

**Berkswell Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan – Consultation Responses – 18<sup>th</sup> June to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018**

**Table 3 Residents and Local Stakeholders 050918 FINAL**

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Vision/ Objective / Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>Parish Councils' Consideration</b>	<b>Amendments to NDP</b>
1.			All	Support	We admire the work and effort that the Berkswell Parish Council team have put into the NDP and wish to register our approval of the draft document as part of the consultation process. Thank you.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
2.			All	Support	The latest Draft Plan is supported.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
3.			All	Support	I fully support the objectives of the plan but If local planning is overruled by Solihull planners what confidence do we have our wishes will be acted upon.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
4.			All	Support	Please find this written confirmation that I am in support of the latest draft of Berkswell's NDP. I have reviewed this latest draft and I am in support of it and the associated policies.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
5.			All and B5	Support	I am aware that the draft NDP for Berkswell Parish is in a further phase of consultation. I have reviewed the latest draft and this email confirms my agreement with it. I am in support of all of the policies, and in particular Policy 5	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					which is about the Berkswell Conservation area.		
6.			All	Support	I write in support of the latest NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
7.			All	Support	I am writing to confirm my support for the current NDP Best regards	Noted with thanks.	No change.
8.			All	Support	I support the latest version of the NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
9.			All	Support	<p>I have seen and read all versions of the NDP for Berkswell. I am delighted that the concerns of residents have been listened to in respect to any changes and consider the matter has been dealt with expeditiously and in an open and transparent manner.</p> <p>I am particularly supportive of all 'green' policies both those that address environmental concerns and issues and those that make sure the area remains as green as possible for wildlife: plants, insects and fauna. I also like the references to connectivity with cycle ways and footpaths.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work in this matter.</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
10.			All	Support	I wish to support the latest version of the NDP Regards [REDACTED]	Noted with thanks.	No change.
11.			All	Support	As a resident of Berkswell Parish I would like to register my wholehearted support for the latest draft of Berkswell Neighbourhood Development Plan	Noted with thanks.	No change.
12.			All	Support	I am writing to say that I fully support the Berkswell Neighbourhood Plan and wish to see it adopted.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
13.			All	Support	I am in full support and agreement of the revised NDP proposals of Berkswell Parish Council, and in particular planning, conservation and green belt policies such as Policy 1, policy 3, Policy 4, Policy 5 and Policy 10 . Parking, the station and walking/cycling accessibility are in policies 7, 8 & 9	Noted with thanks.	No change.
14.			All	Support	I do support the updated NDP. I'm sure like everyone else who has lived here a while – we have been here 17 years, we want to keep the area as it. This doesn't mean we are NIMBYs, we support the expansion ideas for the Airport, but not HS2  I don't like the idea of the village growing into a town. We came to live here	Noted with thanks.  The NDP addresses all the matters raised including the safe, attractive environment, protection of the countryside and open spaces and the need to reduce traffic or manage it more effectively.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>because of the location, motorway network, transport links &amp; also it was &amp; still is a beautiful place to live. I don't &amp; won't have children, however it is important they can play out safely without needing to have parents or chaperones hovering over them.</p> <p>We need MORE green space to encourage more activities for children &amp; adults alike, not more buildings. I appreciate we need to move forward, but not to the expense of the beautiful church in Berkswell or the lovely countryside such as the views from the Greenway at any time of the year. We should also be considerate of the farming community, to get more land to build on would impact on farming generally.</p> <p>I own a small business, personally as it is on-line we have everything we need – other small companies may need to access the shops, post office &amp; other facilities generally so roads &amp; access must be factored into any forward planning.</p> <p>As my husband &amp; myself really enjoy cycling &amp; walking in the area, it might be</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>an idea if somehow we could get the traffic to slow down around the lanes. This would make life safer as a lot of drivers seem to think we are a nuisance, along with dog walkers &amp; horse riders.</p> <p>I know [REDACTED] reasonably well &amp; if you want to edit this email you have my permission to do so.</p> <p>Thank you for being so hardworking &amp; loyal to all of us who live in the area.</p>		
15.			B1, B3, B4 & B7	Support	<p>I would like to inform your Council that I support the latest Regulation 14 Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan. In particular, I strongly support the following draft policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B1 – New Housing – General Principles</li> <li>• B3 – Protecting the Local Landscape</li> <li>• B4 – Local Green Spaces</li> <li>• B7 – Improving Carpark Facilities at Berkswell Station</li> </ul>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
16.			All	Support	I support your latest version of the NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
17.			All but particularly Policies B3, B4 & B5	Support	Just wanted to voice my opinion regards the Berkswell Neighbourhood Development Plan. I support the whole NDP, but particularly policies 3,4 and 5. I really hope it gets the full attention it deserves as I think it is vital to protect the community from the inevitable increase in homes. Without listening to the people who live here, the existing infrastructure would struggle to cope.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
18.			All	Support	Response for with support box ticked	Noted with thanks.	No change.
19.			All	Support	I have reviewed the latest draft NDP that is currently being finalised. I thought the guidelines were clear and helpful to protect the parish and enhance village life. For example the cycle path between Berkswell village and Balsall Common Village. I own Berkswell Pottery which is a small business in Berkswell Village. Having my pottery in such a beautiful setting helps drive business and recommendations and helps inspire creativity and a sense of community. I feel that the plan will help to preserve and sustain this ethos.	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					Do pop in and see my pottery – it would be lovely if the parish council would like to visit.		
20. (2)			All	Support	My wife and I would like to register our support for the NDP of the Berkswell Parish Council	Noted with thanks.	No change.
21.			All	Support	Just a message to register my support for the latest Berkswell NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
22.			All	Support	Having reviewed the latest updated draft of the NDP I just wanted to congratulate the team on their efforts and confirm I am happy to support the plan.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
23.			All	Support	I endorse of the latest version of the Berkswell NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
24.			All	Support	For the record, I am in favour of the latest version of the Berkswell Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
25. (2)			All	Support	We are emailing to confirm our support for the latest version of the Berkswell NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
26.				Support	Berkswell Parish NDP  We record that we support the above	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
27.				Support	I support the Berkswell NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
28.				Support	We support the NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
29.				Support	Please record this e-mail as my total support for the draft NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
30.				Support	I am happy to fully support Berkswell's NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
31.				Support	I would like to register my support for Berkswell PC's approach to the above, particularly point 1. They have endeavoured to get as much input from the local ratepayers as possible. Well done.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
32.				Support	I would like to add my support to the NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
33.				Support	This is to confirm that I fully support the Berkswell Parish NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
34.				Support	Support box ticked on response form	Noted with thanks.	No change.
35.			B1 and B4	Support	Support box ticked on form.  The following written in the comments section	Noted with thanks.  Any changes to the Green Belt boundary will be taken forward by SMBC through the Local Plan Review.	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					We fully object to any future plans for further housing & developments in & around the village as covered under the Government & SBC plans. Once its gone its gone forever. No further developments on greenbelt, now or at any time		
36.			B1 to B10 inclusive	Support	I fully support the latest version of the NDP for Berkswell.  I am also fully supportive of Policies B1 to B10 inclusive.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
37.			All	Support	I have read the latest version of the draft NDP for Berkswell. I agree with it, and am particularly in support of the idea of the cycle path between Berkswell and Balsall Common and also protecting areas such as the football ground as recreational areas for young people in our community to use.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
38.			B1 & B4	Support	I fully support the Berkswell draft NDP particularly 1. The Vision of Berkswell as a distinct area and the protection of the rural environment within the Meriden Gap 2. Policy B1 (brownfield sites, vehicle access and quality open space)	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					3. Policy B4 (Designation of recreation ground adjacent to the Catholic Church as local green space)		
39.			All	Support	I fully support the Berkswell draft NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
40. (2)			All	support	Further to last night's meeting – they don't get any shorter! – I am pleased to offer the Berkswell Parish Council our total support for their NDP proposals.  This email is from two parishioners.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
41.			All	support	I fully support the latest NDP in full.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
42. Chairman Balsall Common Village Residents Association			All	Support	I write to inform you that at the meeting of the Balsall Common Village Residents Association held on the 10 <sup>th</sup> July 2018 it was unanimously resolved to agree with and support the Berkswell Parish NDP revised Draft Consultation Statement as published.  Well done to all involved with the preparation of a well thought through, comprehensive NDP, that will benefit Berkswell Parish and the wider community of Berkswell and Balsall Common for years to come.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
43.				Support	Ticked support on response form	Noted with thanks.	No change.

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Vision/ Objective / Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>Parish Councils' Consideration</b>	<b>Amendments to NDP</b>
44.			Indicated all sections on response form	Support	Ticked support on response form	Noted with thanks.	No change.
45.			Indicated all sections on response form	Support	Ticked support on response form	Noted with thanks.	No change.
46.			Policy 4	Support	As a resident of over thirty years I am seeing many changes to our dear village.  I think developing this land next to the church will be of detriment , as we are short of green space and more housing brings more problems to an over burdened village .	Noted with thanks.	No change.
47.			Indicated all sections on response form	Support	Support box ticked on response form	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
48.			All particularly Policies 3, 4 & 5	Support	<p>I wish to confirm my support for the latest version of the Berkswell Parish Council NDP and especially:</p> <p><b>Policy 3</b> Protection of the landscape and heritage assets. To include protection and conservation of ancient woodland, hedgerows and pasture to preserve ecosystems and biodiversity in all its form and protect endangered and at risk species. Protecting the environment for future generations.</p> <p><b>Policy 4</b> Designating particular open spaces and sporting arenas to Local Green Space to prevent them from future development.</p> <p><b>Policy 5</b> The Berkswell Conservation Area</p> <p>The work of the Berkswell Parish Council NDP Committee is to be congratulated.</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
49.			All	Support	<p>Having read the NDP draft, I confirm my support for the document. I would also like to thank all those councillors and residents who have been involved in preparing this impressive document, it has obviously taken an incredible amount of time and effort.</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
50. (2)			All	Support	We both strongly support the parish council's latest draft NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
51 (2)			All	Support	We support the latest draft.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
52.			All	support	I am a resident in Berkswell Parish and I am in complete agreement with your latest draft plan. Thank you for all your hard work.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
53.			All	Support	Just want to register my support for the latest Draft and to say how much I appreciate the sterling efforts you are making to protect parts of Balsall Common and Berkswell.  There is some crumbs of comfort in the Bulletin in regards to the use of Brownfield Sites and also the use of existing residential roads for access to new housing sites.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
54.			All	Support	This is to confirm my support for the latest NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
55. (2)			All	Support  Note this is their 2 <sup>nd</sup> supportive response	We [REDACTED] fully support your efforts and the current draft NDP. We appreciate the energy and common sense with which Berkswell Parish Council work on our behalf. We have voted for	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					“no change” on the parish boundary issue because we do NOT want to lose the quality and cohesion that you bring to what you do. We hope that sometime in the future we will have a chance to reconsider a merger of Balsall and Berkswell parishes to reflect the single, diverse community we live in.		
Berkswell Society 56.			All	Support	<p>Dear Mr Wilson</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of the Berkswell Society in response to your latest consultation on the Regulation 14 draft of the Berkswell Parish NDP. At a meeting of the Society's Committee held on 10th July 2018, the latest draft with its minor changes from the previous draft, was fully supported. Please take this email as our response to the consultation.</p> <p>We appreciate the efforts of all those who have contributed to the NDP and thank the parish council for involving the Society.</p> <p>John Thomas Acting Chairman</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
57.			All	Support	Support box ticked on response form	Noted with thanks.	No change.

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Vision/ Objective / Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>Parish Councils' Consideration</b>	<b>Amendments to NDP</b>
58. (2)			All	Support	Support box ticked on consent form	Noted with thanks.	No change.
59.			All	Support	Support box ticked on consent form	Noted with thanks.	No change.
60.			P1	Support	<p>I am pleased to know you are working on brownfield sites for house building in the parish. I wish to confirm my support for purpose built roads and provision of green spaces described in your information sheet.</p> <p>Thank you for the work you are doing protecting Berkswell Parish now and in the future.</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
61.			All and P1	Support	<p>I totally support the latest NDP Draft Proposals and in particular, if housing is to be built on Barratts Lane site, purpose built roads need to be constructed for access to and exit from the new housing and not existing residential roads.</p> <p>Provision should also be made for a green space between existing and new homes</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
62.			All	Support	I wish to indicate my support for the latest draft of the Berkswell Parish Council NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
63.			All	Support	Please register my support for the latest draft of Berkswell Parish Council's Neighbourhood Development Plan, in its entirety.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
64.			All	Support	<p>Please register my complete support for the latest draft of the NDP by Berkswell parish council.</p> <p>As a long term resident of Meeting House Lane, I am particularly interested in the NDP policy to require access from purpose built roads not from existing residential roads ( ie Meeting House Lane) to the new housing. As you will be aware one, I think one, possibly two , points of access to new housing is in the mind of Solihull . The whole ethos of the lane is slowly being eroded. It will soon be Meeting House highway. I appreciate your keeping residents informed.</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
65.			All	support	I am writing to indicate my support for the latest draft of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), as described in the leaflet circulated on behalf of Chairman of Berkswell Parish Council.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
66. (2)			All	Support	My wife and I would like to support the latest draft.	Noted with thanks.	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
67.			All	support	<p>I may already have indicated my support for the Berkswell NDP via another mailshot, but better to repeat it here, if not.</p> <p>The Berkswell team have done a marvellous job in seeking out brownfield sites and bringing them to the attention of SMBC. I hope that this leads to these sites being used as a priority - especially as a leaked government document suggests that there may be a weakening for support for no building on greenfield sites until every other possibility has been explored.</p> <p>In the current climate of huge uncertainty re Brexit, and especially since a no-deal is now being considered more likely, it seems that other points may be relevant in the case of the Meriden gap and Barretts Farm. Whatever the outcome of Brexit, the UK will be required to produce more home grown food. The Barretts Farm fields always produce cereal crops, together with providing pasture for cattle. We should support this use continuing.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>Any changes to the boundary of the Green Belt will be a matter for SMBC through the Local Plan Review.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>However, if we lose the battle and <i>some</i> housing is forced on this site, then the point should be emphasised that the fields used should be those where there are <b>no</b> footpaths.</p> <p>In this way, the public is not deprived of the wonderful amenity of footpaths round fields with crops or cattle, trees, ponds and a total feeling of being in the countryside. In bad winter weather we do use Lavender Hall park occasionally, but there is no comparison between a park and open countryside.</p> <p>I have heard discussion about other built amenities which may be offered as a sweetener by a developer. Anything like this would also alter the nature of the area, and obviously would bring more cars and people from across the village, adding to any traffic problems already created by new housing.</p> <p>Please give my most grateful thanks to those people involved in fighting on our behalf.</p>		
68.			All	Support	You have my support.	Noted with thanks.	No change.

<b>Consultee Name Address Ref. No.</b>	<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Para. No.</b>	<b>Vision/ Objective / Policy No.</b>	<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Comments received</b>	<b>Parish Councils' Consideration</b>	<b>Amendments to NDP</b>
69.			All	support	I support the latest draft and agree that brownfield sites are indeed the best option for our growing community.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
70. (2)			All	support	We support the proposals in the flyer that was delivered to our home this week.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
71.			All	Support	I would like to register my support to Berkswell Parish Council particularly with regard to the NDP	Noted with thanks.	No change.
72. (2)			All	Support	My Wife and I support your NDP plan	Noted with thanks.	No change.
73.			All	Support	I support the NDP proposals by Berkswell Parish Council and confirm that you can pass my details to SMBC.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
74.			All	Support	I endorse the Berkswell Parish Council NDP proposals and am happy for my details to be communicated to SMBC.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
75.			All	Support	I support the whole approach of the NDP plan to provide a firm and meaningful guidance for the development and benefit of all in this area and for those who may come and live here in the future	Noted with thanks.	No change.
76.			All	Support	I believe in a plan to provide safety of greenbelt and for the use of brownfield sites to be taken into consideration. I	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					believe in preserving the Meriden Gap to be held for people who may live in this and surrounding areas in the future.	Any changes to the boundary of the Green Belt will be a matter for SMBC through the Local Plan Review.	
77.	15	5.1 4	B1	Comment / Support	<p>I oppose and new building development unless already approved on the greenbelt land especially opposite the windmill in Windmill Lane and to the side and rear of Wellfield Close. I oppose any greenbelt land becoming brownfield land in Balsall Common.</p> <p>I support the NDP in providing an infrastructure levy for Balsall Common. I have concerns with building on greenbelt land and the affect it may have on the environment and wildlife and the increase in air pollution etc. We need more green woodland spaces not less to improve air quality. Once built on, these green spaces maybe gone forever.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Any changes to the boundary of the Green Belt will be a matter for SMBC through the Local Plan Review.</p>	No change.
78.			All	Support	I am emailing to register my full support of the above plan.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
79. (2)			All	Support	I am a Berkswell Resident and have lived in the Village for over 45 years. I support your development Plan, however I cannot seem to fill in your form, since it is in a	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>locked form. Can you send me an electronic word doc so that I can fill in and send back to you before the closing date.</p> <p>However for the record Both my Wife and I :- I fully Support the Berkswell Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>(Note an email is sufficient to comment and [REDACTED] advised that their response has been added to this table)</p>		
80.			All	Support	Well done for pulling this together so quickly. I support Berkswell Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
81.			All	support	I am contacting you to express support for the Berkswell Parish NDP, as the consultation period is about to close.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
82.			All	support	<p>I am completely in favour of the Berkswell Parish NDP.</p> <p>Living adjacent to an area of potential new development I can support what the NDP proposes in Policy 1, supporting green space between old and new developments similar to Riddings Hill and access off purpose built roads such as</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Hallmeadow Road to avoid inappropriate use of existing local roads not suitable for additional traffic or safe for pedestrians etc.</p> <p>I can also agree totally with the need in this area for enough car parking facilities for the local rail terminal but also for any additional housing. As a commuter location almost all residents work away from the village and local transport is not always suitable with additional car spaces needed.</p> <p>I support the NDP.</p>		
83.			All, B8	Support with comment on layout	<p>Thank you to all the team who have worked so hard and relentlessly to produce this draft document. It has my full support.</p> <p>Only suggestions are perhaps to indent the sub-bullets on P8 and be consistent with the formatting of the figure/map titles (eg below item and centred). Just to really polish the presentation!</p>	Noted with thanks.	No change.
84.			All	Comment	I am writing to offer my views (sorry couldn't download the form).	Noted.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>I am for providing more housing, but strongly feel that Brownfield sites should be considered rather than greenbelt. There are also several smaller sites that could fit more in keeping with existing houses.</p> <p>I do not think that housing around the Windmill is a good idea and strongly object, it is a known historic site and very important to the area.</p> <p>I also object to the Barratts Farm estate of 800 houses. I think that a smaller scheme of around 500 houses leaving a wide strip of green belt between the existing houses on Meeting House Lane, Waste Lane and Old Waste Lane would be far more reasonable and acceptable to everyone.. Houses at the back would greatly devalue these houses and spoil the country views. We have just moved to Waste Lane because of the views and walks behind. We have a very small garden and houses at the back of us would be able to see us eating in the kitchen, it would be ridiculous.</p> <p>I agree with the shop and road proposals.</p>	<p>Any changes to the boundary of the Green Belt will be a matter for SMBC through the Local Plan Review.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					For the size of the village, we would very much benefit from a leisure centre/swimming pool in the area which would also generate local jobs. I am happy for my data to be used.		
85.			All	Comment	I wish to register my support for no house building on Barrett's Farm, Windmill Lane or area behind certain houses in Meeting House Lane.	Noted.  Any changes to the boundary of the Green Belt will be a matter for SMBC through the Local Plan Review.	No change.
86.				Support and comment	Although I support this NDP in principle I do not accept proposals or amendments that could include for the introduction of a bypass or other diversionary or road widening scheme through the Berkswell Parish or land that could be realigned under a boundary change/transfer from Berkswell to Balsall Common Parish.	Noted.  Refer comments about road widening scheme to parish council.	No change.
87. (2)			All	Comment & support	We would like to support the latest draft development plan in opposition to the selected sites! Hopefully common sense will prevail!	Noted with thanks.	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
88.			All	Support & comment	<p>I am fully supportive of the aims, objectives and policies documented in the latest draft.</p> <p>However I am concerned about your ability/preparedness to implement such policies. eg Whilst developing your proposals on house design and character, you did not even comment on a recent planning application in Meeting House Lane to knock down a cottage of many decades standing and replace it with a very large 3-storey residence. This was approved by Solihull MBC.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>The parish council will refer to the policies and proposals in the NDP when commenting on future planning applications.</p>	No change.
89.			All	Support & comment	<p>I live in Berkswell Village (██████████ Berkswell), and am a student. <i>(Wording changed to protect identity of a minor)</i> at Heart of England School. My Mum suggested I should read the latest version of the NDP and give you any comments about this draft.</p> <p>As a young person living in the area I care about making sure where we live is developed well, whilst keeping the history of the local area but also making it good for young people, families and older people all living in the community together. I agree with the draft NDP and</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>The NDP includes proposals to improve opportunities for walking and cycling in the parish.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>in particular the protection of the football ground (I have played for the Hornets most of my school life and still play for the under 18's), the conservation area (as this is where I live) and the improved accessibility planned cycle way idea connecting Berkswell Village to Balsall Common Village - this would make a big difference for people travelling between the villages. I've just spent a few days in Oxford and was very impressed by their cycle paths and the number of people on bikes using them - it would be great to develop this here.</p>		
90.			All	Support & comment	<p>Thank you for your communication regarding proposed housing development on Barrett's Farm &amp; Windmill Lane. As a resident of Berkswell Parish for over 60yrs, I would like to express my appreciation of the effort you are making to protect our community from inappropriate development.</p> <p>I fully support the initiatives contained in your draft. A major problem we are experiencing is the totally inadequate provision of car parking in the shopping area of Balsall Common and the</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies and proposals to improve public car parking and increase parking standards in new developments as well as including schemes to encourage walking and cycling as alternative transport methods.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					congestion which results, but I never see this problem mentioned in development proposals. Is it being actively addressed?		
91.			All	Comment	I am happy to support the hard work and findings of the Berkswell Neighbourhood Plan. Clearly there may be some further work of detail required on some aspects .	Noted with thanks.	No change.
92.			All	Comment	I did not respond to the original consultation or this one, because to have separate Berkswell and Balsall ndps is ridiculous. When the boundaries are redrawn to cover Balsall Common it will be worth responding.	Noted.  Balsall Parish Council is also preparing an NDP for their parish area. Berkswell parish council is committed to working together with Balsall parish council on cross boundary issues.	No change.
93.1			All	Comment	While welcoming and supporting the NDP, I believe it would be improved by some minor amendments.	Noted.	No change.
93.2			B1	Comment	Draft Policy B1: New Housing – General Principles  The objective of Criterion 2(i) is understood, but there can be undesirable results from creating public access to rear-garden fences. The fear of anti-social behaviour and crime means that	Partially accepted.  Detailed comments submitted by West Midlands Police have helped to strengthen community safety aspects of the NDP, however specific concerns about public open	Amend NDP.  Amend Policy B1 2i to:  <b>"Quality open space should be placed between existing homes and new development to retain the green character of the parish and to</b>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>obtrusive styles of fencing can be introduced. Legitimate activities in the public area may also cause unwelcome disturbance, including organised events and artificial lighting.</p> <p>The draft policy seeks "quality" open space between existing and new housing, but this could create islands of development and increased use of green belt land, and would not necessarily promote community integration. In addition, these spaces would require significant maintenance, increasing over time as trees mature.</p> <p>It's thought that the policy objectives could be met by recommending a generous minimum distance between existing and new housing, of, for instance, 50 m. This would be less prescriptive, and allow a more nucleated pattern of development and more flexibility in the layout of the green spaces proposed in criterion 2(h) and Policy B3.</p> <p>As part of the constraints imposed on development by Policy B1, there should</p>	<p>space being sited between existing homes and new development was not raised in the Police's comments.</p> <p>The aim of this criterion was to promote community integration of existing and new occupiers. It would be disappointing to remove this opportunity, when it may be possible to provide suitable and well-designed solutions using the experience, advice and support of the West Midlands Police (as offered - see Table 2) to address safety and security measures comprehensively across new development schemes.</p> <p>However, in the interests of improving flexibility in the policy, the NDP could be amended to include reference to a 50m minimum distance between existing and new housing.</p>	<p><b>support community integration through joint use by existing and new occupiers. Where such provision of open space is not possible due to site constraints, a minimum distance of 50m should be provided between existing and new buildings in large developments to protect the privacy and amenity of residents and to support a lower density pattern of development".</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					be the objective of securing the long-term maintenance of public green space. This could include dedication of the land to local bodies or groups of homeowners, or protective covenants.	Management of open spaces is not an issue for the NDP but should be referred to SMBC as part of the development management process as and when development proposals come forward.	
93.3			B3	Comment	<p>Draft Policy B3: Protecting Local Landscape and Built Character</p> <p>There should be a requirement that agricultural, commercial, and infrastructure developments are designed to be as unobtrusive as possible. Light colours and tones of blue should be avoided in all parts that are widely visible, and the main parts of structures should be in subdued colours i.e. desaturated tones of yellow-green (olive), khaki, brown, ochre, russet, etc. Attention should be paid to the appearance of fencing, particularly pallisade security fencing, and unnatural colours such as grey, black, and blue-green should be avoided.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend Policy B3 as suggested.</p> <p>However there may be a lack of background evidence (eg an adopted colour guide) to support specific references to colours and therefore more flexibility in the wording is required.</p>	<p>Amend NDP.</p> <p>Amend Policy B3.</p> <p>Insert additional text:</p> <p><b>"Large Agricultural Buildings in the Open Countryside</b></p> <p><b>Proposals for large agricultural, commercial, and infrastructure developments in the countryside should be sited, designed and landscaped with sensitivity, taking into account the characteristics of the Arden landscape of the rural area of the parish.</b></p> <p><b>Prominent, metallic or bright colours should be avoided in</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
							<p>buildings or parts of buildings which are highly visible from or located within sensitive landscape areas. Natural and earth colours and materials are preferred wherever possible.</p> <p>Boundary treatments should be designed taking into account the Landscape Character design criteria under this Policy and Policy B6, and obtrusive security / palisade type fencing should be avoided."</p>
93.4			B6	Comment	<p>Draft Policy B6: Conversions of Former Agricultural Buildings</p> <p>The policy should include measures to preserve the openness of the Green Belt from harm caused by inappropriate fencing etc around the new domestic curtilages. Fencing and hedging should follow the style of existing agricultural boundaries. Close-boarded fencing should not be used. Consideration should be given to Haha ditches instead of adding further fences and hedges.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Amend Policy B6 as suggested.</p>	<p><b>Amend NDP.</b></p> <p><b>Insert additional wording to Policy B6:</b></p> <p><b>"Boundary treatments should reflect existing field boundaries in the wider rural area such as hedges and post and rail fencing. Suburban style close-boarded fencing and high brick walls are not appropriate and should be avoided. Consideration could be given to the use of ha-ha ditches. Appropriate screening should be provided to</b></p>

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>The policy should recommend that subdued colours are used for window and door frames.</p> <p>The policy should seek to protect the landscape by recommending the planting of trees and shrubs to screen parked vehicles, wheelie bins, and ancillary domestic structures.</p>		<b>help conceal parking areas and vehicles, bin storage areas and other ancillary domestic structures or buildings."</b>
94.			Policy 4	Object	<p>With regard to the discussions involving the future of the land adjacent to the church in Meeting House Lane, I understand that this land is actually the property of the church.</p> <p>Therefore I imagine that any decisions about the future use of the land must, of necessity, involve the owners of the property. It is a mistake to refer to the land as a recreational area when, in fact, it is private land to which the public has access by permission of the landowner. I feel that the public consultation by BPC has not been clear on this point.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The landowner has objected to the identification of the site off Meeting House Lane as a Local Green Space. The Parish Council has met with the landowner (on 21st August) and has advised that there will be further opportunities for representations on the NDP. In the meantime there is a commitment to continuing dialogue.</p> <p>Land ownership is not a planning matter, and the agreement of the landowner is not a requirement for Local</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
						Green Space designation. Access is also not a requirement of Local Green Space.	
95.			Policy 4	Object	<p>As a resident of Balsall Common, I have concerns about the arguments put forward to support this proposal, as follows:</p> <p>☐ The land is a privately-owned field. It is neither a “park” nor a “Recreation Ground” (BPC Plan)</p> <p>☐ “The site has a high recreational value because of its central location” (BPC Plan).</p> <p>A field in a central location may have a number of different “high values”, which may be other than for recreation.</p> <p>☐ “The predominant activity in January was dog walking/exercising” (BPC Plan).</p> <p>Dog-walking is carried out by many residents of Balsall Common and Berkswell in a variety of areas, including in fields growing crops. This does not automatically make such fields “recreation areas”.</p>	Not accepted.	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>☒ <i>“The site is also special because of its tranquillity and value for wildlife”.</i></p> <p>There are many large gardens and fields in Berkswell and Balsall Common that are tranquil. What precisely is “special” about this site and exactly what wildlife is particularly well-represented here?</p> <p>☒ <i>“The proposed Local Green Space was supported by a neighbouring developer / landowner as an open space within a housing scheme as part of the proposed development at Barratt's Farm”.</i></p> <p>If a developer is supporting it, this can only because this will save them having to use their land to provide a recreational space. This will enable them to make more profit from the land they already own. Should the BPC be involved in this?</p>		
96. (2)			Policy 4	Object	<p>I would like to object to the designation of the land, adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold Church in Meeting House Lane, as Local Green Space.</p> <p>As you are aware this land is privately owned by the Archdiocese of</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Birmingham. Mindful of community needs, they have allowed access to the public for various events. The right of way is used, as are other rights of way in the area.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest the land has significant wildlife value, or is particularly tranquil.</p> <p>There are various other recreational areas within the village, namely, The Lant, Lavender Hall and Willow Parks, and also land around The Grange.</p> <p>As and when further development comes to Balsall Common, there will obviously be designated green space areas within future building plans.</p> <p>The Diocese is looking to develop the land to help meet the needs of the elderly within the village. This would also provide these residents with easy access to the village centre.</p> <p>It would appear that the Archdiocese of Birmingham is being penalised because of its generosity to the local community,</p>	<p>Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan. Land in private ownership can be protected as a Local Green Space without the consent of the landowner, similar to Green Belt.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review and identification of the proposed strategic sites provides significant opportunities to provide suitable housing to meet local needs, including homes for older residents. Smaller housing suitable for residents wishing to downsize is also supported in NDP Policy B1.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					most of whom forget this is not public land.		
97.			Policy 4	Object	<p>I wish to raise concerned regarding the proposed designation of land on Meeting House Lane, Balsall Common, adjacent to the Catholic Church, as Local Green Space. My points are as follows:</p> <p>☐ The field is privately owned, and the public has no right of access. As such, Berkswell Parish Council (BPC) should have no right to designate it a Local Green Space.</p> <p>☐ A number of interested neighbours with gardens backing onto or near the field, such as some residents of Meeting House Lane and Oxhayes Close have petitioned their neighbours to make this request to the BPC, but it is in their own personal interest only, not that of the wider community. It is already known that developers would have to provide recreational space themselves, but that might not have been behind the back gardens of these particular residents.</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan. Land in private ownership can be protected as a Local Green Space without the consent of the landowner, similar to Green Belt.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>☐ The BPC NDP questionnaire did not make it clear that the area was privately owned, and therefore the question and the responses from residences are invalid. I am sure most residents would see the injustice of anybody's private property being ring-fenced for public use.</p> <p>☐ There used to be children's play equipment in one corner of this field when Berkswell Parish Council leased an area, but BPC ceased the arrangement a very long time ago, possible before the new century.</p> <p>☐ One of the local football clubs leased the area from the Catholic Archdiocese of Birmingham for some years, but this also ceased in the early 2000's.</p> <p>☐ To make the status and ownership of the land clear to residents, there has been a notice at the entrance in Meeting House Lane since the early 2000's.</p> <p>☐ This field has no more, and very probably less ecological significance than the fields that have already been</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>identified for future development (such as Barrett's Farm). It is not of exceptional value, and indeed seems to be mostly used by just a few residents as a dog toilet. The same cohort use many fields on the periphery of the village in the same way, but that does not mean those fields are established local recreational areas</p> <p>☒ Any developer developing the Barrett's Farm area or any other will be obliged to provide recreational space out of their existing land pool. This will limit the number of houses that a developer could build on their own land. If BPC itself provides the recreational space by designating this field, they will have assisted the developers in maximising the profitability of the developer's land.</p> <p>☒ They could thereby open themselves to a charge of collusion with a developer. This alone would seem reason enough not to be swayed by the self-interest of a small number of local residents. It is even more concerning if it</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>can be shown that the NDP questionnaire was misleading in not explaining the background or the status of the land, but merely asking a yes-or-no question.</p> <p>I would therefore urge you to leave the status of this land as it is currently, and to rely on the future planning process to ensure sufficient green space is left from all the land available for development, without hindrance or favour.</p>		
98.			Policy 4	Object	<p>We write regarding the strenuous efforts being made by Berkswell Parish Council to propagate the allocation of land adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold RC Church in Meeting House Lane as Local Green Space.</p> <p>We object on the following grounds:</p> <p>The land in question is in close proximity to the Lant which is already green space – if it were geographically distant, there might have been a case; there is none for such duplication</p>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan. Land in private ownership can be protected as a Local Green Space without the consent of</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>☐ Apart from a footpath there is no right of way to the land unless BPC is ultimately considering a compulsory purchase</p> <p>☐ Arguments focussed on tranquillity, wildlife value, exceptional quality etc are flimsy at best and not credible at worst</p> <p>☐ In line with recent building development at the bottom of MHL, this parcel of land, in the middle of residential properties, is clearly suitable for building and no amount of wishful thinking will change this now, or in the future.</p> <p>☐ The land is the property of the Birmingham RC Archdiocese and its future use is not in the purview of BPC</p> <p>It is unfortunate that so much effort has been wasted on pursuing this idea, including the setting up of a poster at the roundabout, thankfully now removed, which clearly presented a traffic hazard. Given the lack of interest which has been expressed on such issues, the combination of the two parish councils being a case in point, one could be</p>	<p>the landowner, similar to Green Belt.</p> <p>Smaller housing suitable for residents wishing to downsize is also supported in NDP Policy B1.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>forgiven in believing that for some reason, a small group has decided this is a good idea and is trying to force it, none too subtly, upon the local population.</p> <p>On the other hand, the owners of the land, the RC Archdiocese of Birmingham, are seeking to progress a development that will put in place much needed older persons' accommodation that demographics clearly indicate will be needed in the future. In addition, the faith school in Dorridge, which is oversubscribed, desperately needs additional space which could be provided by some of the funds raised by such a sale.</p> <p>It is difficult, if not impossible, to believe that the BPC proposal offers greater long term value to the wider community.</p>		
99.			Policy 4	Object	<p>Regarding the BPC proposal to allocate the land adjacent to the Robert Grissold RC Church in Balsall Common as Local Green Space, I'd like to make the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The referred site doesn't have recreational value as the only right of access is the existing footpath.</li> </ul>	<p>Not accepted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely</p>	No change.




Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>- There's no significant wildlife in the area.</p> <p>- We see no reason to justify making that area a Local Green Space.</p> <p>I therefore request the BPC proposal to be rejected, allowing future development plans at the referred site.</p>	supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan.	
100.	39		All B4	Support with Objection to one policy B4	<p>Thank you for providing a copy of your amended NDP, I am pleased to confirm my support for all aspects of the plan with one major exception as detailed below...</p> <p>I strongly object to your proposal to designate the land adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold Catholic Church in Meeting House Lane as "Local Green Space", you are well aware that this land is privately owned by the Catholic Church, you therefore have no right to suggest what use it should be put to in your development plan. The Church allows local residents to use the land for recreational purposes as a courtesy, the residents have no automatic right to use this facility, should the Church wish, the land could be fenced off to prevent public access. I would like to see this proposal removed from your NDP.</p>	<p>Support noted with thanks.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan. Land ownership / acquisition of land is not a requirement for Local Green Space, similar to Green Belt.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
101.1			B4	Object	<p>I refer to the proposals/suggestions contained in the Development Plan with particular regard to the Local Green Spaces. It is not clear on what basis the PC would seek to have the land near the Hornets ground and that in Meeting House Lane so designated.</p> <p>Unless the PC is prepared to pay market value to acquire and I or maintain these spaces in future, it seems the rights of the owners are being set aside. If the electorate are offered "something for nothing" no doubt they will go along with these proposals but would not be so keen if they have to bear the burden of acquisition/maintenance.</p> <p>Apart from an adjoining footpath there does not seem to be any public right to use these areas, nor any special features justifying their suggested "Local Space" status.</p> <p>I hope the Council will take note of these contrary views in considering their final plan and drop these proposals.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p> <p>Land ownership / acquisition of land is not a requirement for Local Green Space, similar to Green Belt.</p>	No change.
102. (5)			B4	Object	I am writing to you to express my complete disagreement with reference to the proposal of BPC to keep land adjacent	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>to Blessed Robert Grissold church on Meeting House Lane, Balsall Common.</p> <p>The suggestion that this land is of significant recreational value is untrue - its overgrown and only used by local dog walkers who allow their pets to foul on this piece of land. Further dog walkers and all people from the local Balsall Common community have more than one foot path around that area of Balsall Common along with an abundance of walkways through Barretts Lane, the Greenway and so forth. This confirms that there is no real recreational 'value' to the small piece of land adjacent to the Church for the local community.</p> <p>The suggestion made in the proposal that the field is 'tranquil' is again irrelevant since it is only used by dog walkers who are surrounded by an abundance of other green areas. Further, the suggestion regarding the ecology of the green space is not justifiable when there is an abundance of other green areas adjacent.</p> <p>The site/field adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold belongs to the Church; it is</p>	<p>in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p> <p>Land ownership / acquisition of land is not a requirement for Local Green Space, similar to Green Belt.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>obvious therefore that the legal owner of this land should retain full control of the future of this land. The selling of this site partially or in full would raise significant funds for the Church and more importantly raise funds to increase the size and consequent pupil capacity at Saint George and Teresa in Dorridge, therefore potentially reducing strain on pupil numbers at Balsall Common and Berkswell Primary Schools.</p> <p>Please register it is our objection to the Berkswell Parish Council Proposal</p>		
103.			B4	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposed plan of Berkswell Parish Council to allocate the Land adjacent to The Catholic Church (Blessed Robert Grissold) in Meeting House Lane as Local Green Space.</p> <p>My objections are these:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This Land is owned by The Archdiocese of Birmingham. It was purchased over 70 years ago. It was earmarked then for a Faith School which has yet not come to fruition. The owners are now seeking to progress for a new</li> </ol>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Faith School to replace the present one at Dorridge, which is oversubscribed and in dire need of expansion. It has no space to do this. Children from our parish have over the years , attended and still do. Another plan in the pipe line is A Complex for Elderly People which will be much needed in the future. This would be an ideal site so near to all the necessary amenities.</p> <p>Both projects hopefully will be mainly paid for from the sale of the land.</p> <p>2. B.P.C. plan to use this land for recreational purposes. Across the road opposite is The Lant Trust Ground which is used for the same purpose. Surely, there is no need for another one so close. In any case, the only access is by A Public Footpath, and would this meet the needs of Health and Safety?</p> <p>3. B.P.C. considers the land to be tranquil and of some wildlife value. These can be found in other areas of Balsall Common and are really unnecessary. I sincerely trust you will consider my objections with careful thought and discrimination.</p>	<p>Land ownership / acquisition of land is not a requirement for Local Green Space, similar to Green Belt.</p> <p>The NDP includes policies which support a mix of housing including smaller housing suitable for people wishing to downsize.</p> <p>The expansion of a school is a matter for the church and educational authorities but there may be opportunities to enhance local educational provision through developer contributions linked to the possible development of the proposed strategic sites in the Local Plan Review.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
104.	32 &3 3	7.2 7	B4	Object	 <p>I take issue with the request to designate the field at Meeting House Lane as local green space. It's a small field that is, as often as not, completely overgrown. The one time (I live around the corner from the field) I wanted to take our local youth group out to it to play rounders, it was completely overgrown. The only people who use it are dog walkers who let their dogs run loose and defecate in the field - its actual recreational value is therefore close to zero. If by 'tranquil' the Parish Council means 'unused' then yes, maybe it is tranquil! As regards wildlife, there doesn't appear to be any more there than there is in my garden. Apart from pooing dogs of course... there's a few of those.</p> <p>The BPC has been trying to nobblo that field since for almost as long as I have lived in the village - it's like an obsession for them. I shall be relieved when the boundary line is changed and it's no longer under their jurisdiction.</p> <p>Finally, the BPC has not shown how the field qualifies as an 'exceptional green space'. The request should be refused.</p> <p>Please return this form by midnight on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2018 to: The Clerk, Berkswell Parish Council, PO Box 6975, Coventry, CV5 9LP or clerk@berkswellparishcouncil.org.uk</p>	Noted.  The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces. The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations and should be retained in the Submission Plan.	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>completely overgrown. The only people who use it are dog walkers who let their dogs run loose and defecate in the field - its recreational value is therefore close to zero. If by "tranquil" the parish council means unused, then yes maybe it is tranquil! As regards wildlife, there doesn't appear to be any more there than in my garden. Apart from poo-ing dogs of course - there are a few of those. The BPC has been trying to nobble that field for almost as long as I have lived in the village - it's like an obsession for them. I shall be relieved when the boundary line is changes and it's no longer under their jurisdiction.</p> <p>Finally the BPC has not shown how the field qualifies as an "exceptional green space". The request should be refused.</p>		
105.			B4	Object	<p>The NDP (specifically, Table 1) refers to the tranquillity of the field, specifically referencing the mature trees &amp; hedgerows that "adds to the sense of a quiet green oasis in the midst of a built-up area". This claim is at odds with other statements in the NDP. Para 7.21 of the NDP (referring to the character of the built-up area within Berkswell Parish) says "The area is characterised by mature</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Residents (including dog walkers) value the recreational opportunities of</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>trees and hedgerows incorporated within the built-up area" and "The general "greenness" of the suburban areas is a key local characteristic". Photos of the mature trees and hedgerows along Meeting House Lane are even included to illustrate this point. The photos and statements do not support the depiction of the field as an oasis of tranquillity in an otherwise built-up, urban area. The primary assertion to support the proposal of LGS designation is that the church's field is of high recreational value, although according to their own survey, the majority of this recreation is dog-walking.</p> <p>The local football club, The Hornets, have in the past made use of the field by specific agreement with the landowners, but this has not been the case for a few years since the Hornets moved to what they describe as their "new permanent home" off Lavender Hall Park. (As a side-issue, this surely negates any suggestions in Kirkwells' response about the church field being protected as a lapsed football pitch, since there is already of superior replacement). The proposal to designate</p>	<p>the area. Dog walkers and families are no less important than other residents and users, and informal recreational use of green spaces has a value just as more formal uses have.</p> <p>The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations (including at Reg 14) and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p> <p>The identification of several different names for the area does not diminish its value.</p>	



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>the church's field as a Local Green Space hangs entirely on the assertion that the land is of "high recreational value" to the local community. The ad hoc use by the field by people walking their dogs and a few families hardly justifies the terminology "high value".</p> <p>There is no evidence of any regular, planned use, no evidence of value to community groups rather than just a small number (compared to the local population) of individuals. In addition, Berkswell Parish Council "notes" the comment made by Monsignor McHugh and by several respondents to the initial consultation, that the dog-walkers who use the site do so only by permission of the landowner but fail to follow this through to its logical conclusion.</p> <p>The comment by Kirkwells that "public access is not a requirement for a Local Green Space within the NPPF" is factually correct but again, misses the point. I object to the part of policy B4 that proposes designation of the land adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold Church as a Local Green Space. I submit that the</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Berkswell Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan fails to demonstrate that this piece of land meets the requirements for designation as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>As an observation, it seems that a great deal of effort has gone into gathering evidence to support this particular proposal, far more so than the apparent effort expended to support the other proposal for a piece of land to be designated as a Local Green Space. Before directly addressing the Local Green Space requirements and the reasons that the field next to the church does not meet them, I would like to address some other comments and assertions in the NDP and in the response from their consultant to issues raised during the consultation.</p> <p>Specific mention is made of the fact that Greenlight Developments, the developers responsible for the development of the Barrett's Lane site have expressed their support for the proposal. I do not believe that this support is in any way remarkable – in fact the most obvious explanation is</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>that it is down to purely commercial considerations. An adjacent piece of land that is protected against future development would be appealing to Greenlight's future customers and offer the developer commercial benefit – and at no cost to themselves, since someone else owns the land.</p> <p>Objections about the naming of the site in the NDP and initial consultation have been largely dismissed but are nonetheless important. Ordnance Survey maps are known to be generally accurate, but they are not infallible; the fact that other mapping systems use a different name for the same piece of land indicates that there is no general agreement. This is most likely because this is simply a piece of land that is not currently being used for any specific purpose.</p> <p>The replies from the Parish Council and Kirkwells to responses made during the initial consultation assert that the piece of land in question is “known locally as the Meeting House Lane Playing Field or Recreation Ground” – but no evidence is given to support this assertion. In my</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>experience (20 years' residence in the village) the land is known locally as "the field next to the church" or "the church's field". My assertion is no more provable than that made in the NDP, and equally as valid. It does, however, have the benefit of being a more accurate description of the piece of land.</p> <p>(CONT. ON NEXT PAGE) The NDP (specifically, Table 1) refers to the tranquillity of the field, specifically referencing the mature trees &amp; hedgerows that "adds to the sense of a quiet green oasis in the midst of a built-up area". This claim is at odds with other statements in the NDP. Para 7.21 of the NDP (referring to the character of the built-up area within Berkswell Parish) says "The area is characterised by mature trees and hedgerows incorporated within the built-up area" and "The general "greenness" of the suburban areas is a key local characteristic". Photos of the mature trees and hedgerows along Meeting House Lane are even included to illustrate this point. The photos and statements do not support the depiction of the field as an oasis of tranquillity in an</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>otherwise built-up, urban area. The primary assertion to support the proposal of LGS designation is that the church's field is of high recreational value, although according to their own survey, the majority of this recreation is dog-walking.</p> <p>The local football club, The Hornets, have in the past made use of the field by specific agreement with the landowners, but this has not been the case for a few years since the Hornets moved to what they describe as their "new permanent home" off Lavender Hall Park. (As a side-issue, this surely negates any suggestions in Kirkwells' response about the church field being protected as a lapsed football pitch, since there is already of superior replacement).</p> <p>The proposal to designate the church's field as a Local Green Space hangs entirely on the assertion that the land is of "high recreational value" to the local community. The ad hoc use by the field by people walking their dogs and a few families hardly justifies the terminology "high value". There is no evidence of any</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					regular, planned use, no evidence of value to community groups rather than just a small number (compared to the local population) of individuals. In addition, Berkswell Parish Council "notes" the comment made by Monsignor McHugh and by several respondents to the initial consultation, that the dog-walkers who use the site do so only by permission of the landowner but fail to follow this through to its logical conclusion. The comment by Kirkwells that "public access is not a requirement for a Local Green Space within the NPPF" is factually correct but again, misses the point.		
106.			B4	Object	I object to the proposed designation of the land adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold Church as a Local Green Space in policy B4. Berkswell Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan has failed to demonstrate that the requirements for designation as a Local Green Space have been met for the following reasons:	Noted.  The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces.  Residents (including dog walkers) value the recreational opportunities of the area. Dog walkers and	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Parish Council and Kirkwells assert that the piece of land in question is “known locally as the Meeting House Lane Playing Field or Recreation Ground” – but no evidence is given to support this assertion. In my experience, it is, in fact, known simply as “the field next to the Church”. Berkswell Parish Council has dismissed objections over the name of the site, however they are important. There is no agreement between maps of the area on the name of the field due to the fact that the land is not used for any specific purpose.</li> <li>The claimed support for draft policy B4 is based on responses to a deeply flawed and leading question included in the initial consultation questionnaire. My, and other’s written objections to the question included in the survey responses have not been mentioned. The question was “Do you support designating the recreation ground on Meeting House Lane next to the Catholic Church as local green space to protect it</li> </ul>	<p>families are no less important than other residents and users, and informal recreational use of green spaces has a value just as more formal uses have.</p> <p>The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations (including at Reg 14) and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p> <p>The identification of several different names for the area does not diminish its value.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>from development” is biased and is designed to lead the respondent to assume that the field next to the church is designated as a recreation ground. <b>This is not the case.</b> It is a private field, owned by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Birmingham with a public right of way running along one of the boundaries. The largely positive response is therefore unsurprising and rendered invalid given the recreation ground referred to does not exist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 77 of NPPF states 3 requirements that must be met for land to be designated as a Local Green Space.</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The green space is reasonably close to the community it serves - this is true and I do not dispute this.</li> <li>2. The green area concerned is local in character and not an extensive tract of land – this is also true and, again, I do not dispute this.</li> <li>3. A designated LGS must be “demonstrably special to a local community” and hold “a particular local</li> </ol>		



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>significance" – I believe that Berkswell Parish Council have failed to prove this requirement. The examples given for local significance are as follows:</p> <p>§ The Site's beauty – The NDP does not indicate that the site exhibits any exceptional or out-of-theordinary beauty.</p> <p>§ The Site's historic significance - The NDP does not claim any historic significance for this site.</p> <p>§ Tranquillity or richness of wildlife - The claim made in the NDP about the site's "richness of wildlife" is unsubstantiated; the Ecological Survey by Warwickshire County Council cited in the NDP does not even mention this site. The NDP (in Table 1) refers to the tranquillity of the field, specifically referencing the mature trees &amp; hedgerows that "adds to the sense of a quiet green oasis in the midst of a built-up area". However, para 7.21 of the NDP (referring to the character of</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>the built-up area within Berkswell Parish as a whole) says “The area is characterised by mature trees and hedgerows incorporated within the built-up area” and “The general “greenness” of the suburban areas is a key local characteristic”. This demonstrates that there is nothing significantly different between this field and others in the area that are being built upon, and the built-up area as a whole.</p> <p>§ The Site’s recreational value – This is the nub of Berkswell Parish Council’s assertion that the site be designated as a local green space. I will expand on why this demonstrates a flawed understanding below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CONTINUED ON PAGE 3</li> </ul> <p>Please use the box below and overleaf for any comments.</p> <p><b>Thank you for your time and interest. Please return this form by midnight on 31st July 2018 to: The Clerk, Berkswell Parish Council, PO Box 6379, Coventry, CV6 9LP or clerk@berkswellparishcouncil.org.uk</b></p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2</li> <li>• The primary assertion to support the proposal of LGS designation is that the church's field is of high recreational value. However, Berkswell Parish Council's own survey demonstrates that the majority of this recreation use is for dog-walking. Whilst the local football club has made use of the field (by specific agreement with the landowners), this is no longer the case and has not been for several years and, in no way could this site be designated as a lapsed football pitch as Kirkwalls would have it, since it is no longer used as such and a better alternative is available in Lavender Hall Park.</li> <li>• The ad hoc use of the field by people walking their dogs and the occasional family does not justify the field being "high value". There is no evidence of any regular planned or actual usage and no evidence of value to community groups. Therefore, the low percentage of the population of the area that actually</li> </ul>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>use it for walking their dogs cannot justify a designation of high recreational value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamentally, any use of the space is only by kind permission of the landowner. This is <b>not</b> a public space and access could be rescinded at any time. The field would then not be available for use for any kind of recreational activity, would have little or no value to the local community and would, in effect, be another ordinary field that people could see alongside a public footpath. This information has been communicated to Berkswell Parish Council in responses made to the initial consultation by Monsignor McHugh and by several respondents and 'noted'.</li> <li>• With no guaranteed right of access there can be no enduring "high recreational value" to this piece of land; which in turn means that Berkswell Parish Council are unable to demonstrate that the Church's field meets the criteria of Local Green Space designation.</li> </ul>		


Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Whilst Greenlight Developments, the developers of the Barrett's Lane site have expressed their support for the proposal. This is unremarkable and perhaps enlightened self-interest. Their support can be easily justified through purely commercial reasons. An adjacent piece of land that is protected against future development would be appealing to Greenlight's future customers and offer the developer commercial benefit – and at no cost to themselves, since someone else owns the land.</p> <p>Paragraphs 76 and 77 of the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) are quoted within paragraph 7.27 of the NDP. Two notable sentences from these paragraphs are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Local Green Spaces should ... be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space.</i></li> </ul> <p>I submit that the Church's field is one of those open spaces for which Local Green Space designation is</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>inappropriate and cannot be justified. I object, most strongly, to this designation. I also submit that the Draft Policy B4 cannot be accepted until the land owned by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Birmingham, that is adjacent to Blessed Robert Grissold Church on Meeting House Lane, is removed from the list of sites that should be designated Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>A high level of support for draft policy B4 has been claimed, based on responses to a questionnaire at the initial consultation page. I commented at the time, and still contend, that the questionnaire was flawed, using misleading terminology, and being poorly designed. The question itself is biased, leading and overly simplistic, meaning that the largely positive response is neither surprising nor particularly valid.</p> <p>These are general comments; I would now like to concentrate specifically on Draft Policy B4 and paragraph 7.27 of the Draft NDP.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Paragraphs 76 and 77 of the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) are quoted within paragraph 7.27 of the NDP. Two notable sentences from these paragraphs are: Local Green Spaces should ... be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. and The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space.</p> <p>I submit that the church's field is one of those open spaces for which Local Green Space designation is inappropriate. Paragraph 77 of NPPF the gives three requirements that must be met for land to be designated as a Local Green Space. I do not dispute two of them: - the green space is reasonably close to the community it serves - the green area concerned is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>The third requirement is the one that I believe Berkswell Parish Council have failed to prove in the instance of this piece of land. A designated LGS must be "demonstrably special to a local community" and hold "a particular local significance". The examples cited in the</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>NPPF suggest that such significance could come from a site's beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife.</p> <p>The NDP does not claim any historic significance for the site, nor does it indicate any exceptional or out-of-the-ordinary beauty. The claim made in the NDP about the site's "richness of wildlife" is unsubstantiated; the Ecological Survey by Warwickshire County Council cited in the NDP does not even mention this site.</p>		
107.			Policy 4	Object	<p>Land adjacent to Robert Grissold Church</p> <p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I feel obliged to write to you in connection with your council's proposal that the land above be declared a Local Green Space.</p> <p>AS I see it it is currently an overgrown field with a public footpath to one side and is used on a regular basis by dog walkers.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Residents (including dog walkers) value the recreational opportunities of the area. Dog walkers are no less important than other residents and users, and informal recreational use of</p>	No change.



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>This would seem to be its only recreational use if your proposal was accepted. It occurs to me if it was accepted who would be responsible for its maintenance and indeed upkeep. There seems little to support the requirement in terms of ecological grounds or any recreational value and no evidence of any wildlife or value to the local community.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how your proposal would stand up to scrutiny at any level. Yours sincerely</p> 	<p>green spaces has a value just as more formal uses have.</p> <p>The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations (including at Reg 14) and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p>	
108.	53 and 54		Policy 10	Comment/ object	<p>Query on Berkswell Draft NDP Page 52, Businesses in the rural area I am very concerned by the comment made in section 11.2 in the NDP that "The reasonable expansion — of established businesses into the green belt will</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Policy wording for B10 has been carefully prepared in close consultation with planning officers from SMBC.</p>	No change.

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>be.allowed-where the proposal would make a significant contribution towards the local economy or employment providing that appropriate mitigation can be secured."</p> <p>This is giving the green light to large industrial development in the green belt that the council has long since committed to protect. For a business to make a significant contribution towards the local economy or employment then it would probably have to be of a significant size.</p> <p>Thus, an example might be where a business has previously been allowed to move into a farm yard building (because the building was existing and considered to be redundant) and will look to use this clause to gain approval for a much larger scale new development that, had it not previously been a smaller scale business in a farm building, would never have been considered to be appropriate to be allowed to be built in the green belt. Thus, I am worried that this may be used by big business to expand existing developments that are in the green belt</p>	<p>National planning policy and Solihull MBC's strategic planning policies tightly constrain development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>NPPF para 87 sets out that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>Paragraph 89 sets out that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions include buildings for agriculture and forestry, the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>and that should certainly not be encouraged.</p> <p>There is a clear policy that discourages new industrial developments in the green belt unless it is in areas designated and set-aside for that purpose and that would be, for example, located next to the NEC and the M42 for traffic and logistical reasons. In rural areas there is a policy that, under certain circumstances, allows for redundant farm buildings to be utilized by business and change of use can be allowed. However then stating that there is now a new policy to subsequently allow such companies to then expand (building brand new buildings in the green belt) is surely in contravention of the intention/policies to protect the green belt and this does not take into account the special circumstances that allowed change of use for the redundant farm buildings in the first instance.</p> <p>The phrasing "reasonable" is also widely open to interpretation. What would be considered to be reasonable by an industrialist developer could be</p>	<p>the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces and limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.</p> <p>Paragraph 90 sets out that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These include the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>considered to be totally unreasonable to others. Anyone using the special circumstances clause to open a business by turning a redundant farm building into an office, factory unit or storage unit, should not have a reasonable expectation of being subsequently allowed to expand it by building new buildings or large extensions to the farm building <u>as planning conditions for industrial developments in the green belt are quite rightly tightly controlled.</u></p> <p>I also believe that whilst employment for locals is important we have to understand that there is no employment problem in Berkswell and thus to put any emphasis at all on encouraging developments that contribute towards improving local employment is thus wrong. Any new developments in Berkswell would mean jobs for people living outside of Berkswell and would simply encourage more traffic to travel into Berkswell at a time when looking for ways to better control that traffic is a key aim for the council. Berkswell is not in need of attracting new business to the area and of providing more jobs for</p>	<p>of permanent and substantial construction.</p> <p>The NDP does not seek to undermine national and SMBC Green Belt policy, however it does seek to provide more local detail to guide decisions in relation to proposals which may come forward over the plan period.</p> <p>The parish council is committed to retaining the openness of the Green Belt, but is also supportive of small scale local businesses which support the economic sustainability of the area and provide employment opportunities.</p> <p>The policy does not encourage large scale industrial development in the Green Belt, and if it did so, it would be challenged by SMBC planning officers and would be amended or deleted by an</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>locals. There is full local employment. There are designated business zones within a short drive from Berkswell that are better placed for new industrial developments and <u>there is simply no need to encourage more development in the green belt.</u></p> <p>If any business sees a need for additional space then it of course always has the opportunity at any time to apply for planning permission <u>in the normal way.</u> for an extension to its premises or to seek to build a larger unit elsewhere and to move. <u>It is surely not correct to have a special local policy that encourages and promotes business to expand in the greenbelt when that is under constant pressure and the council is (supposedly) committed to protect it.</u></p> <p>I am also highly concerned with the statement in the NDP that "proposals include for the re-use or conversion of existing former agricultural buildings <u>OR the development of sensitively designed new buildings within the curtilage of existing farm buildings.</u></p>	<p>examiner. Instead the policy refers specifically to small scale business units.</p> <p>Refer also to Policy B6 which provides detailed criteria for the conversion of former agricultural buildings. This has been prepared in consultation with SMBC planning officers to help address concerns about proposals for inappropriate conversions which have come forward in recent years.</p>	

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>As already stated above it is <u>noted</u> that there is already_ a_policy for the re-use of redundantfarnv _____ buildings.</p> <p>However, it is surely not at all correct to then have a further policy of allowing new build developments within the "curtilage" of existing farm buildings. Again, this is simply giving a green light to developers who can look to purchase a small farm building, changing it into an industrial unit, and then to build a new industrial unit right next to it (in the green belt) and this cannot be correct and again is in direct contravention to the councils long standing policy of protecting the green belt and not allowing industrial developments <u>unless there are very special circumstances</u>. There is nothing in the NDP that states that these "new buildings" in the green belt would be limited in size or number (!) and the very word "curtilage" is also wide open to interpretation. Curtilage being an area, <u>usually enclosed</u>, encompassing the grounds and buildings <u>immediately</u> surrounding a building.</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>What is "immediate" to me suggests a matter of a few feet, for others it may be a much larger area.</p> <p>I therefore request that Berkswell Parish Council reviews these two clauses because they are clearly at odds with its long standing aims to prevent building in the green belt (especially industrial units) and to try and reduce or limit and otherwise control additional traffic in the area. Obviously suggesting that the building of new industrial units are somehow now allowed in the greenbelt and ignoring the long standing aims to discourage traffic in Berkswell is wrong.</p> <p>The two statements in the NDP work directly against long established Parish Council guidelines and are in any case simply not needed because, and as already pointed out, any local business that wishes to expand; already has the approved and correct means to apply for planning approval in the normal way</p>		

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>Query on Berkswell Draft NDP Page 52, Businesses in the rural area</p> <p>I am very concerned by the comment made in section 11.2 in the NDP that <i>"The reasonable expansion of established businesses into the green belt will be allowed where the proposal would make a significant contribution towards the local economy or employment providing that appropriate mitigation can be secured."</i></p> <p>This is giving the green light to large industrial development in the green belt that the council has long since committed to protect. For a business to make a significant contribution towards the local economy or employment then it would probably have to be of a significant size. Thus, an example might be where a business has previously been allowed to move into a farm yard building (because the building was existing and considered to be redundant) and will look to use this clause to gain approval for a much larger scale new development that, had it not previously been a smaller scale business in a farm building, would never have been considered to be appropriate to be allowed to be built in the green belt. Thus, I am worried that this may be used by big business to expand existing developments that are in the green belt and that should certainly not be encouraged. There is a clear policy that discourages new industrial developments in the green belt unless it is in areas designated and set-aside for that purpose and that would be, for example, located next to the NEC and the M42 for traffic and logistical reasons. In rural areas there is a policy that, under certain circumstances, allows for redundant farm buildings to be utilized by business and change of use can be allowed. However then stating that there is now a new policy to subsequently allow such companies to then expand (building brand new buildings in the green belt) is surely in contravention of the intention/policies to protect the green belt and this does not take into account the special circumstances that allowed change of use for the redundant farm buildings in the first instance.</p> <p>The phrasing "reasonable" is also widely open to interpretation. What would be considered to be reasonable by an industrialist developer could be considered to be totally unreasonable to others. Anyone using the special circumstances clause to open a business by turning a redundant farm building into an office, factory unit or storage unit, should not have a reasonable expectation of being subsequently allowed to expand it by building new buildings or large extensions to the farm building as planning conditions for industrial developments in the green belt are quite rightly tightly controlled.</p> <p>I also believe that whilst employment for locals is important we have to understand that there is no employment problem in Berkswell and thus to put any emphasis at all on encouraging developments that contribute towards improving local employment is thus wrong. Any new developments in Berkswell would mean jobs for people living outside of Berkswell and would simply encourage more traffic to travel into Berkswell at a time when looking for ways to better control that traffic is a key aim for the council. Berkswell is not in need of attracting new business to the area and of providing more jobs for locals. There is full local employment. There are designated business zones within a short drive from Berkswell that are better placed for new industrial developments and there is simply no need to encourage more development in the green belt.</p> <p>If any business sees a need for additional space then it of course always has the opportunity at any time to apply for planning permission in the normal way for an extension to its premises or to seek to build a larger unit elsewhere and to move. It is surely not correct to have a special local policy that encourages and promotes business to expand in the green belt when that is under constant pressure and the council is (supposedly) committed to protect it.</p>		



Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
					<p>I am also highly concerned with the statement in the NDP that <i>"proposals include for the re-use or conversion of existing former agricultural buildings OR the development of sensitively designed new buildings within the curtilage of existing farm buildings."</i></p> <p>As already stated above it is noted that there is already a policy for the re-use of redundant farm buildings. However, it is surely not at all correct to then have a further policy of allowing new build developments within the "curtilage" of existing farm buildings. Again, this is simply giving a green light to developers who can look to purchase a small farm building, changing it into an industrial unit, and then to build a new industrial unit right next to it (in the green belt) and this cannot be correct and again is in direct contravention to the council's long standing policy of protecting the green belt and not allowing industrial developments <u>unless there are very special circumstances.</u></p> <p>There is nothing in the NDP that states that these "new buildings" in the green belt would be limited in size or number (!) and the very word "curtilage" is also wide open to interpretation. Curtilage being an area, <u>usually enclosed</u>, encompassing the grounds and buildings <u>immediately</u> surrounding a building. What is "immediate" to me suggests a matter of a few feet, for others it may be a much larger area.</p> <p>I therefore request that Berkswell Parish Council reviews these two clauses because they are clearly at odds with its long standing aims to prevent building in the green belt (especially industrial units) and to try and reduce or limit and otherwise control additional traffic in the area. Obviously suggesting that the building of new industrial units are somehow now allowed in the greenbelt and ignoring the long standing aims to discourage traffic in Berkswell is wrong.</p> <p>The two statements in the NDP work directly against long established Parish Council guidelines and are in any case simply not needed because, and as already pointed out, any local business that wishes to expand, already has the approved and correct means to apply for planning approval in the normal way.</p>		
109.					I support the latest draft of the NDP plan as printed in The Communicator today.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
110.					I agree with Berkswell's draft NDP.	Noted with thanks.	No change.
111.					On July 31 I sent an email – copy following, but my fingers mistyped your email address – I missed the o from org. I have long finger nails!. I understand if this is too late but I thought I would send the copy for your information.	Noted with thanks.	No change
112.					Not sure why we are being asked to do this again but I confirm that as a local household we support the NDP, particularly policies, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7 & 8.	Noted with thanks	No change

Consultee Name Address Ref. No.	Page No.	Para. No.	Vision/ Objective / Policy No.	Support / Object / Comment	Comments received	Parish Councils' Consideration	Amendments to NDP
113.			Policy 4	Object	<p>I see the intention to designate the field on meeting house lane as a green space as disingenuous. It is completely overgrown, and to be frank just a dog toilet. There is less wildlife than we attract to our garden with a few bird feeders. It seems that BPC are obsessed with this field, they have been trying in one way or another to gain control of it since we moved to the village. There are many better uses to which it could be put, including housing, or even a sports centre/swimming pool.</p> <p>BPC has not provided sufficient evidence to show that the field is an exceptional green space, and the request should therefore be refused.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The NDP sets out how the area meets the criteria set out in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Residents (including dog walkers) value the recreational opportunities of the area. Dog walkers are no less important than other residents and users, and informal recreational use of green spaces has a value just as more formal uses have.</p> <p>The proposed protection of the site as a Local Green Space was widely supported by local residents in public consultations (including at Reg 14) and should be retained in the Submission Plan.</p>	No change.