



Solihull MBC Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For
official
use only)

Name of the Local Plan to which this representation relates:

Draft Submission Plan

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*		2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
<i>*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.</i>		
Title	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>
First Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Peter"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Leaver"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="Director"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="St Modwen Developments Ltd"/>	<input type="text" value="JLL"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="██████"/>
██████ Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>
E-mail Address	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="██████████████████"/>

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox" value="√"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox" value="√"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox" value="√"/>

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.

Please refer to our Statement supporting Representations to Policy P3. This has been submitted with the representations. A short summary statement is provided below.

JLL considers the approach of the Submission Draft to the provision of industrial and warehouse floor space to be deeply flawed on a number of grounds. These are summarised below.

The principal evidence base to the submission draft, G L Hearn's HEDNA, has underestimated substantially the **local** need for development land for industry and warehousing. GL Hearn has mishandled primary recent evidence on increases in industrial floor space and ignored clear market signals which show a significant imbalance between demand and supply.

The supply of sites to meet **local** need is wholly insufficient, both quantitatively and qualitatively. It provides a very restricted offer to companies looking to expand or invest in Solihull.

The approach to identifying and delivering employment land to meet **local** needs

for industry and warehousing does not accord with the guidance set out in PPG on Economic need. In addition, it is not justified by its principal evidence base. As such, Policy P3 is unsound in terms of meeting **local** need for industry and warehousing.

The Submission Draft makes no allowance for **large scale logistics**. Indeed, the Submission Draft and G L Hearn's HEDNA make no reference to this sector. This is a significant failing given the circumstances: -

- Paragraph 82 of the NPPF requires planning authorities to make provision for logistics operators of a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations.
- The clear guidance in PPG for strategic authorities to identify the scale of the need for logistics and consider the most appropriate locations to meet those needs.
- The signposting by the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Sites Study of a "severe shortage" in supply, relative to demand, of development land to accommodate this sector.
- Similar conclusions by the successor study to the West Midlands Strategic Employment Sites Study, currently in draft form but with its conclusions well known to the strategic authorities (as part of the commissioning group), which refers to an "urgent need" for additional sites to be brought forward.
- The recognised strength of the logistics market and the growing gap between demand and supply in this location.

The West Midlands Strategic Employment Sites Study 2015 identified Solihull as forming part of the M42 corridor (Area A) and considered this to be an area of high demand for big box logistics, with supply "severely short". It recommended that local studies should be commissioned to identify specific opportunities and assess policy implications. Unfortunately, no such study has been carried out for Area A. Solihull, as the authority with the greatest access to this stretch of the M42, should have taken a leading role, but has not done so.

Solihull, North Warwickshire, Birmingham and Tamworth – the principal local planning authorities in this area – have simply failed to engage on this issue. This has resulted in very little new land being identified in Local Plans to meet future demand. This is a chronic failure of the Duty to Co-operate.

Similarly, there seems to be a lack of engagement between Birmingham and Solihull – which form part of the same LEP – about how Solihull could take a role in accommodating the significant identified overspill of employment land need for Birmingham.

These omissions are fundamental. They result in the Submission Draft not delivering the scale and quality of employment land required in order for the Borough to meet its economic needs and optimise its assets. This is an object failing given the uncertain economic and political times ahead.

(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.

To rectify matters, the Submission Draft should increase its requirement to meet **local** need for industry and warehousing to 44 hectares (developable, rather than gross).

In addition, the Submission Draft should make an express allowance for the **large scale logistics** sector. This allowance should be over and above local need and provide a minimum of a further 35 hectares.

In combination, the Submission Draft should provide and plan for **at least 80 hectares** of employment land for industry and warehousing to provide for both **local** need and the need for **large scale logistics** (i.e. big box). Without the allocation of this land, the demand for industrial and warehouse units for Solihull will be further suppressed and opportunities for economic growth, whether organic or inward investment, will be missed.

This will require the release of Green Belt land and the allocation of additional new sites. We consider that the scale of need for new employment land, the reasons for its need, the emphasis placed on meeting this need in the NPPF and PPG, the increasing importance of employment in an uncertain economic outlook and the absence of other alternatives, amount to the exceptional circumstances required by the NPPF to release Green Belt land through the development plan-making process. Releases in similar circumstances have already been previously made within Solihull – Blythe Valley Business Park and Birmingham Business Park – and the wider region – i54, Peddimore and Coventry Gateway.

If it is recognised that more land is required and needs to be identified, then there should be a further consultation and/or Call for Sites. Our client, St Modwen Developments Ltd, would be pleased to provide details of a large site that is well related to a motorway junction of the M42, that is capable of meeting some of the additional need referred to above.

(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, 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:

These representations raise significant issues and are supported by detailed evidence. JLL's participation at the examination should assist the Inspector, once appointed, in establishing whether Policy P3 is a sound basis to assess economic need and deliver the right quantity and quality of employment land.

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:

Peter J Leaver

Date:

14.12.2020