

Berkswell Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

Minutes of the meeting held on 18th December 2017 in The Jordan Room (and then upstairs), St John the Baptist Church, Berkswell at 1.30PM.

- 1) Evacuation procedures** – Fire exits were advised.
- 2) Open Forum**
There were 4 members of the public in attendance. Will Heard of Balsall PC advised that he was there to observe as a member of the Balsall PC NDP Committee.
- 3) Attendance**
Andrew Burrow (AB) Chairman
Jane Edwards (JE)
Vince Ritters (VR)
Kay Howles (KH)
Keith Tindall (KT)
Geoff Wheeler (GW)
Richard Drake (RD) Secretary
Louise Kirkup (LK) (Consultant)
- 4) Apologies for absence**
None received
- 5) Declaration of interest**
AB advised that he owned a property on Old Waste Lane which included a field that could be removed from the greenbelt in the current SMBC Draft Local Plan. He will not take part in any discussions where he could compromise our discussions.
GW advised that he owns a property on Meeting House Lane (backing on to proposed development on Barratts Farm). He will not take part in any discussions where he could compromise our discussions.
- 6) Confirmation of minutes of 8th November 2017**
The minutes were approved and signed. Draft minutes are on the Berkswell PC website. The signed copy will be held by the Berkswell Parish Clerk.
- 7) Matters arising not covered by the Agenda:**
There were no Matters arising
- 8) Grant status**
It was advised that the deadline for completion of the work covered by the grant had been extended until 31st March 2018

(At 13.37 we moved to the upstairs room due to a double booking. Meeting restarted at 13.42)

Approved:

9) Berkswell Village traffic calming project

The committee agreed to the inclusion of the project within the NDP process in line with guidance from SMBC. *Attachment 1*

10) Analysis methodology for Issues and Options consultation

The committee agreed the approach which had been taken to data analysis. *Attachment 2*

11) Publication of analysis and tabulation responses

The committee agreed to the publication of:

11.1 An analysis of the responses to the consultation where statistical analysis is appropriate; and

11.2 A tabulation of responses to questions where a written response was given.

(JE & VR agreed to assist AB in a final review before publication)

12) Consideration of the output from Working Group A (RD, KT & VR) with respect to the potential areas for planning policies arising from the Issues and Options consultation and agree next steps towards a draft NDP on those matters

12.1 Business – LK to propose additional wording to show support of diversification where this does not compromise retaining and protecting the Greenbelt.

12.2 Residential – as AB will not take part in these discussions this was deferred until later in the meeting.

13) Consideration of the output from Working Group B (AB, JE, GW & KH) with respect to all other matters covered by the Issues and Options consultation and agree next steps towards a draft NDP on those matters. The report from working group B was accepted after agreeing the modifications shown in green in *attachment 3*.

13.1 It was agreed to review the Local (Warwickshire) Historic Environment Register for areas we might include)

13.2 It was agreed to prepare a list of potential Local Green Spaces. These to potentially include: Catholic Playing Field; Hornets Ground (and land above); Riddings Hill and Hall Meadow verges.

13.3 It was agreed to remove Broadband from the list as no realistic planning policy available.

13.4 LK to draft a possible policy to support small scale, local needs only, affordable housing.

13.5 GW to “localise” the draft Preservation of Greenbelt statement provided by LK. To include a statement confirming an NDP cannot cover scale of housing development.

13.6 LK to draft guidelines to include in the NDP concerning the Berkswell Conservation Area. AB to contact Martin Saunders (SMBC) to request his support.

13.7 LK to consider and propose a draft policy on the Conversion of Agricultural Buildings.

13.8 LK to draft a proposed policy(s) on not allocating Greenbelt land for Station parking and encouraging/improving non-vehicle access (including secure cycle storage). AB to revisit volume of parking on Hallmeadow Rd and Station Rd. AB to consider surveying drivers using Berkswell Station.

13.9 Main points on Improving Local Infrastructure to be included in the Appendices to the NDP. Committee to consider work to identify potential cycle routes.

13.10 Committee to consider an Appendix to list those “Community Issues” which were raised by residents but are considered “out of scope”

Approved:

(AB now left the meeting and the Committee returned to discussing 12.2 above)

12.2 Residential:

12.2.1 Obtain data on car ownership per household to support proposed “1 car per bedroom” parking policy.

12.2.2 LK to propose appropriate wording on “buffer zones”. (GW did not take part in this part of the discussion).

12.2.3 Consider adding requirement for secure cycle storage to requirements.

12.2.4 Banning parking on pavements could not be specifically covered by a planning policy.

12.2.5 It was agreed that LK would propose appropriate wording for the draft NDP on the themes proposed by working group A (*attachment 4*)

(AB now rejoined the meeting. RD left the meeting to avoid any conflict of interest on agreeing the response to Balsall PC.)

14) Reply to Balsall PC response to Issues and Options Consultation.

The committee agreed the proposed wording of the reply and to share the comments/suggestions received concerning improvements to the Balsall Common Centre.

(RD now rejoined the meeting.)

15) HoE pupil survey

It was agreed that the Committee supported a survey of pupils at the Heart of England School if it could be arranged to investigate teenagers’ infrastructure suggestions as suggested by a questionnaire respondent.

16) Draft NDP

LK advised that she should be able to produce a Draft NDP by 9th February 2018 for circulation to the Steering Committee.

Date of next meeting:

It was proposed the next meeting of the Steering Group should be on Wednesday 21st February 2018 at a 1.30PM. Venue to be in Balsall Common at a venue to be advised.

Approved:

Attachment 1 -Berkswell village Traffic calming Project

Background

Berkswell village has for a number of years been subject to significant traffic congestion at certain times due in part to high numbers of people visiting the village for recreational purposes; attending the church for standard services and extraordinary events such as weddings and funerals but mainly due to parents bringing their children to the school. The overwhelming majority of children attending the school are driven in mainly from Balsall Common, adjacent areas of Coventry some from Meriden and, of course, rural areas of Berkswell Parish. This serves to put pressure on village parking, road capacity and particularly pedestrian safety: parents and children have no safe road crossing points and have to walk in the carriageway as the village is poorly served by pavements. In addition, the village also suffers from vehicles being driven at excessive speed both during school start and finish times and generally.

The Project

A community led project under the auspices of the parish council but with financial help from the Berkswell Charities and Berkswell Society was initiated in 2016. Arup were commissioned to work with a steering group covering the main stakeholders to develop proposal for a way forward. The key priorities were seen as

1. To meaningfully reduce speed of traffic passing through the village
2. To meaningfully improve (or the feeling of) pedestrian safety for residents and other users of village amenity
3. To improve parking and enhance visual amenity as a result of achieving points 1 & 2

Significant consultation was undertaken as 3 events held by the steering group. Arup produced comprehensive proposals which in summary are

1. A widening of the current pc car park entrance to permit 2 way flow in and out of the car park
2. The provision of a footpath behind the Meriden Road car park to reduce the safety risk to users of that car park particularly to the children brought to the school
3. The provision of build outs on the four roads entering the village to calm traffic
4. A table top or similar at the cross roads to calm traffic complete with crossing points on Coventry road and the Meriden Road to facilitate safe crossing, particularly for children and parents going to and from the school from the Bear car park
5. A realignment of Meriden Road to produce a "slight bend" to emphasise the village cross roads and hence calm traffic
6. The provision of a footpath from the pumping station on Lavender Hall Road to the village green.

Current Status

Arup consulted with SMBC Highways during the plan creation. The proposals have now been formally presented to SMBC Highways for evaluation and support. The initial feedback is favourable. The pc has requested that SMBC Highways for more formal response to each of the scheme elements, and the overall combination, with an assessment of benefit versus cost in order that a final scheme can be developed. SMBC Highways have asked that the scheme be included within the NDP.

Financing

It is envisaged that the overall scheme will be financed mainly from non PC sources including charitable trusts and the HS2 community fund perhaps with a contribution from the PC for those elements which benefit the wider parish.

Approved:

Attachment 2 - Analysis methodology for Issues and options consultation

Background

Respondents to the issue and options consultation answered both open questions seeking a written response and “closed” questions seeking a yes/no answer or a selection from given choices. There were two questionnaires, a general questionnaire and one specifically for businesses.

There were 405 responses to the general questionnaire and 19 business responses. In a small number of cases respondents had given their post code but no parish. In these cases the correct parish was inserted from Royal Mail’s “postcode finder”. Some respondents had given neither post code nor parish. In these cases their responses were included with the non Berkswell Parish responses.

Analysis methodology

The analysis of the “closed” questions involved simple downloading of data into an excel spreadsheet and its analysis from there. Results from Berkswell Parish residents and other respondents were analysed separately and a report produced.

The analysis and interpretation of the written responses was more of a challenge. In theory respondents focused their comments and suggestions on the precise question asked. In practice it was not that simple so the following process was adopted. The working groups used a sorting process to bring together comments and suggestions into themes. The sorting process was based on the quality tool called the Affinity Process, where comments are grouped based on their affinity to each other and then a group title or theme established. Some comments fell into more than one theme and this was recognised by the process by the allocation of more than one theme per respondent’s comment where appropriate. The overall process was managed as follows:

1. The advantage of the Affinity Process is that there is no right or wrong allocation of a theme, merely a methodology for sorting to help subsequent analysis and the process was trialled to ensure it was understood by all committee members.
2. The respondents’ suggestions/comments were then allocated to 3 working groups who sorted the respondents’ comments/suggestions using the affinity process, with each comment/suggestion being allocated to one or more themes for analysis.
3. The initial sorting themes and classifications were then moderated by the whole committee to ensure consistency.
4. The “sorting” power of Microsoft word was used to sort the comments via their primary and secondary themes for analysis.
5. In this way comments/suggestions on similar themes were grouped together which made practical the drawing conclusions from over 1000 comments, wherever in the questionnaire the respondent placed their answer.
6. The committee then split into two working groups (A & B) to conduct the analysis of the suggestions/comments made and to draw preliminary conclusions for presentation to the full Steering Committee.
7. The preliminary conclusions from the A & B working groups are to be discussed in public at a formal meeting of the Steering Committee with the independent consultant present. The preliminary conclusions reached by working group A will be challenged by members of working group B and the consultant for robustness and vice versa.

Treatment of non Berkswell Parish responses

In the vast majority of cases the answers to closed questions did not significantly vary between the Berkswell and non Berkswell respondents. Where they did, the analysis gives more weight to the Berkswell responses but that impact is not great. For the comments and suggestions no real distinction was made based on the rationale that a good suggestion is a good suggestion irrespective of its source and it is quality of suggestions that is most important not quantity.

Transparency

The results of the statistical analysis and the individual text suggestions/comments with their theme categorisation are matters of record. It was proposed by the working groups that the data be published on the NDP web site.

Approved:

NDP agreed actions from analysis of responses to Issues and Options consultation excluding those for detailed planning policies for new housing and business.

1. Background

- 1.1. These agreed actions are based on the report produced by NDP working group B dated 10th December 2017.
- 1.2. Changes to those recommendations are shown in green

2. Proposed modifications to the draft Vision and Objectives (question 1)

- 2.1. 95% of Berkswell Parish residents indicated that they agreed with the draft vision and objectives.
- 2.2. 88% of other respondents agreed.
- 2.3. 107 respondents made comments and suggestions.
- 2.4. The following modifications (in red and green) are proposed to reflect residents input to the Issues and Options consultation. These principally are drawn from residents' answers to question 1 but all suggestions from all were examined.

Draft Vision for Berkswell Parish NDP

Our Vision is that Berkswell Parish is and will remain a pleasant and safe place in which to live and bring up families; it will continue to be a supportive and inclusive society; it will remain sheltered from the neighbouring conurbations by protecting the rural environment within the Meriden gap but have good transport links and modern and enhanced communications.

The many historic features that emphasise the rural character of Berkswell, whether in the countryside or built environment, will be protected and new development will be designed to be sensitive to our local heritage.

NDP Draft Objectives

In order to deliver the Vision the NDP has the following objectives:

Housing Objectives

- 1. To provide the types of property to attract young people to live and work here **and** **resizing opportunities for older current residents.****
- 2. To promote high quality housing designs that allow for space, privacy, visual amenity **and** **ecological sustainability.****

Landscape Character and the Rural Area Objectives

- 3. To support the continued protection of Berkswell village as a Conservation Area **and****

Approved:

other heritage assets across the parish.

4. To ensure development incorporates high quality green landscaping schemes to integrate the new built environment with the rural and the existing built environment
5. To retain wildlife habitat within the developed, to be developed, and rural areas of the parish.

Accessibility and Infrastructure Objectives

6. To promote improved and safe accessibility to public transport links including walking, cycling, horse riding, and public rights of way.
7. To improve vehicular traffic flows throughout the parish.
8. To provide adequate space for off-road parking in residential areas and for businesses.
9. To support improved community spaces such as meeting halls and public open space for purposes of enjoyment **for Balsall Common.**
10. **Encourage the development of infrastructure for facilitating health, well being, leisure and community for all residents.**

Business Objectives

11. **To support investment in local economic development to meet local businesses' needs in the parish including farming that are not met more appropriately by the Solihull Local Plan and which do not adversely impact rural roads in the parish.**
12. **To work with Balsall Parish Council to jointly improve the shopping area.**

3. Affordable housing outside of Balsall Common (question 3)

- 3.1. This section of the questionnaire was specifically about a need for affordable housing outside of Balsall Common
- 3.2. 61 respondents indicated that they thought they needed affordable housing outside Balsall Common, primarily within Berkswell village.
- 3.3. The Solihull draft plan provides for significant affordable housing in Balsall Common with a target of 50% all new homes being affordable
- 3.4. An "affordable home" has a specific legal definition designed to provide homes for the financially less well off typified by the rent being 80% of market levels for the version of affordable homes provided for rent. (similar approaches apply for shared ownership and affordable to buy)
- 3.5. Current affordable housing in Balsall Common (on Riddings Hill) is about 1.5 miles from the centre of Berkswell village. The nearest site within the December 2013 Solihull Local Plan (Hallmeadow Road) where affordable housing should be built is 1.3 miles from the centre of

Approved:

Berkswell. Allocation 1 (Barrett's Farm) in the current draft Solihull Plan 2017 is about 1.5 miles which under the draft plan will have very considerable amounts of affordable housing.

3.6. Berkswell village already had 8 almshouses provided at nil or very low "rent/contribution from residents" and two Council houses (needs confirmation) within a total of approximately 75 homes. In addition the Berkswell Estate has 8 properties for residential rent in Berkswell village. Two of these are currently let rent free.

3.7. An NDP can provide affordable housing via a rural exception site.

3.8. The Solihull plan states with regard to rural exception sites

3.8.1.1. *The provision of affordable housing developments on green belt land to meet the local needs of households in that Parish or neighbourhood will be supported in circumstances where,*

3.8.1.1.1. *The development proposal is consistent with the Village, Parish or Neighbourhood Plan; or*

3.8.1.1.2. *There is evidence that people with a local connection to the Parish area have a housing need that cannot be met through affordable housing provision on an allocated housing site and the proposed development is supported by the Parish Council or Neighbourhood Group."*

3.9. Conclusion

3.9.1. There is a significant quantity of affordable homes scheduled to be built within the parish according to the draft Solihull Plan. These are in relatively close proximity to Berkswell village. Consequently, the Parish Council does not consider that the evidence from the justifications given in responses to the Issues and Options questionnaire meet the test in the Solihull plan for a rural exception site within the greenbelt. Therefore, it is not proposed to include a rural exception site within the NDP

4. Protecting the Local landscape character (question 4)

4.1. 97% of Berkswell respondents indicated their support for policies to protect the local landscape character

4.2. 94% of other respondents supported this.

4.3. The Hedgerows Act provides protection to hedgerows and trees within them.

4.4. Areas in private ownership can be designated as local green space. It is a matter for the examiner as to whether evidence has been provided for community value

4.5. Land with historical interest can be protected

4.6. Conclusions

4.6.1. This section could be covered by the general planning rules including the land allocated under the Solihull draft plan. In particular, the resident's suggestion that the building of houses and creation of parks should be undertaken in a manner to integrate with existing mature trees on the development sites.

4.6.2. The draft NDP should include a general statement about the protection of the greenbelt informed by the wording provided by the Examiner for the Baggington NDP on this topic.

4.6.3. Any policy relating to the conversion of agricultural buildings for residential use should also encompass these concepts (question 8)

4.6.4. Some more general draft guidelines should be developed perhaps encompassing the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines

Approved:

4.6.5.Areas of community green space should be identified and protected using the NPPF policies

4.6.6.Areas of historical interest should be identified and protected

5. Berkswell Conservation area protection (question 5)

- 5.1. Responses point out that the Berkswell conservation area (covering the village of Berkswell and immediately surrounding area) cover buildings which are an eclectic mix with no particular vernacular style.
- 5.2. No suggestions were made about the possible content of a policy to improve the planning rules covering the Conservation area.
- 5.3. Only 28% of respondents supported the NDP producing planning design guidelines for the conservation area
- 5.4. The conservation area has a high proportion of listed buildings and monuments which currently provide additional protection because of a need to consider their setting when new development is considered
- 5.5. The Solihull draft plan does not propose new homes in the village of Berkswell.
- 5.6. There is existing developed land that at some point in time could be proposed for housing development and existing buildings could be extended or redeveloped

5.7. Conclusion

5.7.1.The NDP consultant should seek to work with the SMBC conservation officer to create helpful policies/guidelines

6. Conversion of former agricultural buildings (question 6)

- 6.1. 79% of Berkswell respondents and 86% of other respondents supported a policy setting out guidance to protect the character of agricultural buildings in conversion schemes.
- 6.2. The conversion of former agricultural buildings into homes is covered by planning policy. Our conclusion is that this is already encouraged in the NPPF and Solihull Local plan and the NDP supports this.

6.3. Conclusions

- 6.3.1.One area that might be covered by the NDP is that permission could be granted to replace a flat or virtually flat roof on a former agricultural building in the greenbelt with a pitched roof with tiles in a manner that is consistent with surrounding buildings, subject to the visual impact on the greenbelt or heritage assets not being significantly eroded.
- 6.3.2.A second area that might be considered is that such conversions should not allow the development of additional outbuildings such as garages because that will impact the openness of the greenbelt.
- 6.3.3.A third policy could require that the materials used in the conversion reflect the materials in use in the buildings prior to conversion but allowing asbestos cladding to be replaced with wooden/brick cladding in a manner consistent with buildings in the area.

Approved:

7. Improving accessibility- (Question 7)

- 7.1. 94% of Berkswell Parish respondents and 89% of other respondents agreed the NDP should encourage new developments to have good accessibility to walking, cycling and mobility scooters networks and to reduce reliance on cars for accessing local shops and services.

7.2. Conclusion

7.2.1. This should be considered for inclusion in possible planning rules with the objective of providing access through a network of cycle/pedestrian/mobility scooter routes.

7.2.2. A map showing current and proposed cycle routes should be included in the draft plan

8. Parking at Berkswell Station

- 8.1. 91% of Berkswell Parish respondents supported improved parking at the Station. 72% agreed that the NDP should allocate land for additional parking. (94% and 88% respectively for other respondents).
- 8.2. A suggestion was made for multi storey car parking at the station.
- 8.3. There is very extensive overflow car parking on Hallmeadow Road for the station. A survey of such car parking 6th to 10th February 2016 found between 11 to 39 cars parked there each day.
- 8.4. This survey needs updating and re-enforcing
- 8.5. The current car park is immediately adjacent to the WCML and partially bordered on the west side by commercial premises and a narrow strip of zone 3 flood plain. There are no residential buildings in the immediate area.
- 8.6. Many residents' comments called for protecting the greenbelt. 97% of Berkswell residents and 94% of other respondents supported a policy to protect local landscape character
- 8.7. An extension to the current car park would possibly require the owners of the land allocated for housing in allocation 1 to release land for a car park and it not to be used for housing.
- 8.8. Other available land to the north and east would appear to be green belt
- 8.9. The planned HS2 line will have a high elevation near to the current car park as it jumps over the west coast mainline and Truggist Lane.
- 8.10. It is possible that additional car parking space could be found between the WCML and the HS2 line. At this stage the practicality of a car park extension in that location cannot be evaluated by this NDP. West Midlands Trains advised at the rail consultation group meeting held on 28th September 2017 in the Mailbox in Birmingham that Berkswell Station was not scheduled for car park expansion under their new franchise agreement.

8.11. Conclusion

- 8.11.1. The NDP Steering Committee feels unable to recommend the allocation of land for increased for station parking because of the uncertainties and residents desire to protect the greenbelt.
- 8.11.2. However, "permission" for a two story (ground and first floor) car park within the current station car park footprint could be considered for inclusion in the NDP.
- 8.11.3. There is no indication regarding who would meet the cost of such a car park and the NDP Committee think that such infrastructure should be provided by the rail operator.
- 8.11.4. The NDP should seek to set some general planning guidance/rules covering the provision of additional parking at the station.

Approved:

9. Improving local infrastructure

9.1. The following suggestions were made by residents and have been grouped by theme enhancing Balsall Common	
Summary of respondents suggestions	Comment
<p>9.1.1. Improve Balsall Common centre holistically and not just parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.1.1.1. Trees 9.1.1.2. Statues/fountains 9.1.1.3. Areas to sit outside 9.1.1.4. Village green 9.1.1.5. Street market 9.1.1.6. Make it a go to destination not just somewhere you have to shop 9.1.1.7. Pavement cafes 9.1.1.8. Charging points for cars 9.1.1.9. Improve Balsall Common centre parking <u>both</u> quantity and layout 	<p>Residents' suggestions when combined seem to propose creating an improved sense of place for the centre of Balsall Common to make it a place to visit in its own right rather than merely a quick shopping top up area. This is consistent with the proposed Vision of Berkswell Parish being a pleasant and safe place to live and bring up families</p>
<p>9.1.2. The following two subjects call for a combined community centre fulfilling several needs</p>	
<p>9.1.3. Sports facilities suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.1.3.1. Gym 9.1.3.2. Swimming pool 9.1.3.3. All weather sports e.g. football and hockey 9.1.3.4. Public sports facilities including tennis 9.1.3.5. Adult outdoor gym/trim track/petanque 9.1.3.6. Extend current Lant facilities into Barrett's Farm to utilise current built facilities 9.1.3.7. Use Heart of England as a hub for the village 	<p>We presume using Heart of England as a hub means create shared Heart of England School and community facilities</p> <p>There were a lot of suggestions in this area, communal hall and public open space which are listed in 9.1.2 to 9.1.4.</p>
<p>9.1.4. Communal halls/facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.1.4.1. Multi-purpose hall covering Sports, community centre, arts, business meeting rooms 9.1.4.2. Modernise current Balsall Common village hall 9.1.4.3. Outside Facilities 9.1.4.4. Use Heart of England as a hub for the village 	<p>We presume by outside facilities the respondent means sports facilities listed elsewhere.</p> <p>We presume using Heart of England as a hub means create shared Heart of England School and community facilities</p>
<p>9.1.5. Public space on new housing allocations</p> <p>9.1.5.1. Play areas for children</p>	<p>These suggestions fit within the Vision of Berkswell Parish being a pleasant and safe place to live and</p>

Approved:

<p>9.1.5.1.1. Play areas for children in the south of Balsall Common</p> <p>9.1.5.1.2. Fishing lake for children to replace existing ponds (on Barrett's Farm) and/or use flood plain area</p> <p>9.1.5.2. Communal site for village events</p> <p>9.1.5.3. Wild areas of public space and natural green space for</p> <p>9.1.5.3.1. Ecological reasons</p> <p>9.1.5.3.2. Children to have dens/camps</p> <p>9.1.5.3.3. Picnic areas</p> <p>9.1.5.3.4. Ponds for children to fish</p> <p>9.1.5.4. Investigate facility needs for teenagers</p> <p>9.1.5.5. Dog walking</p> <p>9.1.5.5.1. Replace footpaths to be lost through SMBC local plan housing allocations that are currently used for dog walking</p> <p>9.1.5.5.2. Off lead dog walking</p> <p>9.1.5.5.3. 2 to 4 miles in length</p> <p>9.1.5.6. Provide a network of cycle tracks within the new developments</p>	<p>bring up families. In particular they point to an environment which enables children/young people to develop by providing relatively safe but stimulating/challenging outside environments for play. The suggestions also fit with the strong wish expressed by residents to protect the landscape character and the community benefits it provides.</p>
--	---

Approved:

9.2. Enhancing the rural areas	
Summary of respondents suggestions	Comment
<p>9.2.1. Traffic calming in Berkswell village</p>	<p>There is a Parish Council project that is developing proposals on this issue which SMBC Highways Department has requested be included within the NDP. It would be hard to justify CIL arising from Balsall Common housing development, contributing to this project except for specific provisions for Balsall Common residents in terms of parking for the school/church. If private/HS2/other funding was available to meet a significant proportion of the cost that would improve the cost/benefit balance of this infrastructure enhancement for all parish residents.</p>
<p>9.2.2. Cycle tracks</p> <p>9.2.2.1. Provide a network of cycle tracks</p> <p>9.2.2.2. Link the greenway to Station Road in Balsall Common</p> <p>9.2.2.3. Provide a cycle/pedestrian connection between Balsall Common and Berkswell village</p>	<p>The provision of cycle tracks in the rural areas provides both improved connectivity without the use of cars and also recreational/health improvement opportunities. HS2 Ltd has provided an assurance to SMBC that their project will provide a link from Station Road to the greenway as a legacy facility.</p> <p>76% of Berkswell respondents and 68% of other respondents supported the provision of a Balsall Common/Berkswell village link. Such a link, combined with a traffic calmed Berkswell village, would provide recreational benefit to Balsall Common residents and would link Riddings Hill estate school pupils with the Berkswell primary school. It would be hard to justify CIL arising from Balsall Common housing development, meeting the full cost. If private/HS2 funding was available to meet a significant proportion of the cost that would improve the cost/benefit balance of this infrastructure enhancement for all parish residents.</p>
<p>9.2.3. Pavement enhancement/introduction suggestions</p>	<p>A survey of residents of Meeting</p>

Approved:

<p>9.2.3.1. Meeting House Lane</p> <p>9.2.3.2. Four oaks to Berkswell village</p> <p>9.2.3.3. Balsall Common to Carol Green (Truggist Lane)</p> <p>9.2.3.4. Tanners Lane</p>	<p>House Lane during April 2016 indicated that residents were strongly opposed to a pavement on what they consider to be a rural lane.</p> <p>There is a continuous footpath from Four Oaks to Berkswell village (swopping sides of the road at 2 points). However, in one area towards Four oaks it has become eroded with no kerb after road resurfacing.</p> <p>Suggestions for footpaths on Tanners and Truggist Lane could be seen as suburbanisation of the rural areas and contrary to the expressed wish of 97% of respondents to the survey supporting a policy to protect the rural landscape character.</p>
--	--

10. Broad band and telephony

- 10.1. One objective of the emerging draft NDP is “To enhance communications in terms of telephony and broadband.
- 10.2. There are some comments in the responses indicating this is an issue for some respondents
- 10.3. We note that section 5 of the NPPF concerns supporting a high quality communication infrastructure. However, it would appear that the prime focus of paragraphs 43 to 46 concerns the planning rules concerning mobile telephony and mobile data. Paragraph 42 is only a vision statement with respect to broadband. We note that the government has a strategy to roll out improved broadband in rural areas. We note that BT open reach and Virgin have high speed networks covering most/all of Balsall Common but some of the rural areas of the parish suffer permanent or intermittent slow speeds.
- 10.4. Approximately 450 homes, from a total of approximately 1340 within the parish, fall outside of Balsall Common.
- 10.5. We are unable to think of a planning approach that would encourage enhanced broadband speeds in the rural areas of the Parish. **This issue should be deleted from the NDP objectives**

18th December 2017

Approved:

Attachment 4

Working Group A - Areas to be considered for planning rules

Residential

- 1) Landscape – wherever possible/practical
 - a. Mature trees and hedgerows to be retained
 - b. Existing water courses and features to be retained
 - c. Surface water drainage to use existing surface water courses and/or create new ones to reduce run-off and encourage wildlife.

- 2) Footpaths, rights of way, bridle paths, pavements - wherever possible/practical
 - a. All existing to be retained
 - b. To be wide enough to allow safe multiple use including mobility scooters
 - c. New non-vehicle access to be integrated with existing
 - d. Access to be restricted to appropriate users (i.e not cars or motorcycles)
 - e. To be light/lit and open to encourage confident use and reduce anti-social behaviour

- 3) Parking
 - a. A minimum of one off-road parking place per bedroom (not including garages)
 - b. Roads to be wide enough to allow parking without parking on pavements or grass verges

- 4) Buildings
 - a. Height to be restricted to 3 floors (or a metre equivalent)
 - b. To facilitate the charging of electric vehicles on driveways
 - c. To not compromise privacy of other residents (restrict overlooking)
 - d. All/majority of surface areas to be permeable wherever practical/possible
 - e. To include secure storage for recycling bins
 - f. Basements to be included where practicable (for parking, storage and services)
 - g. Highest possible standards of energy conservation/efficiency and where possible/practical energy generation
 - h. Highest possible standard of water conservation/efficiency
 - i. Building orientation and design to maximise solar heat gain through window placement.
 - j. Buildings to include wildlife friendly features e.g. bird boxes

Approved:

5) Layouts

- a. Vehicle access to new development to be from main roads.
- b. Layouts to create small clusters of mixed scale dwellings (up to 20) to facilitate social cohesion and community security.
- c. Larger developments to be broken into areas of c250 properties (NB Riddings Hill is seen as a model for many aspects).
- d. Housing mix to have an emphasis on 2/3 bedroom properties including some single storey dwellings.
- e. Layouts to limit through vehicle traffic (preference for closes/cul-de-sacs) but encourage through non-vehicle access.
- f. Communal green spaces to include children's play areas within convenient distances.
- g. New roads to include grass verges as well as pavements.
- h. Parking on pavements and verges to be discouraged by design and by policy.
- i. Establish new non-vehicle access to facilitate safe access to local facilities e.g. shops, station, schools and medical centre.
- j. **At the Steering Group meeting it was agreed to consider appropriate wording for including "buffer zones" between new development and existing properties.**

6) Environment

- a. Include wildlife areas and corridors. 50% of any new development to be green space (excluding gardens) to include ponds, parks, meadows, orchards and nature reserves.
- b. Restriction on business use of residential properties to non-distribution business.

Business

- 1) All distribution businesses and businesses generating significant traffic to be based with direct access to main roads (A452).
- 2) Heights of business premises to be restricted to those of residential.
- 3) A minimum of one off-road parking space per employee as well as allowing for customers and own business vehicles.
- 4) All/majority of surface areas to be permeable wherever practical/possible.
- 5) Preference for small scale business/retail developments in keeping with locality.

Approved: