In any new development there should be provision of space for recycling and waste bins to be covered, especially outside the terraced houses where they often sit prominently at the front of the properties e.g. Riddings Hill.	12	Covered by draft policy B1 Building Design Principles	No change
Insist on trees in streets in developments	12	A new point that had not been incorporated. Woods had been but not street trees. Draft policy B3 will be amended	Draft policy B3 will be amended
Protect the Berkswell Windmill and ensure no development on Site 3 or within the vicinity of this historic monument.	12	The protection of heritage assets is covered by draft policy B4	No change.

Protect the Berkswell Windmill and ensure no development on Site 3 or within the vicinity of this historic monument.	12	The protection of heritage assets is covered by draft policy B4	No change
Barratt's Farmland: I would like to see either Green Areas reserved here or a proportionate % of acreage reserved as GREN SPACE.	12	This is covered by draft policy B3.4 (note this sub policy will be moved to B1 in the next draft)	No change
In addition to the green spaces mentioned in Q4, would it also be possible to include a specific measure of green space to be included in housing numbers eg. 100 houses require x acres of green space for recreational utilisation by the community? I think this would ensure on-going provision of appropriate amounts of recreational green space for the future in addition to focussing on the two areas already identified.	12	A specific measure is included within Policy B3. A review has concluded for easy of understanding that this should be moved to policy B1.	No change
Developing sport/recreation facilities helps put heart into the community and contact between people. Green areas within easy public access should be encouraged - not putting 'play area' on the opposite side of the road to houses - as per Needlers End Lane in Balsall Common.	12	This requirement is covered in policy B1 and B3	No change
Public access to the back garden fences of existing dwellings could cause issues of nuisance and vandalism. Open space between old and new settlements could create islands of development and unnecessary use of green belt land and would	12	This has not been the case on Riddings Hill development. Generally provision of public open spaces between existing and new developments should	No change

not necessarily promote community integration. It would be better to aim - where appropriate - for generous provision of domestic curtilage between the existing and the new developments		support community integration and would reflect the local character of suburban areas.	
1. Draft policy B1 seems skewed towards large scale housing. Should the 'general principles' also cover small scale individual housing proposals which may come forward?	12	Draft policy B1 covers both and large and small developments, in particular Building Design Principles and natural environment	No change
Map is too small and does not include path and width of HS2. It's not safe to use for cyclists and pedestrians.	14	The PC does not understand this point. The current greenway is safely used by cyclists . There is no reason to believe that the new link to be provided by HS2 will not be of a suitable width. In any case it is out of scope of the NDP	No change
Ensure that cycle ways are suitable for pedestrians too - walkers and joggers.	14	This is an issue for SMBC Highways standards and out of scope.	No change
Improved multi-modal transport options - e.g., traffic free pedestrian/cycle paths.	14	This forms part of the NDP vision and draft policy B9	No change
Since I moved here 7 years ago. I have noticed, along with increased housing, it has brought more vandalism to private and public property, more youths in the village at night and crazy driving. We residents need to feel also that our way of life is not jeopardised by increased development with more families that cannot be controlled	15	An NDP cannot control who resides in new housing	No change
Prioritising safety of the children accessing Berkswell School is essential.	18	There is a separate survey of residents views on the parking and traffic calming measures in Berkswell village. These views will be analysed in depth, discussed with SMBC Highways department and a final plan produced. That commitment will be given in the 2 nd draft plan appendix 4.	No change
Meriden Road - option 1 - with zebra is best option.	18		No change
I will support 2 if there are significant improvements in the parking/draining and traffic calming in the village. At the moment	18		No change

bringing up more people towards the village would resort in more chaos.		
The zebra crossing is required as I have 3 children that are expected to cross the road. At some point a child will be killed as there is no crossing and the speed of traffic.	18	No change
There is a real danger to families with several children trying to cross from The Bear to the school. The traffic is too fast, and I have witnessed several "near misses" when a child has stepped out into the road. A safe place to cross is absolutely imperative to ensure the children's safety. The proposed footpath along Meriden Road and traffic calming would go a long way to help with the safety issues.	18	No change
Item 3 agree but parking for the use needs to be considered and provided for this and church use to stop parking in the road. Better leisure will more use and more cars	18	No change
We have 2 columns each side of the road denoting Berkswell that are a danger to traffic, but still no traffic calming measures at Berkswell cross roads	18	No change
Permits for car outside the school for resident and school staff. The parents have permission to park in the Bear Car Park, to drop off and to collect the children. Suggest calming measures down Meadow Road, cars are still speeding through Berkswell village. Any chance for a footpath from the crossroads, Backs Lane and Cornets End Lane, down to the Heart of England social club.	18	No change
Not sure if it is part of this process but I feel that it is vitally important to address the traffic	18	No change

issues through Berkswell village, then amount of commuter traffic, and the speed of drivers. In the USA, for crossroads they use a system where all approaching roads have to stop and give way, in turn, and this seems to work really well as it gives fair access and slows the traffic down in the process, perhaps the commuters would look for alternative routes if they were delayed for a few seconds! Keep up the good work!			
I support using the alms houses garden to accommodate a footpath along Lavender Hall Lane I would support initiatives to make better use of the land at the end of Pound Close.	18		No change
I agree entirely with the Draft Vision.	19	The PC appreciates these comments of support.	No change
Good plan, well thought out but long	19	The supplementary comments about parish boundaries and tree maintenance on Hallmeadow Road are noted but out of scope of the NDP	No change
I agree with draft vision for Berkswell Parish N.D.P	19		No change
I agree with the draft vision of the NDP	19		No change
Needs to be looked at as concept plan. Something on the lines of Riddings Hill. With access roads serving the whole of the new estate. New development having green space areas and wildlife areas, which has been seen to be very successful.	19		No change
Fully support draft policy B7 - this is getting ridiculous and parking along Hall Meadow is dangerous, irresponsible, and damaging the verges.	19		No change
We strongly support policy B6 (mainly for our own ends). We are keen to purchase one of	19		No change

the proposed new dwellings by the crossroads. However, many appear to be opposed to new dwelling development. We think it important to develop the village sympathetically for the future.		
This is a well-drawn up plan to reduce this impact of a lot of new houses and make it better for all concerned. Those living in the Parish and newcomers to the area. My additional concern is Balsall Centre this with more population will not cope.	19	No change
2. Like the idea of cycle link between Berkswell and Balsall.	19	No change
Need to go for a complete fields width between MHL/Kelsey Lane, Barrett's Lane, and Beverley Close/Sunnyside to follow the successful Riddings Hills development. Needs a full concept plan to be developed to allow new constructions in Berkswell Parish especially adjacent to the existing residential zones. Piecemeal development results in a mess which residents and new residents will have to live with for years.	19	
Congratulations to those who produced the Plan. It covers most aspects of our rural area accurately. We need more trees as investments into the future. Financial ??? are good - or to allow children to develop naturally by understanding the requirements of self and all aspects of the "Blue Planet" Selection planting, maintenance of trees in Berkswell are conspicuously absent when developers sell off their "gains" to builders. Agriculture is also to blame by uprooting hedges and using deadly chemicals to clean land. The trees	19	No change

along ??? meadow Road are an eyesore apart from the old hedgerow oaks. This demonstrates the need for planners to place documents for consultations with local people and insist that proper standards are required before consent be permitted. We will benefit both financially and retain our gift of the natural world. "Even in the midst of World War 1, birdsong and the poppy blocked out some of the horror. "Gravel pits in Berkswell have been used sensitively and creatively by packing in estates and made into nationally accepted havens for wildlife. This shows what can be done with hard work, dedication, and love for our rural heritage.		
4. I would like to see more 2 and 3-bedroom houses at reasonable prices.	19	No change
Any new development must provide adequate onsite parking by providing a minimum of 2x off-road spaces plus additional visitor and additional parking within any development as existing highways do not have capacity for extra parking.	19	No change
If we have to have a share of new housing it might be better if small housing estate were built on green belt on outside of Balsall Common. No large housing estate please with winding roads through as these type of estate act as rat runs for young mad drivers and clever car owners trying to dodge the traffic queues. We need the main road to flow quickly and quietly.	19	No change
Please see comments on enclosed document. Thank you to everyone involved in creating such a robust plan in such a	19	No change

comparatively short timescale - great teamwork!		
A very thorough and informative document.	19	No change
A good plan. Green space between new and old houses is a good idea. The proposed cycle path connecting to the Kenilworth Greenway would be a fantastic addition to the area.	19	No change
We support the vision and objectives of the NDP on new property developments as long as not built too close to existing housing which may affect their scenic views	19	No change
Thanks for all the hard work and a well thought through vision	19	No change
Excellent document, clear and highly informative allowing residents to make an informed input to the consultation process	19	No change
Excellent clear document	19	No change
The development plan is ideal and very sensible but will be difficult to achieve in practice	19	No change
My thanks to the Berkswell NDP committee for their sterling work on behalf of myself and the other residents..	19	No change
All objectives appear reasonable. Hope they are adopted.	19	No change
I feel it is vital to maintain open spaces and prevent Berkswell and Balsall Common becoming a suburb! It is also necessary to improve the infrastructure that goes with any increased population - this should be within the new developments and not in our green spaces. I have lived in Balsall Common for 37 years and do not want the area to become a	19	No change

commuter town, this would spoil the country feel of our area. The character of the area was important when choosing to live here.		
I consider this outline of the first draft most commendable for Berkswell	19	No change
Yes, I wholeheartedly agree with the Berkswell parish NDP and congratulate those involved in its compilation. However, I still find it very disappointing that there is not a joint response from both Berkswell and Balsall Common parishes if there is not unanimity between both parishes on the approach to development within the area represented by both parishes, there is a great danger that SMBC will adopt a 'divide and conquer' policy e.g. the issue of infrastructure (objective 10) is just one key example where a joint approach is of paramount importance	19	No change
Thank you to the team for their hard efforts in producing the first NDP	19	No change
Living in this area provides me and my family with excellent schools, adequate leisure facilities and access to the countryside. Local shops provide me with basic requirements but Balsall Common shopping area is not a pleasant place to use and, living in Berkswell village means I have to drive there as access is too poor to do otherwise, there being no footpaths. I am glad this may be addressed through the NDP. Traffic movements in the centre of both villages is too fast and inconsiderate and I am pleased this is to be	19	No change

looked at in Berkswell. This is predominantly a rural economy and living within it is very important to everyone: if houses must be built in the parish then as much green space should be retained as possible between existing properties in Balsall common and within the new development. Thanks to Berkswell PC for leadership here.		
The Draft Plans look reasonable and sensible and without reservation I support them	19	No change
We must resist the developers whose only intent is the making of profit. The villages of Berkswell and Balsall common cannot take any more development. In addition the impending HS2 will devastate the environment. There are insufficient facilities for young people in the village. The new housing is unaffordable and not required. Although I have ticked in support of the planning policies I am strongly opposed to any more building and also back garden developments.	19	No change
Good and helpful documents. I have saved you 70p doing it on line	19	No change
I'd like to see a walkway or cycleway between Berkswell and Balsall prioritised. I think this would greatly enhance the quality of life for Berkswell parish residents: 1. It would mean	19	No change

<p>that children from the Riddings Hill estate could walk /cycle to school reducing the traffic in Berkswell at peak times 2. It would mean Berkswell residents are less reliant on their cars to reach local amenities Result - healthier happier residents!</p>		
<p>In line with your objectives, land off Lavender hall lane is off a main road, and is ready for development. The remaining green space opposite is adequate for that area, and parking has space to be extended. Football activities should all take place there as there is adequate space available. The land at MHL again, in line with your policy objective, is the ONLY patch on the southern side of the village and provides a small buffer between the older development and the new - currently under proposal for land off Barrett's lane. More green space needs to be provided for that area as so much open and free space will be lost on that side of the village currently used quite extensively by residents on this end of the village, soon to be cut off and spoiled by HS2.</p>	19	No change
<p>I do support the vision and proposed planning policies (Questions 1&2) however please ensure that priority is given to brownfield land rather than green belt for new developments</p>	19	No change

I do support the vision and proposed planning policies (Questions 1&2) however please ensure that priority is given to brownfield land rather than green belt for new developments	19	No change
I do support the vision and proposed planning policies (Questions 1&2) however please ensure that priority is given to brownfield land rather than green belt for new developments	19	No change
Well-presented document	19	No change
Excellent work. Balsall PC should just copy it	19	No change
Well done for all the hard work to produce such a good plan	19	No change
Existing green land, and the protection of Berkswell Church land and the Windmill must be secured. It is obvious that given the proposed developments, we will no longer remain a rural village. However, rurality is one of the features that draw us to live here, therefore protection of green spaces are paramount	19	No change
I fully support the proposals in the draft NDP that Berkswell Parish Council has instigated.	19	No change
I fully support the proposals in the draft NDP that Berkswell Parish Council has instigated. I trust Berkswell Parish Council to protect the	19	No change

Greenbelt and ensure green and open spaces are protected.			
I fully support the proposals in the draft NDP that Berkswell Parish Council has instigated. I trust Berkswell Parish Council to protect the Greenbelt and ensure green and open spaces are protected.	19		No change
I fully support the most vigorous of activities to protect and preserve the cultural, historical, and rural aspects of Berkswell Parish. This is in addition to containing the damage caused by HS2.	19		No change
I strongly support the plan helping to retain the rural nature of the current Berkswell Parish. Whilst we want to continue to attract young couples and families to live (especially our own adult children) & work here, this must be balanced with keeping the villages as villages.	19		No change
I think the draft NDP is an excellent piece of work and fully support the proposals contained in it.	19		No change
However, I feel all building on current green belt should be opposed.	20	These comments relate to the selection of land from the greenbelt for housing. It is the responsibility of the planning authority, in our case Solihull Council, to determine green belt boundaries and an NDP must be in	No change
Finally, any planning should take account of the government's recent statements of damage by pollution to health (especially emissions from cars on children) and the fact	20		No change

that the housing minister and the PM have followed the previous housing minister (Gavin Barwell) in stating that no development should occur on green belt land unless every other possibility has been investigated, and then only minimal building should be allowed.		conformance with the Local Plan produced by the planning authority.	
The Lavender Hall Lane site in particular is better used for housing than taking up agricultural land	20	A NDP cannot alter the housing plans of a Local Plan produced by a planning authority such as Solihull Council hence these comments are out of scope of an NDP.	No change
Allow sensible development of green belt.	20		No change
Additional thought - review Brownfield Land review adjacent east side of railway - Lavender hall Lane - new crossing over WCML needed	20		No change
Need to protect the green belt	20		No change
I do not want to see additional development in the village at the volume that has been rumoured. It is a village and should remain so. Too much development will ruin the village feel and make it less attractive to live in.	20		No change
The preservation of Green Space and Green Belt should be paramount.	20		No change
Leave it as green belt	20		No change
Preservation of the green belt area is vital to maintain the nature of the area and to preserve the environmental assets. Can waste bins be located in the laybys and emptied regularly in regular litter picks. Fly tipping needs addressing	20		No change
Preservation of green belt very important also to have suitable infrastructure so as not to	20		

overload rural lanes e.g. Back Lane, Lavender Hall Lane etc		
Reject more housing in the Meriden Gap.	20	No change
No more building in Berkswell or Balsall Common.	20	No change
Berkswell and Balsall cannot sustain any more mass growth without a major bypass and protected green belt.	20	No change
Too many houses, overcrowded.	20	No change
No more development whatsoever. Too many houses in Berkswell and Balsall Common. Quality of life is most important. What about flooding! Too many people in the country. Population control first. No need for more houses.	20	No change
I can't support the NDP as i am opposed to any form of development in the green belt.	20	No change
Enough is enough. We do not require further development in the village. Do not have the infrastructure. No building on green belt land.	20	No change
No further development required. Let's keep it a village. No building on green belt land.	20	No change
Ensure that any development within the Parish and across the Borough of Solihull takes place on Previously developed land. And not green belt, gardens or green fields. Protect green fields and wildlife habitats.	20	No change
Ensure that any development within the Parish and across the Borough of Solihull takes place on Previously developed land.	20	No change

And not green belt, gardens or green fields. Protect green fields and wildlife habitats.			
Plant thick hedge/trees along HS2 route to keep the village quiet!	21	These two comments relate to HS2 and are therefore out of scope of a NDP. As a point of information, HS2 will be providing noise barriers for almost the entire length of the new line as it passes through the parish. In terms of housing allocations under the Solihull Plan review it is for Solihull Council to take HS2 into consideration for their local plan update.	No change
A consideration of the impact of the construction of HS2 appears to be omitted e.g. implications arising from the proposed route on possible development of housing areas and/or local green space designations.	21		No change
I do not agree with the conversion of former agricultural buildings to provide housing. Green land should remain as that.	22	Such conversions are allowed by national planning policy and cannot be restricted by an NDP.	No change
Should we be encouraging agriculture/farming to reduce food miles?	22	This is outside the scope of an NDP	No change
It is a shame that agricultural buildings are converted to homes instead of being offered to young people who are desperate to find a small farm to commence their journey in agriculture. The cost of starting out in agriculture is too often prohibitive for many young people, and that's how traditionally rural communities lose their farms because of conversion to housing. Perhaps if farm buildings have to be converted they could be offered to young people working in agriculture, who need homes close to their place of work because of the unsocial hours often worked? Village Farm, Berkswell being a prime example!!	22	This is outside the scope of an NDP.	No change

What about Riddings Hill Have you asked the residents of Riddings Hill whether they feel the planning of their development 'meets the highest standards' - when I visit that development, it always feels too cramped in with not enough space for parking. This also conflicts with your policy B8.	23	Policy B8 provides for improved parking standards on developments because of the issues of parking referred to in this comment	No change
Adequate car parking is a must for all new residential development.	23	We note this support for draft policy B8	No change
Additional car parking allocations...will this add to the flooding risk in the area?	23	Drainage issues and the permeability of hard surfaces are covered in draft policy B1,3c.	No change
B8 I'm not sure whether cycle storage would be used but ensuring enough car parking spaces is important. So many new estates are difficult to drive around due to parking on the roads and pavements.	23	We note the support for draft policy B8	No change
I think the vision and objectives are backward-looking, unambitious, restrictive and nimby-ism at its worst. Simply protecting our interests in a pointless, time consuming bureaucratic charade of democracy in action.	24	Not accepted. The NDP has been prepared through extensive community consultation, led by local people and it provides a positive planning framework to guide new development in the parish over the plan period.	No change
2) Under Objective 4, I feel it is not sufficient to state "to retain wildlife habitat". Where green belt fields are lost, more ponds, trees and hedges should be provided. Recent news items have highlighted the perilous state of British wildlife in the number of hugely declining species.	24	Draft policies B1.6, B1.3 and B3 are specifically designed to provide the implementation mechanism for draft objective 4	No change.
Under Objective 12 - this point is crucial in meeting current and future needs. How can	24	A NDP cannot dictate detailed shop/private sector service/shop provision. Balsall Common	No change

massive housing developments be contemplated when, after May, there will be no banks in the village? The business planning must take account of real needs, and not allow any business who chooses to be established.		centre falls predominantly within Balsall Parish and their NDP will cover policies to retain the vibrancy of the centre. Our objectives say Berkswell Parish Council will support this.	
NDP Objectives: 5. Plus support any heritage aspects in Balsall Common. 7. Plus compatible with safe pedestrian route. 12. Shopping area to expand to meet needs of any new housing. Planning Policies: B4 - Plus local green space as part of any new housing. B5 - Plus any buildings of architectural merit in Balsall Common.	24	Objective 5 specifically requires the protection of heritage assets across the whole parish. This includes Balsall Common. Draft policy B5 specifically concerns the conservation area within Berkswell village. Policy B3 is designed to provide protection for heritage assets across the rest of the parish including that part of Balsall Common which is within Berkswell Parish. Draft policy B4 is about designating as Local Green Space specific areas of existing green space. The provision of new green space within new housing developments is provided for in draft policy B3 although that provision will be moved to draft policy B1 to eliminate any possibility for confusion.	No change
Look again at possible public transport to Kenilworth (our nearest town)	25	Public transport is out of scope of a NDP however the plan supports travel which is not reliant on the private car.	No change
Also, ensure a suitable bus service is established to the station and the surgery.	25		No change
I see a significant problem with litter, mainly plastic bottles. Those who benefit from using the land (i.e. the Hornets) should clear the mess they create.	26	The collection of litter is not within scope of a NDP	No change
4. Green spaces should include provision for re-cycling litter.	26		
3. IS there a plan for how it will be used. Who might maintain it or pay for its maintenance - who would own it? Whilst I'd like it to remain and I use it myself for short-cut during dog-	27	The ongoing maintenance of existing public open space is provided by Solihull Council.	No change

walking - it seems underused and in need of maintenance. 4. I'd like to see it remain, while walking in this area		Maintenance of Local Green Space is not a planning matter but new public open spaces provided as part of new development schemes will be required to provide a management plan.	
2. The green space centred around Lavender Hall Lane is fairly well maintained but the other two green spaces, Meeting House Land and Needlers End appear neglected.	27		No change
Whilst obviously desirable who will be responsible for the public liability, maintenance and cost there of the proposed green buffer zones between developments?	27		No change
My reservations about policy B1 sect 2.9 have been given on previous occasions. There needs to be a long-term maintenance agreement for any green spaces.	27		No change
I am very sad that Berkswell and Balsall Common are not limited as one council to work for the whole communities	28	After Balsall Parish Council withdrew from the joint NDP a set of principles were agreed to co-ordinate the two NDPs. Berkswell PC has forwarded all information from its NDP process to Balsall PC. Balsall PC were invited to contribute to the Issues and Options consultation and it made a submission which was carefully considered and some changes to the Berkswell NDP process implemented. Balsall PC chose not to make a submission in relation to this 1 st draft plan. Berkswell PC have sent to Balsall PC the results of the community consultation on this 1 st draft plan because many comments relate to Balsall Parish. On 3 occasions Berkswell PC have offered in writing	No change
Keep Parish boundary as it is!!!	28		No change
It is a pity that the two PCs cannot work together. The threat of 10,000 dwellings in Balsall Common says that they will go to the west towards Knowle where there is much open space - unlikely to go east, thus making Balsall Common into a small town. Separating the rural part of Berkswell village to a hamlet would be prudent. "Green lungs" are excellent, but not in tight spaces.	28		No change

<p>A good effort but it is a great shame that Berkswell PC and Balsall PC do not have the maturity and drive to come up with one plan. As it is there will be two plans which will gather dust on the shelf and SMBC as usual will be free to do what it likes!</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>to meet with Balsall PC but to date Balsall PC have not responded positively to those requests.</p> <p>Parish boundaries are out of scope of an NDP but there will be opportunities to take part in future public consultations as part of any boundary review.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>I propose periodical meetings between local parish councils eg Berkswell, Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden where ideas concerning common issues could be proposed, discussed and supported.</p>	<p>28</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>I would agree that the parish boundary should be moved to the proposed HS2 railway line.</p>	<p>28</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>Ensure Berkswell Parish boundaries remain as they are. I and my family are proud to live within Berkswell Parish and trust the Parish Council. You are doing a fantastic job- long may it continue! Thank you!</p>	<p>28</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>Ensure Berkswell Parish boundaries remain as they are. I and my family are proud to live within Berkswell Parish and trust the Parish Council. You are doing a fantastic job- long may it continue! Thank you!</p>	<p>28</p>		<p>No change</p>
<p>Very supportive of Berkswell Parish Council and the work it does to protect our Parish.</p>	<p>28</p>		<p>No change</p>

I also oppose the integration with Balsall Parish on the grounds that Balsall is now fundamentally different from Berkswell in the three aspects mentioned above, and a combined Parish would be much less motivated to protect and preserve them.	28		No change
More opportunities for work should be provided in the immediate vicinity: give consideration to light industrial development.	29	There is a business park with light industrial development already in the parish on Meriden Road, Berkswell. Pictures of this are shown in the draft plan. Draft policy B10 is designed to support local business expansion which will not damage the essential rural nature of the parish.	No change
Local independent businesses should be supported ahead of any additional multi nationals when allocating new commercial sites and a definitely no to any large supermarkets.	29	We note this comment. Draft policy B10 is concerned with supporting local businesses.	No change
B10 - original idea for new settlement - ex quarry land? Could be a business park with new infrastructure from developers.	29	The Solihull Local plan focuses major business growth in several area including the area near the airport just to the north of the parish. The PC does not consider it necessary supplement this with a significant business park within the parish.	No change
There is too much property development proposed for Balsall Common, leading to it becoming a small town rather than a village and therefore it will lose its character and identity.	30	Outside scope of NDP	No change
Spencers Lane needs desperate reduction in traffic and calming measures. It has become	31	The parish council notes these various comments about highways within the parish and	No change

dangerous and a hazard for residents coming out of drives.		is concerned about the volume and nature of traffic on rural roads across the parish.	
Fully support development in Berkswell, how long will these plans take to get them in operation. There is a need for housing and appropriate space should be offered for housing. Spencers Lane is becoming far too busy, measures need to be taken and further street lighting (dim) needs to be thought through by the residential housing length.	31	However, in general terms highways issues are out of scope for an NDP but can be considered as general parish council business to work with the highway authorities where appropriate. With regard to the use of Meeting House Lane as an access road for new development that issue is covered by policy B1.2	No change
With regards to the accessibility and infrastructure objectives, with continual development bringing more local and through traffic, perhaps additional attention could be paid to extensive traffic-calming measures, particularly in central urban areas e.g. Balsall Common, Berkswell Village - residential areas e.g. Meeting House Lane, Station Road and also in the little pockets of residential areas scattered around e.g. Carol green, Hodgetts Lane. Speed limits also need to be enforced more thoroughly throughout the area. Whilst cars are necessary if not essential fact of every day modern living, irresponsible and inconsiderate driving should not be allowed to dominate our lives	31		No change
Appendix infrastructure suggestions section 5.3 mentions the path between Berkswell and Four Oaks as needing repair. I live in Four Oaks and I would second this, but also add that the path is completely missing for a stretch of around 10m where it crosses the road. Given the location is just after a bend on a 50MPH road, this is quite unsafe and	31		No change

<p>unfortunately I avoid taking that route at all with a pram. I would also not consider it safe for young children. It would be great if as well as being repaired, the pathway was extended around 10-20m on the eastern side of the road around where it crosses the road, so we are not forced to walk on the road at that location.</p>			
<p>Inside build a suitable bypass pass the station and onto Kenilworth, Coventry etc...</p>	31		No change
<p>My road already experiences excessive volumes and speeds of traffic, even though it is narrow in parts and does not have pavements all of the way along it - the so-called traffic calming measures already in place are highly ineffective and it is only a matter of time before one of the many dog-walkers, runners, cyclists and school children who use it as a route are injured by speeding motorists. I am sure that there are other examples like this in the Berkswell and Balsall Common area and I make a plea to the parish councils and Solihull MBC to do all they can to manage increased traffic properly (e.g. extend Hallmeadow Road to be an access road to the Barretts Farm Development, build a larger car park at the train station, have access points to new developments only from main roads, improve public transport with</p>	31		No change

more train and bus services, add traffic calming measures to Station Road, Meeting House Lane and other roads near to new developments).		
I support initiatives to improve walking between Berkswell and Balsall Common (even before HS2), and walking from Berkswell to Meriden and put up a warning sign for walkers who might venture down Cornets End Lane (very dangerous). I would support initiatives to increase the number of circular footpaths in the area. I would support initiatives to reinstate hedgerow trees where these have fallen. I would support initiatives to reduce fly tipping in the area eg by putting a barrier across the top of Mercote Hall Lane.	31	No change
Appropriate traffic calming measures should be considered. Not just speed humps.	31	
Whilst there is great merit in looking to protect the local environment from increased HGV traffic there should also be a clear intent shown to carefully consider the impact caused by any increase in traffic (cars and vans) that may be caused by any new developments. Berkswell/Meriden/Balsall Common are all connected by a very few small country roads, especially Meriden Rd/Berkswell Rd that has become a rat-run	31	No change

<p>for commuters travelling at high speed. It is becoming more dangerous despite the lowering of the speed limit with the resurfacing of the road leading to an increase rather than a decrease in speed. Previously applicants for developments have made statements that their developments would not lead to any increase in traffic levels and those statements have been accepted and not challenged. There is a huge pressure on the locality from traffic travelling into the area or through the area and we should surely not be encouraging more traffic due to developments, especially and specifically commercial developments, within the area.</p>			
<p>Parish needs to consider its development plan in conjunction with future development of road infrastructure around HS2 build programme and proposed A45 / A46 link road, and any proposed Balsall Common bypass. Overall perspective of housing development in Balsall Common should be considered within a single planning framework in order to get a coherent plan that balances the development of the whole settlement - this NDP does not seem to address this.</p>	31		
<p>I would like a safe way to walk from Berkswell (I live in Benton Green Lane) to Balsall</p>	31	<p>This is a highways issue and out of scope. A pavement from Pound Close to the Moat has</p>	<p>No change</p>

Common. Maybe a link with proposed cycle path		been discussed with SMBC and discounted on cost grounds and that would only go half way to Benton Green Lane.	
. I am keen to see development of more public walkways and cycle paths in the area (e.g. for the Kenilworth Greenway to be made accessible from Balsall Common and Berkswell without having to haul my bike over a stile!).	32	We note this support for draft policy B9. The 1 st draft plan notes that HS2 Ltd have given an assurance that it will provide a connection from the Kenilworth Greenway to Station Road in Balsall Common as part of the HS2 project as shown on the map on page 46 of the 1 st draft NDP	No change
B9 - need for chamfered crossings for wheel chairs etc. where footways end.	32	This point is noted and is covered by the design guidelines published by the Department of Transport.	No change
We need to keep this village a good place to live. We pay a lot of money to live here & we enjoy the village & what it has to offer.	32		No change
I enjoy walking with my husband across the fields & Greenway, we also enjoy cycling around the country lanes in relative safety. Please do not spoil a very pleasant village	32	Draft policy B9 is designed to achieve the objectives mentioned in this comment	No change
It would be great to negotiate direct access onto the greenway from the back of the station carpark. This would enable many people to cycle to work at the university or in Coventry. Secondly a footpath down Lavender hall lane from the bridge to Berkswell village would enable us to walk our	32	HS2 has provided an assurance that there will be a connection from the greenway to Station Road. Policy B9 and the aspirational cycleways map on page 46 of the 1 st draft plan covers the point about a footpath link	No change

children to school this reducing the reliance on the car.			
3. When considering conversion of Farm buildings, consideration also needs to be given to wildlife e.g. barn owl habitats.	33	This issue is covered by national legislation and guidelines. The NDP also protects wildlife sites in B1 and B3.	No change
Draft policy B6. If that policy is to convert redundant agricultural buildings, then why is the owner of an unused pigsty and barns on Barretts Lane being denied three applications to convert one dwelling for himself	33	It is not factually correct that conversion of these buildings has been rejected by the planning authority. The latest application was for replacement of the building with a cottage. Whilst this application was supported by the PC it was rejected by the planning authority and by a planning inspector on appeal. This case does not relate to draft policy B6	No change
I also note the reference to conversion of former agricultural buildings as one of the planning policies, whilst I support that proposal I am concerned with the 2 'agricultural building' conversions currently being developed in Barratts Lane farm. Whilst there were some small agricultural buildings on that site the new 'conversions' could not be considered conversions but are effectively new large and out of place developments, I would hope they will not serve as a model for future agricultural building conversions.	33	This issue is not an NDP issue but the interpretation of National Planning Policy Framework by Solihull Council	
I am also curious as to how the agricultural building at Barretts farm can be viewed as appropriate as a housing site. I sincerely hope	33	See above	No change

<p>this does not indicate that this will be used as future housing developing models.</p>			
<p>B6 some re-uses could be for craft centres and small businesses c/f Wootton Wawen.</p>	33	<p>This is allowed for under policy B10.3</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>B5 Conservation Area status, does NOT preclude development or re-development, but gives extra powers over design.</p>	34	<p>That is a correct interpretation of draft policy B5</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Also, (since my previous sentence is unlikely to be achieved) any development should not be on one side of the village, but in order to make traffic circulation less difficult, different sites should be used.</p>	35	<p>This issue of the majority of planned housing around Balsall Common being in Berkswell Parish is an issue for the Solihull Local Plan review and out of scope for this Berkswell NDP</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Further, consideration of the current or near future of any proposals by Solihull MBC to alter green belt boundaries.</p>	35	<p>Green belt boundaries are outside the scope of the NDP</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>It's very upsetting that nothing could be done to preserve the limited green space by the Riddings Hill health centre, despite the onset of hs2 development. Very disappointed young couple that have recently purchased a house on the estate.</p>	35	<p>The site concerned was released from the green belt in the 2013 Solihull Local Plan and is outside the scope of this NDP</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>In this era of austerity, funding must come from somewhere for public services. We either need an increase in Council Tax (which is never popular) or there needs to be more people living in Balsall Common/Berkswell. If the community is to continue to grow and</p>	35	<p>The housing plan within the draft Solihull Local plan is outside the scope of this NDP.</p>	<p>No change</p>

prosper, we need to stop being nimbys and open our community to other people.			
In this era of austerity, funding must come from somewhere for public services. We either need an increase in Council Tax (which is never popular) or there needs to be more people living in Balsall Common/Berkswell. If the community is to continue to grow and prosper, we need to stop being nimbys and open our community to other people.	35	The housing plan within the draft Solihull Local plan is outside the scope of this NDP.	No change
I do believe the housing developments impact on Balsall Common village and is minimal in Berkswell village.	35	The housing plan within the draft Solihull Local plan is outside the scope of this NDP. It is a true statement that has been made in this comment that the Solihull draft plan provides for additional housing within Berkswell Parish to the east and south of Balsall Common by changing the green belt boundaries but not around Berkswell village.	No change
Housing in Station area not appropriate	35	This is an issue for the local Solihull Plan who define areas to be taken out of greenbelt	No change
Response to Solihull Council detailed comments			
2.5 Now 15 Green Flag parks, with addition of Bentley Heath recreation ground		Accepted	Draft plan to be amended to include this

4	Objective 2, add '& layouts' and 'water management'		Accepted	Draft plan to be amended to include this
4	Objective 3, add '& blue'		Accepted	Draft plan to be amended to include this
5.13	Welcome reference to SHMA part 2		Accepted	No change
B1	<p>Point 2, typo at 'a',</p> <p>'d' may promote poor urban design, connectivity and legibility, as through routes important for permeability,</p> <p>suggest precede 'f' with Wherever possible as verges may discourage more efficient use of land and not always appropriate for local character,</p>		Accepted	<p>Corrected</p> <p>This is common practice on the Riddings Hill estate in Balsall Common. Permeability is covered by B1.2f in the 1st draft plan. That paragraph will be strengthened. The PC sees permeability as more important for non-motorised traffic to promote travel other than by car.</p> <p>The whole draft policy section already states "where practical". However, the word "Longer" has been inserted in front of "f" to denote that this requirement does not apply universally.</p> <p>This is already specified within policy B3. However, several residents have mentioned the need for standards for the provision of green space within this draft</p>

<p>'h' standards in accordance with SMBC</p> <p>Point 4, 'a' may create homogenous development lacking character, interest and focal points (and heighten air pollution), 'b' may raise building heights, making it difficult for buildings to appear grounded in their plots and to allow natural surveillance</p> <p>Point 5, welcome reference to SHMA in a, and wording appears to accord with SHMA, support b and c</p>			<p>policy and in the appropriate section to be moved from B3 to B1 in the next draft of the plan.</p> <p>The section has been reworded to make it clear that maximum heights are limited to 2 ½ storeys providing height variation to that level.</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>B2 Support as rural exception, village is excluded from settlements suitable for limited infilling. First paragraph and final clause indicate a need to define the village curtilage?</p>		<p>Noted</p>	<p>Wording to be amended in 2nd draft plan to reflect this point</p>
<p>B4 There is a potential issue here as the recreation ground in Meeting House Lane is included in the hatched area of DLP Site I Barratt's Farm, and</p>		<p>The Parish Council believes that it has a robust case for designating this land as Local Green</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>it is understood the Church is looking at potential development. If the site is a playing pitch, or lapsed/disused pitch, it would need to be replaced if development were to take place to accord with the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy</p>		<p>Space and the proposed designation is supported by a neighbouring developer as part of the overall vision for their proposed development.</p>	
<p>B5 Extensions 1, this may not work for 2 storey additions where extensions in line with existing ridge heights may be preferable, so suggest development respectful to the character of the existing building with the street scene protected. Other suggestions/issues for B5 to be picked up at meeting</p>		<p>Accepted.</p>	<p>Wording to be amended in 2nd draft plan to reflect this point</p>
<p>B6+ Development management does not raise any issues with this policy</p>		<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>B7-9 Highways issues Walter was generally comfortable with the Transport policies which he considered were a sensible approach, subject to one comment and a suggestion.</p>			<p>Provide some additional wording in NDP to refer to NPPF and need for compelling justification.</p>

<p>On Policy B8 he questioned whether the penultimate sentence was necessary given the approach in the first part of the policy. If you recall, it was this sentence that my Development Management colleague expressed concern about. I have checked the reference to potential conflict with the NPPF. Paragraph 39 relates to local parking standards, but was supplemented by a Planning Update: Written Statement HCWS488 made on 25 March 2015 stating:</p> <p>“Local Planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network.”</p>		<p>The parish Council considers that it has a compelling case for defining local residential parking standards. Balsall Common has poor public transport not well suited to commuting as shown in the draft plan. This has caused an significantly above average car usage for daily needs in our area as shown in Solihull statistics within the 1st draft plan. The Council has a legal duty to protect the disabled and young persons in push chairs from parking on pavements under discrimination legislation. The provision of adequate off road parking is critical to meeting these duties. Draft policy B8 requires developers to produce a parking plan and “where possible” provide specified parking places per home and also allows communal parking to meet part of the identified provision.</p>	
<p>B10 Looks to be largely okay. First sentence, suggest keep more generic as some conference and training facilities can be substantial. The last clause should be broadly consistent with paragraph 89 third point of the</p>		<p>Accepted.</p>	<p>Wording to be amended in 2nd draft plan</p>

NPPF, and with emerging DLP Policy P17 point re additions up to 40% of original floor space			
11.8 'Further small scale convenience shopping within strategic sites' probably unlikely unless significantly higher level of growth proposed		Accepted.	Wording to be amended in 2 nd draft plan
11.10 Balsall Parish Council not Balsall Common		Accepted.	Wording to be amended in 2 nd draft plan