

From: [Davis, Rowena \(Places Directorate - Solihull MBC\)](#) on behalf of [Policy & Spatial Planning, PSP](#)
To: [James, Sarah \(Places Directorate - Solihull MBC\)](#)
Subject: FW: Consultation exercise
Date: 11 August 2014 11:10:47
Attachments: [petition_signatures_1340142218.pdf](#)

Rowena Davis
Housing Strategy & Support assistant
Policy & Spatial Planning Services
telephone: 0121 704 8486
email :rdavis@Solihull.gov.uk

Please only print this e-mail if you really need to.

-----Original Message-----

From: "kealie" [redacted]
Sent: 03 August 2014 00:19
To: Policy & Spatial Planning, PSP
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Consultation exercise

Response to the Schedule of Main Modifications To the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD – Submission Document (July 2013)

http://www.solihull.gov.uk/Portals/0/Planning/Gypsy/Schedule_of_Main_Modifications_only_v3_FINAL%20with%20proposals%20map.pdf

I am responding by e-mail as it is not easily possible to complete your pdf form electronically.

Kealie Ahmad, B94 6BS.

My comments relate to main modifications 15,16,20 ie the addition of the intensification of the existing site Canal View from 1 pitch to 3.

****I object to these MM's, they are not legally compliant, and are unsound for the following reasons:****

Planning permission has been sought for this extension for many years and has been refused through due planning process which allows for representations and hearing in a public forum. By simply inserting this as a new site in the plan at this late stage makes a mockery of that robust planning process. There is no application, no consideration, no representation, no hearing, nothing, just an arbitrary decision that despite years of refusing this is now the chosen site for intensification as an easy option to meet the concerns raised by the Inspector.

Furthermore, this site was already considered in the early stages of the ridiculous “call for sites” exercise and rejected:

Document DPD 008

“The site at Canal View was fully considered by the Council as part of the preferred options process and was not considered suitable to be taken forward as an allocation. The site assessment sets out the inappropriateness of the site for allocation. “

So, how has the site gone from being inappropriate to appropriate and what was the process for deciding this

should now be the chosen site to be part of the plan when objectively measured against all the other sites which were similarly rejected some considerable time ago. How has that measuring been carried out and where is the evidence for it, it certainly wasn't carried out in the open, there certainly has been no transparency. This is unjust and arbitrary.

How has that evidence been updated since all the sites were considered originally, circumstances may have changed making the other sites more suitable, or they may even now be other options more suitable.

http://ww2.solihull.gov.uk/Attachments/DPD_018_Site_Assesment_Document_May_2013_update.pdf

The justification used in the modifications document is far from a fair assessment of the site and is deliberately misleading which means that anyone wishing to make representations will not have a true picture. Also, there are no other sites or evidence of consideration against which to measure the suitability of this site.

“7.9.2 The site performs relatively well against most of the criteria in Policy P6 of the Solihull Local Plan. There are no significant highway issues and, whilst public transport is not readily available within the immediate vicinity of the site, most facilities and services are located within a realistic walking distance. Although there are no public views of the site, it is located within a sensitive Green Belt location. An extension of the site would have an urbanising effect on the attractive rural landscape, particularly when considered cumulatively with the neighbouring authorised Gypsy and Traveller site at Salter Street. For this reason, it is considered that only a modest intensification of the existing authorised site is suitable for allocation.
7.9.3 The site is available and achievable, however, as the pitches are required to accommodate the family's future growth, the site has been phased back to the latter part of the plan period i.e. post 2017.”

The site does not perform at all well against most of the criteria in policy P6, it is simply convenient to say that it does, as it solves the problem of having to have fewer numbers at the Haven. The analysis of the performance of all of the sites considered against the policy was completely biased and not factual, they were written in such a way as to lead the reader down a particular and convenient path. They have not even been considered at all this time.

There are significant highway issues, it is completely misleading to say there are not. The access road to the site directly crosses the exit to St Patrick's CE Primary Academy. There have been a number of near misses, and when the “call for sites” exercise was running, almost 200 local residents and families from the school signed an electronic petition against intensification of Canal View and Land off Salter Street (the other gypsy site directly adjacent which already has 3 pitches.) Councillor Courts and the Director of Places were aware of the existence of this petition at the time, this is attached.

The Board of Governors of the school also strongly objected, though their letter did not even elicit a response.

Most facilities are not within a realistic walking distance at all, and there is no public transport at all. Even before the public highway is reached the access road is very narrow, unlit, long and has no footpath. Additionally heavy plant vehicles constantly use the access road going to and from the neighbouring gypsy site. Then the nearest amenities are in Cheswick Green, which is far walking distance, and again lighting is poor, and footpaths intermittent. In any case, it is a fact that the amenities are no more or less convenient than the amenities of Hockley Heath to the 2013 proposed site on School Road.

Intensification would not be modest at all in this sensitive green belt and rural setting. 3 pitches equates to a day centre / washrooms, a touring caravan, and other vehicles. This is in addition to the large gypsy site directly next door which already has 3 pitches consisting of two huge bungalows, touring caravans, stables, kennels, heavy plant vehicles (including a crane, diggers and an HGV).

Cumulatively the impact on the green belt would be huge and inappropriate under current legislation. What's more, 4 different planning inspectors have said so in the various appeal decisions against the neighbouring site. So, why would Solihull MBC consider intensification appropriate at this site but not the neighbouring one? The Inspectors made it perfectly clear what the effects on the openness of the green belt would be. Intensifying Canal View, next door to Land of Salter Street would have exactly the same affect, and would be contrary to

the spirit of the decisions which the Inspectors have already made, and indeed circumvents them because there is no due planning process here. This is why what you propose is not legally compliant.

How can this be a consultation in good faith when the facts are hidden from the average uninformed reader of the MM document? Another reason why this is not legally compliant.

It's as if the reasons for rejecting in the first place simply don't exist any more when of course they do. Where is the analysis of what has changed to approve this site other than the Planning authority have told us we need to find 5 sites somewhere other than at The Haven? It looks like Solihull MBC have just gone back to original doc and gone "eeny meeny", where is the analysis? Where is the consideration of other, newly available sites, brownfield or otherwise? A lot has changed since the original considerations.

Solihull MBC are also aware that there is an issue regarding asbestos contamination of this land, and the Parish Council have raised this previously, but again there is no mention of this in the consideration given in the MM document.

Finally it is also completely misleading to say that intensification of this site meets a future family need. This reason was rejected when planning applications have been made, so why is it being put forward as a compelling reason now? It is a fact that in 2017, all the children of this family will be 17 or older so what exactly is the future family need? Would I be given planning permission to build 3 houses the size of a static caravans on my land in the green belt to accommodate my family's future needs, I would also love to have my 3 grown up children and their families live with me? My parents and in-laws are also becoming elderly and in poor health and will need looking after and in our culture it is the eldest son's responsibility. Will I get the same consideration when I have to go through the due planning process (when this family doesn't have to)?

The Inspector should be invited to properly assess your proposition for these MM's in light of what previous Inspectors have decided in appeals on the neighbouring site, and be asked to give their view on the cumulative effect of what in effect will be a 6 site gypsy site (as Canal View and Land off Salter Street are directly next door to each other) on this particular location.

I would also ask Solihull MBC to respond to why the ward of Blythe is yet again the epicentre of their urbanisation plans.....there is greenbelt and fields in Hockley Heath, Dorridge and Knowle too, why is our Blythe ward greenbelt the only rural area in Solihull being completely urbanised?

I would prefer a response by e-mail.

██████████.