

SDC Response to Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council's Draft Local Plan Consultation- January 2019

Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) welcomes the opportunity to comment and makes the following representations in respect of strategic cross boundary issues, as set out in Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council's Draft Local Plan Consultation (January 2019). As such, specific comments are made in response to Questions 1, 11-15, 19, 22 and 34, although the Council reserves the right to comment at a later date, should it be deemed necessary.

Q 1. Do you believe that there are exceptional circumstances that would justify the Council using an alternative approach, if so what are the exceptional circumstances and what should the alternative approach be?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council is supportive of Solihull's conclusion that the standard methodology should be used. Should SMBC wish to use an alternative methodology, careful consideration would need to be given to the potential wider and possibly consequential implications on other authorities within the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area.

Q2. Do you agree with the methodology of the site selection process, if not why not and what alternative/amendment would you suggest?

No comments.

Q 3. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Balsall Common, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development in Balsall Common would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 4. Do you believe that Site 1 Barratt's Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Barretts Farm would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 5. Do you believe that Site 2 Frog Lane should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Frog Lane would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 6. Do you believe that Site 3 Windmill Lane should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Windmill Lane would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 7. Do you believe that Site 21 Pheasant Oak Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Pheasant Oak Farm would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 8. Do you believe that Site 22 Trevallion Stud should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Trevallion Stud would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 9. Do you believe that Site 23 Lavender Hall Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Lavender Hall Farm would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 10. Do you have any comments to make on potential changes to the Green Belt boundary east of the settlement that would result in the removal of the 'washed over' Green Belt from those areas not covered by a formal allocation?

Stratford- on-Avon District Council has no comments to make regarding potential changes to the Green Belt boundary east of the settlement

Q 11. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Blythe, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council is concerned that development in Blythe could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.

Q 12. Do you believe that Site 4 Land west of Dickens Heath should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council is concerned that development at Dickens Heath (700 dws) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network

around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.

Q 13. Do you believe that Site 11 The Green should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council is very concerned that development at The Green combined with sites 12 and 26 (1940 dws in total) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.

Q 14. Do you believe that Site 12 south of Dog Kennel Lane should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council is very concerned that development at Dog Kennel Lane combined with sites 11 and 26 (1940 dws in total) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.

Q 15. Do you believe that Site 26 Whitlock's End Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council is concerned that development at Whitlock's End combined with sites 11 and 12 (1940 dws in total) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. It is recognised that Whitlock's End railway station is in the vicinity and could relieve some of this pressure. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.

Q 16. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Hampton in Arden, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development in Hampton-in-Arden would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 17. Do you believe that Site 6 Meriden Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Meriden Road would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 18. Do you believe that Site 24 Oak Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Oak Farm would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 19. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Hockley Heath, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would comment that any development in Hockley Heath could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District in terms of for example transport infrastructure and the strategic importance of the A3400. The statement on page 38 that "Due to the proximity to the borough boundary, future expansion of the settlement within Solihull Borough is limited and largely restricted to the north and west of the village" is therefore broadly welcomed.

The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.

Q 20. Do you believe that Site 25 land south of School Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would comment that development of land south of School Road (100 dws) would be unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the District.

Q 21. Do you have any comments to make on potential changes to the Green Belt boundary north of School Road that would result in the removal of the 'washed over' Green Belt from this ribbon of development?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that potential changes to the Green Belt boundary north of School Road would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 22. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

It is recognised in the LPR that although Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath do not have significant areas of employment (which could result in high levels of out-commuting) are all located in close proximity to the Strategic Highway Network. They do have a full range of facilities including both secondary & primary schools, health services

and a range of shops, services and facilities and therefore is well placed to accommodate growth in excess of just its own local needs. For these reasons it is not anticipated that development here would have an adverse impact on infrastructure in Stratford- on- Avon District.

23. Do you believe that Site 8 Hampton Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Hampton Road would impact directly on Stratford-on- Avon District.

24. Do you believe that Site 9 land south of Knowle should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at land south of Knowle would impact directly on Stratford-on- Avon District.

25. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Solihull and The Mature Suburbs, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development in Solihull and The Mature Suburbs would impact directly on Stratford-on- Avon District.

26. Do you believe that Site 16 east of Solihull should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development east of Solihull would impact directly on Stratford-on- Avon District.

Q 27. Do you believe that Site 17 Moat lane/Vulcan Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Moat Lane/Vulcan Road would impact directly on Stratford-on- Avon District.

Q 28. Do you believe that Site 18 Sharmans Cross Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Sharmans Cross Road would impact directly on Stratford-on- Avon District.

Q 29. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Meriden, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development at Meriden would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District.

Q 30. Do you believe that Site 10 west of Meriden should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development west of Meriden would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 31. Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for North Solihull, Castle Bromwich & Marston Green, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development identified for North Solihull, Castle Bromwich & Marston Green would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 32. Do you believe that Site 7 Kingshurst Village Centre should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development identified for Kingshurst Village Centre would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 33. Do you believe that Site 15 Jenson House/Auckland Drive should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Stratford-on-Avon District Council would not wish to comment on this question as it is unlikely that any development identified for Jenson House/Auckland Drive would impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District

Q 34. Should the washed over Green Belt status of these settlements/areas be removed, and if so what should the new boundaries be? If not why do you think the washed over status of the settlement should remain?

It would have been helpful if maps showing the location and extent of the five settlements (Cheswick Green, Millison Wood, Tidbury Green, Whitlocks End and Widney Manor Road) to be removed from the Green Belt had been provided as part of this consultation. As such, Stratford-on-Avon District Council is not able to properly assess the impact to the wider Green Belt of their removal and therefore reserves the right to comment further, if necessary. The Council notes the requirement, as set out in the NPPF, to establish defensible long-term boundaries to the Green Belt. Given that this consultation is not considering the issue of housing numbers or the Birmingham shortfall, Stratford-on-Avon District Council respectfully queries to what extent proper decisions can be taken at this stage as to what settlements to inset from the Green Belt when the strategic context is still unknown?

Q 35. Should the washed over status of these settlements/areas remain? If not why not?

Stratford- on- Avon District Council does not have a view on whether the Green Belt status of Barston, Chadwick End, Berkswell and Bickenhill should remain.

Q 36. Are there any other areas of the Borough where washed over status should be reviewed, if so which areas and why?

No comments.

Q 37. What compensatory provision should be made for land being removed from the Green Belt? Where relevant please give examples that are specific to individual sites proposed for allocation.

No comments.

Q 38. Do you have any comments on these amber sites, i.e. is it right they should be omitted, or do you believe they should be included, if so why?

No comments.

Q39. Are there any red sites omitted which you believe should be included; if so which one(s) and why?

No comments.

Q 40. Would the above approach of requiring affordable housing contributions of 40% of total square meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace incentivise developers to build more smaller market housing?

No comments.

Q 41. If so, what is the most effective approach? Is it to calculate affordable housing as: (a) 40% of bedroom numbers, (b) 40% of habitable rooms, or (c) 40% of habitable square meterage?

No comments.

Q 42. What is the best way of measuring developable space for this purpose: bedroom numbers, habitable rooms or habitable floorspace?

No comments.

Q 43. What other measures would incentivise developers to build more smaller market housing?

No comments.

Q 44. Are there any other comments you wish to make on the Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation?

No comments.