



Solihull MBC Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For
official
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

1000 New Houses Cheswick
Green Site 12 Dog Kennel
Lane

Please return to psp@solihull.gov.uk or Policy and Engagement, Solihull MBC, Solihull, B91 3QB BY Monday 14th December 23:59

Our Privacy Notice can be found at <https://www.solihull.gov.uk/About-the-Council/Data-protection-FOI/Solihull-Council-Statement/Economy-and-Infrastructure/Policy-Engagement>

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

Part A

1. Personal Details*

**If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation (if applicable) boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title

Mrs

First Name

Carole

Last Name

Duggan

Job Title
(where relevant)

Retired SRN Nurse

Organisation
(where relevant)

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Post Code

Telephone Number

E-mail Address

(where relevant)

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant

Yes

No

4.(2) Sound

Yes

No

4 (3) Complies with the
Duty to co-operate

Yes

No

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

I object to the above application on the grounds that it is not sound nor is it legally compliant.

The application is too large to be accommodated around the Cheswick Green Settlement which five years ago had 1000 dwellings, now extended to 2000 and up to 3000 with the Blythe valley development. This proposed development will increase the number of dwellings to 4000 +. It fails to respect the important character and integrity of established village boundaries, puts additional strain on existing local services including NHS, local infrastructure, roads & transport and increases to risk of further flooding of existing properties. The use of Brown Field site should also be exhausted before Green Belt proposals.

The Flood Risk

It is unlawful to do anything to a piece of land that will increase the risk of flooding to neighbouring land and property. Protection from prosecution does not exclude the Planning Committee or Council employees from their moral obligation to the residents whose properties will have an increased flood risk. The Ordnance Survey Map shows that all the surrounding area including Dickens Heath etc has a surface water run off to

the river Blythe.

The proposed development site drains into Mount Brook and on to the River Blythe increasing the flood risk to associated land and properties

It needs to take proper account of the actual recorded flooding and increase from natural drainage into the Mount Brook plus potential flood levels to existing properties bordering Mount Brook and the river Blythe.

The Established Climate Change Effect has shown that the use of the 1 in 100 year calculation no longer applies. The use of this base offers no guarantee that neighbouring property and land will not be flooded should development take place. In fact the Environment Agency has already set a precedent by using 1/1000 year calculation for storm defences in East Anglia.

With the increased flood risk already caused by Climate Change many existing properties along the Mount Brook and River Blythe are subject to either increased home insurance costs and or the failure to obtain flood insurance. Further development will not improve this situation and could leave these property owners with further cost together with associated property devaluation.

Although the Risk Assessment mentions Climate Change, it fails to provide any related risk calculations.

Green Belt Gap

It is important to retain the gap between Cheswick Green and the Shirley/ Dickens Heath conurbation as per the original planning concept for Cheswick Green. At the planning conference held by SMBC in 2011, residents in rural areas considered that Green Belt buffers around existing villages must be maintained in order to protect the communities and prevent urban sprawl. In recent times the number of dwellings in the area have increased 3 times to approx 3000 and further development means a disproportionate increase in the local area compared to the rest of the Borough. National Planning policy confirms that Green Belt should be defined by permanent roads etc. The council with this development intend to create an artificial boundary by building a new road as part of the Development. This is against the spirit and intent of the policy.

Local Infrastructure

The local infrastructure is already struggling even though the Blythe Valley development is in its early stage of construction. Multiple planning applications are taken as individual when they should be considered as a whole. The area cannot accommodate the scale of development being proposed in terms of local services, medical, education and amenities in general, in an area where the private motor car is the main source of transport. The poor and fluctuating public transport service offers no guarantee for easy future access to and from Cheswick Green to access places of work. The local road network is already subject to gridlock during peak periods and school drop off and pick up times. This is not only caused by local traffic but it has now become a main commuter route by-passing a gridlocked M40/42 motorway route. This situation can only become worse.

There is already limited scope for 'entertainment/ occupation' of young people which has been the cause of anti-social behaviour in the past.

The provision of an extra 1000 dwellings, beside those others in construction will increase emissions of carbon dioxide and enhance climate change and risk of flooding. As these are new dwellings which will replace a green field site then there can be no offset. This will not only require provision of additional electricity generating capacity but also natural gas supply and treated water supply and maintenance of supply pressure, plus extra sewage treatment capacity.

Schools and Medical Centre

The existing Schools and Medical facilities will need to be expanded as well as main NHS hospital capacity. All these are already overloaded with long waiting times for local and hospital medical care. Schools are full and drop off and pick parking is a problem blocking road access and increasing the risk of accidents during these periods.

On these grounds I request that the application is refused.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

General

The development application detail only relates to this sole development which is insufficient considering the other determined and undetermined applications in the locality. The effects of these multiple applications need to be assessed as a whole when considering, flooding, transport, services, amenities and employment etc. This total BL2 proposal should be rejected.

Green Belt and Housing Numbers

Dog Kennel Lane is the only boundary between Cheswick Green and adjoining parts of the Borough. This boundary should be maintained to keep open the only green space between these areas, if not, not only will this green corridor be lost but then it risks further extensive development in the future.

The housing numbers are too large for the proposed development and insufficient space will be given in order to provide a good standard of living. If the development is agreed then a reduction in housing numbers will be required to overcome crowding. Recent planning approvals in Solihull have allowed the construction of back to back, shared drive, housing i.e. slums of the future to be developed. It is in the council's interest to build as many houses as possible as this increases the amount of rates going into their coffers. Not a good incentive for development control.

Flooding Risk.

In order to prevent the use of injunction and/or possible future prosecution it will be

necessary for the Developer and Planning Committee to have the Flood Risk Assessment agreed and signed off by all the existing land and property owners who may be subject to the effects of any development as per a minimum 1/1000 year level. Should planning be given then a condition of that development must be that the maintenance costs of any required flood defence should be paid upfront by the Developer to cover a minimum 25 year period. Flood defences have failed on recent developments due to lack of maintenance.

Infrastructure

Should the development be approved then the developer should be charged for the additional infrastructure facilities in the area to relieve congestion, provide schooling, medical and flooding control, footpaths and cycleways rather than through the tax/rate payer

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

NO

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

9. Signature:

Date:

12/12/20