

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future

Solihull Local Plan Review

Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation

January 2019

Issues and
Options

Draft Plan

Submission
Plan

Examination
of Plan

Adoption of
Plan

This page is left intentionally blank.

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	4
2.	Background.....	7
3.	Housing Requirement & Current Land Supply	9
4.	Site Selection Process.....	15
5.	Balsall Common	21
6.	Blythe	27
7.	Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine-de-Barnes	34
8.	Hockley Heath.....	37
9.	Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath	40
10.	Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs	47
11.	Meriden	51
12.	North Solihull, Marston Green and Castle Bromwich	54
13.	UK Central Hub	58
14.	Green Belt.....	63
15.	Omitted Sites	70
16.	Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix	73
17.	Responding to this Consultation & Schedule of Questions	76

APPENDICES

A.	Housing Completions 2001/02 to 2017/18	80
B.	Population & Households in the Borough.....	82
C.	Schedule of Allocated Sites	83
D.	Sites from the Solihull Local Plan, Brownfield Land Register and Land Availability Studies.....	85
E.	Schedule of Assessed Sites.....	89

Version Control:

v2 -08 February 2019 - Site reference numbers corrected & other typos

1. Introduction

1. At the heart of planning is the need to plan positively for sustainable development. One of the principal ways this is achieved is by having a local plan to guide the development of an area. Having a local plan is key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities. The aim is that local authorities should positively seek opportunities, through their local plan, to meet the development needs of their area. The Council's local plan addresses the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change that is happening to the Borough, both now and in the future.
2. The current local plan, the "Solihull Local Plan" (SLP), was adopted in December 2013 and covers the period 2011 to 2028. Although it is a recently adopted plan, and is up-to-date in many respects, there are three reasons that have triggered the need for an early review of it. The first is to deal with the legal challenge to the 2013 plan; secondly to accommodate Solihull's own housing needs, as well as helping to address the housing shortfall occurring in the wider Housing Market Area (HMA)¹; and finally to provide a proper planning framework that recognises the arrival of HS2 in the Borough – in particular the first station outside of London which is to be constructed on land opposite the NEC.



3. A review of the local plan commenced with the publication of a Scope, Issues and Options consultation in November 2015 and this was followed up with the Draft Local Plan (DLP) in December 2016.

Purpose of Consultation

4. This is a non-statutory supplementary consultation² to that undertaken for the Draft Local Plan in December 2016, and it should be read in conjunction with that document. What this consultation seeks to do is to:
 - Provide an update on local housing need now that national planning policy has changed through the introduction of a standard methodology.

¹ This is part of the duty to cooperate discussions explained in a later chapter.

² Under regulation 18 of the plan making regulation.

- Assess the 70+ additional call-for-sites submissions that have been submitted since the DLP was published.
- Refine the site selection process for assessing which sites should be included in the plan and reassess all sites (c320) to ensure that the preferred sites are the most appropriate when considered against the spatial strategy, and existing/new or updated evidence.
- Publishing concept masterplans for the principal allocations.
- Exploring a different approach to calculating how affordable housing provision should be calculated on an individual site.
- Setting out the role of the main settlements in the future and seeking views on the existing pressures and future requirements for infrastructure provision.

5. This consultation is not seeking to:

- Revise the contribution that the Council is making towards the HMA shortfall. This will be considered through the draft submission version of the plan³.
- Amend the overall spatial strategy set out in the DLP.
- Revisit the non-housing related parts of the DLP.

How Could it Affect Me?

6. The Local Plan as a whole will set out the future spatial strategy for the Borough and will include the allocation of sites to promote development. It will also identify land where development would be inappropriate because of its impact on, for instance, environmental or historic assets; and it will also incorporate a strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.
7. It is likely that the plan will be of interest to a wide range of residents, businesses, groups and organisations living, working or investing in the Borough, and the Council wishes to encourage all those with an interest to comment on the matters raised in this document.

What will happen if we don't identify enough land for new development?

8. The NPPF requires Local Plans to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites to meet the housing requirement for 5 years with a further supply of developable sites (or at least broad locations for them) for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15. A Local Plan that does not meet this requirement could be found unsound through the examination process.
9. The lack of a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply increases the Borough's vulnerability to speculative housing proposals, and would lead to development and growth taking place in an unplanned manner.

Consultation Dates

10. The Draft Local Plan Supplement will be open for consultation that will run from the end of January 2019 to **15th March 2019**. Throughout the document a series of questions are posed on key points. For ease of reference all of the questions are also listed together in the appendices.

³ The regulation 19 version of the plan

Consultation Documents

11. In addition to this document the consultation also relates to the following publications:
 - [Solihull Local Plan Review – Draft Concept Masterplans](#)
 - [Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation: Amber Sites](#)
 - [Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation: Site Assessments](#)
 - [Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation: Site Assessments Key Plan](#)
12. The [evidence base](#) to support the Local Plan Review has also been updated.

Next Steps

13. Following the consultation, representations will be considered (alongside those made in response to the December 2016 consultation) and the results will then be used, along with other evidence, to assist the Council in preparing the next stage of the plan making process – the publication of the ‘submission’ version of the plan, which is the plan the Council intends to submit to examination.
14. It is anticipated that the submission version of the plan will be published in summer 2019 and that examination in public will take place during the winter 2019/20.

Relationship to Other Plans

15. Once adopted, this plan will replace the Solihull Local Plan (Dec 2013), and its policies will no longer carry any weight. However until that point is reached, the relevant policies in the SLP will continue to be applied as adopted development plan policy. The weight that can be attached to the emerging plan will be dependent upon the stage it reaches; the extent of unresolved objections; and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.
16. The Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations DPD was adopted in December 2014 and co-exists with the SLP. This DPD will continue to be used to provide a framework for determining relevant applications and will also continue alongside the plan produced as a result of the current review process.
17. Presently there is only one adopted Neighbourhood Plan in the Borough⁴. Any others that are pursued in the short term will not only need to reflect the strategic policies of the SLP, but also to take into account the evidence used to prepare this plan; and any other evidence that may be prepared at the local level. Once this plan review is adopted, it will take precedence and subsequent Neighbourhood Plans will need to reflect the strategic policies of the reviewed plan.

⁴ This relates to Hampton in Arden and it became part of the development plan in August 2017. The only other plan that has been examined relates to the Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath area which is expected to be subject to a referendum in 2019.


2. Background

Scope, Issues and Options (Nov 2015)

18. The first stage of the LPR consultation took place from 30th November 2015 to 22nd January 2016. At this stage views were invited on the scope of the review, the issues that ought to be taken into account and the broad options for growth that ought to be considered.
19. The consultation document (available [here](#)) set out the key issues/questions and broad options for accommodating the anticipated growth. A summary of the representations (and the Council's responses to them can be found) [here](#).

Draft Local Plan (Nov 2016)

20. Consultation on the Draft Plan (available [here](#)) commenced on 5th December 2016 and finished on the 17th February 2017.
21. Over 1,750 responses were received and an overall summary of representations has now been published and can be found [here](#). In addition, schedules of individual summaries arranged by question/site and by respondent were also published. These can be found [here](#) and [here](#).
22. Alongside the representations an updated schedule of "Call for Sites" Submissions (July 2017) was also published and it can be found [here](#)



Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

23. The white paper [Fixing Our Broken Housing Market](#) published in Feb 2017 included proposals for 'making sure every community has an up-to-date, sufficiently ambitious plan' and signals the intention that the Government will introduce a standard methodology (SM) for assessing housing need. Consultation on the standard methodology took place in September 2017 and this has now been incorporated into the revised National Planning Policy Framework ([NPPF](#)) which was published in July 2018. The Planning Policy Guidance ([PPG](#)) now includes detail on how to calculate an LPA's Local Housing Need (LHN).
24. Although the SM is now incorporated into the NPPF/PPG, in December 2018 the Government published consultation proposals⁵ seeking views on how the SM is to be calculated. This is expected to result in changes to the NPPF/PPG early in 2019. For the purposes of undertaking this supplementary consultation, the SM set out in the consultation document has been used to produce a Local Housing Need (LHN) figure.

⁵ [Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance](#) (Oct 2018)

Duty to Cooperate

25. Planning for an area's needs should be undertaken at the 'Housing Market Area' level⁶, and in this respect Solihull is one of 14 local planning authorities that is within (in whole or in part) the HMA that includes Birmingham and surrounding authorities. It is recognised that this is a shared issue for the HMA as a whole and a number of districts will be in a position to help to accommodate some of this shortfall⁷. It is expected that this will be one of the key issues to be addressed through the on-going and legal obligation under the duty to cooperate (DtC).
26. Through the Draft Local Plan, the Council included within the housing requirement a figure that not only accommodated the Borough's own needs (which were not being met through the SLP 2013, and was short by some 2,600 dwellings), but also tested incorporating a contribution of 2,000 towards accommodating the shortfall occurring beyond the Borough. Thus the approach in the DLP resulted in the HMA shortfall being reduced by c4,600.
27. Through the representations on the DLP there is a clear expectation from other HMA authorities (and other interested parties) that (a) there is no clear justification why 2,000 was chosen as the figure Solihull would make towards the HMA shortfall and (b) there is opportunity to make a greater contribution.
28. To help inform the Duty-to-Cooperate discussions the 14 HMA authorities commissioned a study (the [Strategic Growth Study](#) undertaken by GL Hearn). One of the aims of the study was to look at options that may be required beyond 2031 (recognising that 2036 provides a useful date to assess need to and what supply is currently identified to that date), and some of the options would take a significant time to come forward thus contributing to supply beyond 2036.
29. For the purposes of undertaking this supplementary consultation, the contribution towards the HMA shortfall remains at 2,000, but the potential for this to be revised as part of the Submission Draft Plan (to be published in summer 2019) remains.

⁶ Although the revised NPPF no longer uses this term (the phrase 'an appropriate geography' is expected in the revised PPG), the functional relationships that underpin the HMA geography remain valid, but this now also provides the opportunity to consider, for instance, how other non-HMA authorities that are part of the West Midlands Combined Authority (for example Telford & Wrekin) can play a part in the duty-to-cooperate.

⁷ Through evidence that supported the adoption of the Birmingham Development Plan in January 2017 it was established that the HMA wide shortfall (to 2031) was 37,500 dwellings. As the time period extends (i.e. when plans seek to provide for a 15 year plan period) the need beyond 2031 also becomes an issue. As few plans have been adopted with plan end dates beyond this time there is a greater (as yet) unmet need beyond 2031.

3. Housing Requirement & Current Land Supply

Recent Levels of House Building in Solihull

30. Before considering the housing requirement that ought to be taken forward through the Local Plan Review, it is useful context to review the levels of house building that have recently taken place in Solihull. A table and graph are provided in the appendices which set out on an annual basis the number of additional dwellings provided, and the number lost through demolitions, for every year since 2001/02. Recently the average number of net completions per year has been as follows:

- 488 dwellings per year as an average of the 17 years from 2001/02 to 2017/18
- 420 dwellings per year as an average of the 10 years from 2008/09 to 2017/18
- 657 dwellings per year as an average of the 4 years from 2014/15 to 2017/18



Approach to Establishing Housing Need in the Draft Local Plan (Nov 2016)

31. The housing requirement figure in the Draft Local Plan was arrived at by identifying the Borough's 'objectively assessed need' (OAN)⁸ as the starting point, added to which was the Borough's contribution towards the Housing Market Area shortfall. The Council commissioned Peter Brett and Associates to undertake a [Strategic Housing Market Assessment](#) (SHMA) for this purpose. How this was used is explained in more detail in chapter 15 of the [Housing Topic Paper](#).
32. The SMHA established that the OAN for the Borough was 13,091 new dwellings over the period 2014 to 2033, which would equate to 689 dwellings per year. Together with the contribution towards the HMA shortfall, the overall housing requirement set out in the plan was for 15,029⁹ new dwellings, which would be an annual requirement of 791 dwellings.

⁸ This was identified through a [Strategic Housing Market Assessment](#) (SHMA) produced by PBA on behalf of the Council.

⁹ Policy P5 – Provision of Land for Housing

33. Since the draft plan was published, national planning policy has changed that has included the introduction of a standard methodology for calculating 'Local Housing Need' (LHN). This is the methodology that should now be used and is explained in the following paragraphs.

The New Standard Methodology

34. The potential for a standard methodology was included in the Government's white paper "[Fixing the Broken Housing Market](#)" when it was published in February 2017. This has now been formally embodied into planning policy through the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework in July 2018 (and associated [Planning Practice Guidance](#)). The standard methodology makes the old approach of identifying OAN obsolete.
35. The standard methodology works by using the latest household projections published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) as the starting point, and then applying a percentage increase to them based on a formula that uses a local affordability ratio. The less an area's affordability is, the more the ratio increases the number of dwellings that should be constructed.
36. Household projections are published every two years and the latest set was made available in September 2018. These are known as the '2016 based household projections¹⁰'. The affordability ratio compares average house prices in the Borough with average earnings in the Borough. These are updated annually, usually in March or April.
37. The rationale for using house prices and earnings as an affordability factor is that if average house prices are over four times average earnings (which makes mortgages less sustainable) then house prices aren't considered to be affordable and a greater number of dwellings is required in order to address the balance.
38. The LHN figure should be considered as the minimum number of dwellings to be provided in a local authorities area, and it is only if there are exceptional circumstances should a lower figure be pursued.

Potential Changes to the Standard Methodology

39. Following the publication of the household projections in September 2018, which were lower than expected, the Government has consulted¹¹ on making changes to how the standard methodology is used. Instead of using the latest household projections published in 2018, the consultation indicates that Councils should use the same standard methodology formula but to revert to using the household projections published in 2016 (known as the '2014 based household projections¹²').
40. The consultation indicates that further changes to the formula may be made, and these are expected to come into effect by the time the next household projections are published in 2020. In the meantime, and on the basis the latest Government consultation confirms the position, Council's will be expected to use the 2014 based household projections published in 2016 when using the current standard methodology formula.

Establishing the Local Housing Need Figure

41. Using 2018 as the base year, the annual requirement from just the household projection part of the methodology would be as follows:

¹⁰ The term 'based' is used as the projections use this year as the base date for the projections and these can be found [here](#).

¹¹ "[Technical Consultation on Updates to National Planning Policy and Guidance](#)" (October 2018)

¹² The 2014 based household projections (as published in 2016) can be found [here](#).

- 2014 based household projections published in 2016 results in 621 dwellings per annum¹³.
 - 2016 based household projections published in 2018 results in 550 dwellings per annum.
42. The latest affordability ratios were published in [April 2018](#), with the next due in March/April 2019. Although these do change from year to year, they are relatively small annual differences and so are not expected, over the course of one year, to result in a significantly different LHN figure.
43. As of March 2018 the median house price in the Borough was £260,000, and the median workplace earnings was £33,454. This gives a house price to earnings ratio of 7.77. As this ratio is above 4, this means that there needs to be a percentage increase to the household projections. The magnitude of the increase is dependent on how far over 4 the affordability ratio is. Using the formula in the standard methodology the Borough's percentage increase is 23.6¹⁴%.
44. Applying the percentage increase from the affordability ratio would result in the following LHN figures:
- 2014 based household projections published in 2016 results in 767 dwellings per annum.
 - 2016 based household projections published in 2018 results in 680 dwellings per annum.
45. It is considered prudent that for the present consultation that the 2014 based household projections are used. This is on the basis that the current consultation will confirm this position in early 2019. If this is not the case then the figures will be reviewed in the submission version of the plan which is expected to be published in summer 2019.
46. Using 2018 as the base date, and 2035 as the end date (on the basis that if the plan is adopted in 2020 and it has a 15 year time span post adoption) the total Local Housing Need figure (just for the Borough's own needs) would be 13,039 new dwellings (i.e. 767 dwellings per annum over the 17 year period from 2018 to 2035).
47. A third step in using the standard methodology is the potential application of a cap. This may then be applied to limit the increase in the minimum annual housing figure that an individual local authority can face by capping the LHN¹⁵. In Solihull's case the cap would be 40% of the projected household growth for the Borough before the affordability factor is applied. The cap would therefore be set at a 40% increase from the 621 dwellings per year identified above, this would result in a cap of 869 dwellings per year. The 767 dwellings per year identified in the previous paragraph is below the cap and therefore the cap is not applied to the LHN.
48. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF indicates that the standard methodology should be used to arrive at the Local Housing Need "unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach". In calculating the Borough's own needs, the Council does not believe there are any exceptional circumstances that justify a departure from the standard methodology.

¹³ The household projections indicate Solihull as having 95,948 households in 2028 and 89,743 in 2018. The difference being 6,205 (over a 10 year period) which equates to an annual average of 621.

¹⁴ Using the formula in the PPG: $(7.77 - 4) / 4 \times 0.25 = 0.236$

¹⁵ The September 2017 Government consultation "Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places" indicated that applying the (then) proposed approach to market adjustment will lead to a significant increase in potential housing need in some parts of the country and to help ensure the method is **deliverable** a cap would apply.

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

Housing Market Area

49. The Draft Local Plan included a commitment to accommodate 2,000 dwellings from the shortfall that is occurring in the wider Housing Market Area. Using the same contribution, the overall housing requirement to be addressed in the Local Plan Review would, using the standard methodology outlined above, be 15,039 dwellings over the period 2018 to 2035, or **885 dwellings per year**.
50. This rate of development represents a doubling of the average rate¹⁶ achieved over the last 10 years. It would also exceed the highest number of net completions achieved in a single year since 2001¹⁷.
51. This consultation has a focus on reviewing the proposed allocations and whilst commentary has been provided on how the standard methodology would be taken into account; this consultation is not seeking views on any potential addition that the Council may make towards the HMA shortfall.
52. The comments made on this issue at the Draft Local Plan (2016) stage will be taken into account as work continues on the submission version of the plan. It is also at the submission stage that the Council will incorporate its response to the Strategic Growth Study¹⁸ (Feb 2018).

Land Supply

53. This housing growth can be delivered through sites with planning permission, suitable deliverable sites identified within the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, sites included on the brownfield land register locations proposed for allocation by the plan and unidentified windfall sites, predominantly within South Solihull. The following table provides an overview of housing land supply:

¹⁶ 885 dwellings per year compared with the 10 year annual average of 420 over the years 2008/09 to 2017/18

¹⁷ 861 net completions in 2005/06 is the highest number of net completions in any single year from 2001/02 to 2017/18

¹⁸ Produced by GL Hearn, the lead consultants for the study.

Solihull Housing Land Supply 2018-2035 (as of 1st April 2018)

Source	Estimated Capacity
1 Sites with planning permission (started)	1,106
2 Sites with planning permission (not started)	2,199
3 Sites identified in land availability assessments	364
4 Sites identified in the brownfield land register (BLR) ¹⁹	200
5 Solihull Local Plan allocations without planning permission at 1 st April 2018	1,236
6 Less a 10% to sites with planning permission (not started), sites identified in land availability assessments and SLP sites	-400
7 Windfall housing land supply (2018-2033)	2,250
8 UK Central Hub Area	2,500
9 Allocated Sites	6,310
Total Estimated Capacity (rows 1-7)	15,765

54. Based on a housing requirement of 15,039 dwellings, and taking into account the land supply identified above, this would indicate a surplus of 726 dwellings. This represents a margin of 11% compared with the number of additional dwellings being allocated through the plan.

Differences from the Draft Local Plan to Note

55. There are a number of differences between the Draft Local Plan and this consultation that impact on housing numbers (both in terms of need and supply), and it is worth noting these as follows:
- Although the overall housing requirement, of about 15,000 dwellings, is similar between the DLP and this consultation, it should be noted this is over different plan periods as the DLP covered the 19 year period between 2014 and 2033, whereas this consultation covers the 17 year period from 2018 to 2035. This means that the annum requirement will now be greater (885 compared to 791).
 - As the new standard methodology uses the current year as the base year (i.e. 2018), there is no need for back casting to capture any under/oversupply²⁰ for plan making

¹⁹ Where they haven't also been included in site allocations as part of this plan or as part of the land supply under planning permissions. This is on the basis that as they are on the BLR there is a reasonable prospect that planning permission will be granted.

²⁰ This is because the rationale for the standard methodology is that previous under/oversupply will be reflected in the affordability ratio.

purposes²¹. Therefore the completions prior to 1st April are not now included in the land supply (this provided 1,385 dwellings in the DLP supply²²).

- Approximately 1,000 additional dwellings now have planning permission (either started or not yet started), but this is exceeded by a reduction (of 1,400) in SLP allocations without planning permission. This is because two major SLP allocations²³ have received planning permission since 1st April 2016.
- An increase of 1,500²⁴ units that is expected to come from UK Central Hub Area during the plan period. This is out of some 5,000 that the area could accommodate in the long term (i.e. beyond the plan period) and arises from work undertaken by the Urban Growth Company²⁵ and the NEC²⁶.
- Reduced capacities from the sites identified in the DLP. This is either because some have been omitted or amended, but mostly this is as a result of the work in relation to the concept masterplans. Although densities in the developable parts of the site will maintain an average 35 dwellings per hectare²⁷ (dph) the gross developable area to net developable area ratios achieved are less. This is the process of starting with the whole site area and taking out land that is not developable. This is either because existing site features (areas of biodiversity value, playing pitches etc.) are to be retained (or new such features need to be provided) or infrastructure requirements (e.g. a new school) are required which means less land for houses will be available. These changes are to ensure high quality places are provided.

Small Sites

56. Paragraph 68 of the NPPF sets out the advantages of small and medium sites, and that Council's should identify "land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare". The Council take this to mean that it is not necessary to identify individual sites to meet this requirement so long as a land supply that is reasonably expected to fulfil this requirement can be identified. Given the housing requirement set out above, the number of dwellings to be accommodated on small sites is around 1,500.
57. The Council has identified a future land supply from windfall development of 2,250 dwellings – the majority of which can reasonably be expected to occur on sites of less than 1ha. In addition the supply of land identified through land availability assessment and the Brownfield Land Register (of some 400 units in total) is generally on small sites. Furthermore planning permissions (both started and not yet started) include a range of small sites. Taken together it is expected that these sources will comfortably exceed the 10% requirement for small sites.

²¹ Once the plan is adopted, housing completions from the base year will be taken into account both in terms of calculating the Housing Delivery Test and the 5 Year Land Supply.

²² Paragraph 217.

²³ Blythe Valley & Powergen.

²⁴ The DLP assumed 1,000 units would come forward in the plan period, this has now been revised to 2,500.

²⁵ Including the publication of [The Hub Framework Plan](#) (Feb 2018)

²⁶ Including publication of the [NEC Masterplan](#) (Nov 2018)

²⁷ The GL Hearn study also looked at densities and concluded that across the HMA as a whole, if densities were increased to 40 dph in Birmingham and the Black Country, and to 35 dph elsewhere in the HMA, then this would yield an additional 13,000 units towards the HMA land supply.

4. Site Selection Process

Call for Sites

58. Published alongside the Scope, Issues and Options consultation in November 2015 was an invitation for landowners, developers and any other interested parties to put forward sites they believe were available for development. This is known as the 'call-for-sites' exercise.
59. The first 'wave' of sites amounted to 246 submissions and they were assessed through the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment SHELAA (Nov 2016). The SHELAA [report](#) and [appendices](#) are available on the Council's web site. These sites were considered for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan when that was published in December 2016.
60. With the publication of the DLP, more site submissions (46) were made and these second wave sites were published in an [updated call-for-site schedule](#) in July 2017.
61. Since then further submissions have been made; and as this plan was being prepared this third wave of sites amounted to a further 26 submissions²⁸.
62. It is anticipated that call-for-sites submissions will continue to be made. Whilst these suggestions will continue to be accepted for consideration, the later they are left in the run up to the next version of the plan being prepared, the less chance there will be for them to be fully assessed and included.
63. It is worth noting that the vast majority of sites that have been put forward as part of this process relate to sites located in the Green Belt. For instance the analysis undertaken for the 2016 SHELAA indicated that 96.5%²⁹ of the 'theoretical capacity' identified in the study would be in the Green Belt.

Site Selection Methodology

64. The DLP (at paragraph 96) set out a sequential approach used to direct growth to particular locations and this was explained in more detail in the topic paper "Reviewing the Options for Growth and Site Selection Process". This included setting an overall hierarchy and how the growth options identified at the issue and options stage could contribute.
65. The hierarchy and site selection process have been further refined to support this present consultation and all of the submitted sites have been assessed against it.
66. The site selection methodology has been split into two steps:
 - Using a site hierarchy based on the one set out in the Draft Local Plan³⁰
 - Using planning judgment to refine site selections
67. This approach does not seek to 'allocate' a particular number to be accommodated by each settlement³¹, but rather to test the appropriateness of sites and whether they could contribute towards the Borough wide supply.

²⁸ The first wave of submissions from November 2015 are numbered 1 to 245, the second wave of sites received from May 2016 are numbered 300 to 346, and the third wave which were received from July 2017 are numbered 400 to 426.

²⁹ Paragraph 4.16 identifies that 29,995 dwellings out of a total of 31,085 would be on Green Belt land

³⁰ Paragraph 336 of the DLP, but now expanded to better reflect the NPPF and provide a finer grain.

³¹ In this context it should be noted that assessments are carried out on a site and/or settlement basis which does not necessarily correlate to political boundaries such as wards.

Step 1 – Site Hierarchy

68. Firstly determine where in the site hierarchy that the site falls within. This seeks to provide a balance and favours brownfield sites, accessible sites and sites which only impact on lower performing Green Belt to determine a sites potential. This approach reflects the advice in paragraph 138 of the NPPF³².
69. It is considered that sites that fall within priorities 1 to 4 should generally be considered suitable for inclusion in the plan ('green' sites). However there may be some exceptional reasons why they shouldn't and these will be identified where necessary. Sites that fall within priorities 8 to 10 should be considered unsuitable for inclusion ('red' sites), but as with the previous category, there may be some exceptional justification why they should nevertheless be included and this will be identified where appropriate.
70. Sites that fall within priorities 5 to 7 are considered to have potential to be included. Some will only have limited potential for inclusion, others will have a greater potential. It should be noted that sites in these priorities will still have an impact, not least of which on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, and they should not be seen as 'impact free'. However for this first step, these sites are judged to fall within two categories: priority 5 sites as potential inclusions ('yellow' sites) and priority 6 and 7 sites as unlikely inclusions ('blue' sites).



Step 2 – Site Refinement

71. The second step is then to take into account other considerations (e.g. site constraints and the spatial strategy) to give a finer grain analysis to the submitted sites. This element requires more site specific planning judgment to arrive at a view on whether a site should be allocated or not.


³² In so far as it relates to non Green Belt, PDL and accessible locations.

72. This second step refines the starting position established by the site hierarchy so that it results in the following categories for the supplementary consultation:

- **Green** – To be included in the plan as an intended allocation. This will mean the development of the site has either no or only a relatively low impact on relevant considerations³³.
- **Amber** – Not to be included in the plan, but for the purposes of this consultation the sites in this category have been highlighted as such so that residents and others can comment on whether these sites are ‘less harmful’ than those placed in the red category.
- **Red** – Not to be included in the plan. This means that the development of the site has severe or widespread impacts that are not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

73. The analysis in step 2 will be used principally to confirm whether ‘potential’ allocations (yellow) should be included as green or amber sites in the consultation, and whether ‘unlikely’ allocations (blue) should be included as amber or red sites in the consultation.

Summary Illustration of Site Selection Process:



³³ Or it has a more severe impact that can be mitigated against. This may include reducing the size of the site to avoid the most harmful impacts.

Step 1 – Site Hierarchy Criteria

Priority	Category	Additional Description	RAG
1	Brownfield in urban area or settlement ³⁴	Non Green Belt previously developed land (PDL) (i.e. brownfield in urban area/settlement)	G
2	Greenfield in urban area or settlement	Non Green Belt non PDL not in beneficial use (or where the impact on the beneficial use can be mitigated) (i.e. greenfield site in urban area/settlement)	G
3	Brownfield in accessible ³⁵ Green Belt location	Green Belt PDL in highly/moderately ³⁶ accessible location (i.e. located on edge of or in close proximity to urban edge/settlement boundary)	G
4	Greenfield in accessible Green Belt location with committed development	Green Belt non PDL in highly/moderately accessible location and being lost (or largely lost) as a result of committed development.	G
5	Greenfield in accessible lower performing Green Belt location	Green Belt non PDL in accessible location. Lower performing Green Belt will generally have a combined score of 5 or less in the Strategic Green Belt Assessment (GBA)	Y
6	Greenfield in accessible moderately performing Green Belt location	Green Belt non PDL in accessible location. Moderately performing Green Belt will generally have a combined score of 6 or 7 in the GBA	B
6b	Greenfield in urban area or settlement	Non Green Belt non PDL in beneficial use (i.e. greenfield site in urban area/settlement) with no or only limited potential to mitigate loss of the beneficial use.	B
7	Greenfield in accessible highly performing Green Belt location	Green Belt non PDL in accessible location. Higher performing Green Belt will generally have a combined score of 8 or more in the GBS	B
8	Brownfield in isolated Green Belt location	Green Belt PDL in isolated location, i.e. poorly accessible (other than by car) to retail, educational & medical services.	R
9	Greenfield in isolated lower/moderately performing Green Belt location	Green Belt non PDL in isolated location. Lower/moderately performing Green Belt will generally have a combined score of 7 or less.	R
10	Greenfield in isolated highly performing Green Belt location	Green Belt non PDL in isolated location. Higher performing Green Belt will generally have a combined score of 8 or more.	R

³⁴ Within urban area/settlement in this context means non-Green Belt locations.

³⁵ An accessible location is located either (a) on the edge of the urban area, (b) on the edge of a settlement that has a wide range of services including a primary school and range of retail facilities. In this context a broad approach to accessibility is used based on a sites location in/edge of urban area or settlement. A finer grain of accessibility is used at step 2.

³⁶ In this context, moderately accessible includes PDL sites that are adjacent to settlements that may only contain a limited range of facilities.

- G – Allocation
- Y – Potential allocation
- B – Unlikely allocation
- R – No allocation

74. This step 1 assessment is on the basis of the site as a whole and in some circumstances (particularly with large sites) may result in a site being considered as being accessible because it one part of it adjoins a settlement, but due to the size of the site, the furthest extreme would not be close to the settlement boundary and may not therefore be as accessible.

Step 2 – Refinement Criteria

75. The factors set out in the table below identify the considerations that will be taken into account as the results from step 1 above are refined. Higher performing sites in the hierarchy need more significant harmful impacts if they are to be excluded, and for sites not performing well in the hierarchy they will need more significant justification to be included.

Factors in favour	Factors against
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the spatial strategy³⁷. • Any hard constraints only affect a small proportion of the site and/or can be mitigated. • Site would not breach a strong defensible boundary to the Green Belt. • Any identified wider planning gain over and above what would normally be expected. • Sites that would use or create a strong defensible boundary to define the extent of land to be removed from the Green Belt. • If finer grain accessibility analysis³⁸ shows the site (or the part to be included) is accessible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in accordance with the spatial strategy. • Overriding hard constraints³⁹ that cannot be mitigated. • SHELAA category 3⁴⁰ sites unless demonstrated that concerns can be overcome. • Site would breach a strong defensible boundary to the Green Belt. • Sites that would not use or create a strong defensible boundary to define the extent of land to be removed from the Green Belt. • If finer grain accessibility analysis shows the site (or the part to be included) is not accessible. • If the site is in a landscape character area that has a very low landscape capacity rating. • If the SA appraisal identifies significant harmful impacts.

Conclusions

76. Those sites that are considered appropriate for inclusion in the plan as preferred options (the green sites) are described in the settlement chapters. The majority of sites submitted

³⁷ Including only proportional additions to lower order settlements (i.e. those without secondary school or not located close to urban edge).

³⁸ Including output from the Accessibility Study

³⁹ E.g. flood risk, biodiversity, heritage

⁴⁰ Paragraph 3.78 describes the category bands used in the SHELAA. Category 1 perform well against suitability, availability and achievability assessments and are therefore affected by the fewest constraints, these are considered deliverable sites. Category 2 sites have a limited level of constraints and are classed as deliverable. Category 3 sites are classed as ‘not currently developable’ and have more significant constraints.

are not included as a compelling case for their inclusion has not been made; largely because they are located in the Green Belt and releasing them for development would not result in a sustainable pattern of development and/or there are other considerations that indicate they are not suitable for inclusion.

77. In carrying out this assessment it should be noted that of the sites that have not been included, some nevertheless performed better than others. As part of this supplementary consultation the Council believe it is useful to identify these 'less harmful' sites (that are shown as amber) so that residents and stakeholders are able to comment on their omission, and whether this is justified. Of course, comments on all of the omitted sites are also welcome.
78. Questions on the merits or otherwise of individual sites appear later in this document, but the Council is also keen to receive comments on the methodology of the revised site selection process.

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

5. Balsall Common

The Settlement Now

79. Balsall Common is largely a post-war suburban village bisected by the A452 which links east Birmingham, the NEC and Birmingham airport with Kenilworth and beyond to the south east. It is located in the 'Meriden Gap' just 2km from the boundary with Coventry⁴¹.
80. The settlement straddles the parish boundary between Balsall & Berkswell parishes, with most of the settlement being located within Balsall parish. Beyond the main settlement are the smaller villages of Berkswell and Temple Balsall; both of which have primary schools but otherwise only a very limited range of facilities. The combined population of the parishes is around 9,700 in some 3,900 households⁴² – the majority of which are located within Balsall Common itself.
81. The settlement is characterised by popular, low density residential areas with an open plan, cul-de-sac style layout. The village has a small but thriving local centre astride the A452 with a range of shops, facilities and services, although there are some opportunities to improve the Centre. A recently constructed medical centre is located on the north east side of the village.
82. The Heart of England secondary school (which accommodates over 1,200 pupils) is located in the settlement, as is Balsall Common Primary School which has three forms of entry. Given its restricted location together with its size does result in congestion around school drop off/pick up times.
83. Berkswell railway station to the north-east of the village provides access to London, Birmingham and Coventry via the West Coast mainline. It has a small car park accommodating which fills up rapidly in the morning with commuter parking resulting in overspill parking in roads nearby.

The Settlement in the Future

84. Balsall Common is one of two rural settlements in the Borough that has a full range of facilities including both secondary & primary schools, health services and a range of retail and associated facilities. As such it is well placed to accommodate levels of growth in excess of just its own local needs. Although it is of a size that caters for many residents day-to-day needs, it does not have significant areas of employment uses (other than service uses) and many of the village's economically active residents travel beyond the settlement for employment.
85. The A452 will continue to provide an important part of the highway network enabling vehicles to travel from Kenilworth and beyond up towards east Birmingham (including the UKC Hub area). The road carries much through traffic (e.g. over 80% of traffic passes through the village during the am peak time without stopping) and now is the opportunity to use new development to complete the highway network so that there is a functioning bypass enabling through vehicles to avoid using the village centre. This in turn will allow for environmental improvements to be undertaken along the Kenilworth Road within the village as it would no longer need to accommodate the through traffic.

⁴¹ And it is noted that there have been and will be further developments in Coventry on its western outskirts close to the Borough boundary.

⁴² Unless otherwise stated, the population and number of households in the settlement chapters relate to figures from the 2011 census.

86. The HS2 line enters the Borough in the south east corner of Berkswell parish and for this initial stretch it uses the line of the Greenway (the now disused rail link to Kenilworth) before reaching the west coast main line. Here the HS2 line crosses over the existing rail line (just to the south of Berkswell station) and continues north westwards on a line roughly parallel to the west coast mainline before entering Hampton in Arden. To accommodate the crossing of the existing rail line, the new high speed line will necessitate the construction of a viaduct some 250m long and 10m high. Initial enabling works in the vicinity of Balsall Common are due to commence in January 2019 with the main works complete by 2025, ready for the line to open in 2026. During this period there will be a focus of construction traffic in and around the village as many vehicles will access the construction zones having travelled south east along the A452 from the A45 and into the village.

What is Required for the Settlement in the Future?

87. Development in and around the village is not only an opportunity for the settlement to play a major part in accommodating the Borough and wider area needs, but also to accommodate a scale of development that is capable of supporting significant infrastructure provision that can help play a part in dealing with existing issues and provide the necessary facilities for future residents. In particular the following areas have been identified and should be taken forward:
88. **Balsall Common By-pass** – Emerging work is indicating that continuing the line of Hall Meadow Road around the eastern side of the village, crossing Waste Lane at Catchems Corner and joining up with the A452 around the Meer End Road junction is the preferred route. The design of the road would be single carriageway with few direct access points thus being attractive to through traffic as an alternative to using Kenilworth Road through the centre. However the road would be expected to provide the main vehicular access into the Barratt's Farm development.
89. **An Enhanced Centre** – Although the centre provides for a range of retail services, it is rather limited in scope and given the level of growth proposed it provides an opportunity for additional residents to support new facilities. Furthermore, the environmental improvements along Kenilworth Road made possible through the provision of a by-pass will also provide a catalyst for enhancements to the centre. Most of the centre is located within Balsall parish, but areas in Berkswell may also be included. The Council will work with both parishes to agree an appropriate way forward, e.g. through a village centre masterplan..
90. **Station Parking** – The northern part of the Barratt's Farm development can be used to provide parking facilities for station users. This would be a short walk from the station and would seek to address the issue over commuter parking.
91. **Improved Public Transport** – A higher population gives greater potential for improved public transport services to be viable, e.g. better frequency of bus services and as HS2 starts



- to operate the existing main line has the potential to provide for greater local commuter services.
92. **New Primary School** – Based on the sites presently favoured for development, a new two form entry primary school is to be accommodated on the Barratt's Farm development. Funding for the school will be expected via section 106 agreements associated with the development of the allocated sites.
93. **Secondary School** – Heart of England School is located in Balsall Common but serves a far wider area, including a significant number of pupils living outside of Solihull. The School will be able to cater for pupils from the proposed developments from within its existing capacity, however this will need to be kept under review as more detail on housing numbers becomes clear. If expansion is required at the School this should be funded through Section 106 contributions.
94. **Community Infrastructure Levy** – Presently the parish councils will directly receive 15% of the levy collected in the area. This will increase to 25% once their Neighbourhood Plans are adopted. This will provide a significant source of funding that can be used to take forward appropriate projects that the community have identified as priorities. This can include simple relatively low cost actions (e.g. further traffic regulation orders) through to more substantial projects. It will be for the parish council to decide how this 'local' element of the CIL receipts is to be spent and there is potential for partnership working to maximise the use of monies from this source.
95. **Concept Master Plans** – The plans that accompany this consultation for the larger allocations include a draft concept masterplan. This seeks to identify the key existing features of the site that may need to be retained, and show at a high level where development is envisaged within the wider site. This is to ensure that when development proposals move to the planning application stage, there is certainty about the important elements of the development, e.g. appropriate green infrastructure & other requirements. This is to ensure a quality development. Whilst this may result in a lower gross to net developable area, this is to ensure a quality development is provided and then efficient use can be made of the net developable area so that the density of these areas will generally average at c35dph.
96. **Green Belt Enhancements** – The revised NPPF makes provision for environmental and/or access improvements to be undertaken to land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. This provides an opportunity for not only additional accessible open space, but also for wider Green Infrastructure improvements (e.g. parkland/woodland). This is especially important in the context of the Barratt's Farm development and provides an opportunity to link up with the Greenway (which is now to be extended further to link to the station).

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

Proposed Approach

97. The Green Belt boundary around the village will need to be amended to accommodate the level of growth proposed for the settlement. To provide a logical, strong and defensible new eastern boundary it is proposed to use the west coast main⁴³ line as the new boundary

⁴³ With the exception of that part of the line adjacent to Lavender Hall Farm. At this point the Green Belt boundary would extend north-eastwards beyond the railway line so that DLP site 21 (r/o Lavender Hall Farm) can be included as an allocation.

from where Kenilworth Road crosses the line to the north of the village to the point the HS2 line crosses the existing railway just to the south of Station Road; then the line of HS2 will be used as the boundary to the point where it crosses Waste Lane; thereafter the line of a new by-pass will be the outer boundary until it reaches the Kenilworth Road south of the village. Development opportunities through the 'call for site' within this line will form the basis for the bulk of the allocated sites.

98. In addition to the principal allocated sites that would then fall within the settlement boundary if the Green Belt boundary were amended as described above, there are a number of smaller sites that may then also be considered appropriate for development as they would also be within the settlement boundary. These sites are not being allocated as part of this plan but are being highlighted as they have been promoted for development by the landowner/developer and if the Green Belt boundary is changed they would no longer be subject to Green Belt policy. The principle as to whether development would be allowed on these sites would be established through the planning application process. This would include the following sites (using the call for site references and the SHELAA for potential indicative capacity):
- 1 – Springhill, 443 Station Road (capacity 21)
 - 36 Land adjacent to Oakwood House, Lavender Hall Lane (capacity 7)
 - 43 – Land adjacent to Old Lodge Farm, Kenilworth Road (capacity 40)
 - 101 – Land at Old Waste Lane/Waste Lane (capacity 40)
 - 333 – 2 Lavender Hall Lane (capacity 1)
99. One call for sites submission (reference 425) was made in relation to land south of Hob Lane and east of Windmill Lane. Whilst using the by-pass line as the Green Belt boundary in this location would mean that this land would be removed from the Green Belt, it is not to be an allocated site as part of this local plan review.
100. Reflecting the comments made during the Draft Local Plan consultation, brownfield sites previously discounted as they were not immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, or are located within larger parcels that make a greater contribution to the Green Belt, will now be included.
101. Some of the sites, in particular Barratt's Farm, have multiple and potential complex land assembly issues. It is important that sites such as this are considered in a comprehensive manner to avoid piecemeal developments occurring. This needn't necessarily preclude a phased approach where one parcel of land or part of a site may be available for development in advance of another, but this should be in accordance with an approach agreed by the Council and all relevant landowners/development promoters. Before being finally included in the plan, it will be necessary for the varied land interests to demonstrate to the Council that they are prepared to work on a collaborative and comprehensive basis to ensure a quality development is possible and can be satisfactorily delivered. This will include joint responsibility for the provision of infrastructure, and this latter point will also be relevant to other sites around the village which also need to ensure they contribute towards the provision of the required infrastructure.
102. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the settlement. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.

103. Balsall Common is one of the Borough's communities that will be more acutely affected by HS2, both during the construction phase and with the impact upon the landscape of the line itself. Phasing has a part to play to mitigate the former impact and it is anticipated that the final version of the plan will need to reflect this by phasing much of the Barratt's Farm development until later in the plan period. This will also provide opportunity for the by-pass to be pursued in a timely manner.

Existing Allocation

SLP Site 19 – Riddings Hill/Hallmeadow Road (capacity 65)

104. The adopted Solihull Local Plan (2013) allocated this 1.6ha site off Hallmeadow Road/Riddings Hill for development of approximately 65 dwellings. As an adopted allocation this remains to be bought forward and is not affected by this consultation.⁴⁴

Proposed Allocations

Site 1 – Barratt's Farm (capacity 900)

105. This allocation focuses on Barratt's Farm but also includes other land holdings nearby. It would include land extending from the current edge of the settlement up to the line of HS2 which is considered would provide a strong defensible boundary at this point.
106. This parcel of land doesn't perform highly in the Green Belt Assessment and it well located, in accessibility terms, to public transport, the village centre and doctors surgery. This site is intended to accommodate the new primary school that is required to serve the settlement.

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

Site 2 – Frog Lane (capacity 110)

107. This site includes the land at the rear of the dwellings fronting Balsall Street East and up to the boundary with Frog Lane. The site to be allocated for development will exclude the playing fields/allotments at the eastern end of the site. The new Green Belt boundary will use Frog Lane and Holly Lane as strong defensible and well defined boundaries.
108. The site doesn't perform highly in the Green Belt Assessment and is well located with regard to the primary school, but less so for other facilities.

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

Site 3 – Windmill Lane (capacity 220)

109. This site is bounded by the settlement edge to the north and Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane as they converge and join at the southern tip of the site.
110. Although the site is located a greater distance from the centre of the settlement than others, this did not prevent the SLP Inspector concluding that the area was so remote that would justify the omission of the two sites in this parcel bought forward under the last plan.
111. In Green Belt terms no other parcel of land around the settlement performs less well as identified by the Green Belt Assessment. At least in part this is due to the development and encroachment that has already taken place in the parcel.

⁴⁴ As this is a site in the adopted plan it is not subject to further consultation.

112. Since the DLP was published, further call-for-sites submissions have been made to include all of the land at the southern tip of the parcel. Although this area wasn't included in the DLP allocation, it is considered there is a case for it being included in that it would use strong definable boundaries.

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

New site 21 – Pheasant Oak Farm (capacity 100)

113. This is a new site to be included in the plan and is focussed on the farm complex (most of which has been included on the BLR), but also including adjacent land so that a strong and logical new Green Belt boundary is formed. This would mean that the allocation would stretch from the edge of the settlement up to the line of the by-pass and include all of the land between Waste Lane and Hob Lane that would sit west of the by-pass.
114. The western part of this area site in a Green Belt parcel that doesn't perform well in the Green Belt Assessment, and although the area of land to be removed from the Green Belt does extend further east than the parcel boundary, this is so that the by-pass would provide an appropriate boundary.

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

Site 22 – Trevallion Stud (capacity 300)

115. This is a new site to be included in the plan and is focussed on the land associated with the stud farm, but it also includes some adjacent parcels. The area to be removed from the Green Belt would be that bounded by Kenilworth Road and Wooten Green Lane – it would thus use strong, defensible boundaries to establish the extent of the Green Belt.
116. Although this is in a wider parcel assessed in the Green Belt Assessment as making a moderate contribution to Green Belt purposes, it is considered that due to the presence of built development and encroachment in this part of the parcel that this smaller area actually performs less well in its own right. A large part of this area is included on the Council's BLR.

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

Site 23 – Lavender Hall Farm (capacity 60)

117. This is a new site to be included in the plan and the area for inclusion is focussed on the previously developed land part of the site that sits behind Lavender Hall Farm.
118. Although the site sits in a broad area parcel of the Green Belt assessment it is considered that the HS2 line will provide a new feature separating this site from the wider Green Belt that will remain to the north east. It is considered that due to the presence of built development and encroachment in this part of the parcel that this smaller area actually performs less well in its own right. A large part of this area is included on the Council's BLR.

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

Other Green Belt Changes

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

6. Blythe

The Area Now

119. For the purposes of this chapter, the Blythe area comprises the parishes of Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and Tidbury Green, which lie to the south of Shirley and the Stratford Road; and west of the M42.
120. This area consists of distinct villages set within, and separated by, attractive countryside and Green Belt, which gives each village a sense of remoteness. The landscape is characterised by smaller hedged fields and numerous hedgerow trees of Arden pasture with the River Cole to the west and River Blythe SSSI from the south. Small ponds and pockets of ancient woodland punctuate the landscape.⁴⁵ There are no Conservation Areas, but several farmhouses are Grade II listed buildings within a farmland setting.
121. Tidbury Green comprises predominantly inter-war linear development along key roads. New residential developments at Tidbury Green Farm and Lowbrook Farm are providing a greater mix of housing types and much needed affordable housing to the area. Tidbury Green primary school has been expanded to provide additional capacity for the pupils arising from these new developments. Wythall train station, which has services to Birmingham and Stratford upon Avon, is within walking distance from the centre of the village, but bus services are poor. The south of the Parish borders the popular Earlswood Lakes and Clowes Wood SSSI. There is a train station with limited services at Earlswood, but few amenities. Tidbury Green parish contains 1,130 residents in 432 households.
122. Cheswick Green is predominantly a planned new village from the 1970s and consists almost entirely of post-war development characterised by cul-de-sac, open plan layouts. There are a number of key local facilities, including a one-form entry primary school, GP surgery, village hall, pub and local shops. Public transport is via the bus service which runs to Shirley and Solihull. It is proposed that the school will be enlarged to two-form entry to accommodate pupils from new housing development at Blythe Valley Park and Mount Dairy Farm, subject to normal statutory processes. The hamlet of Illshaw Heath lies to the south. Cheswick Green has a population of 2,197 residents in 891 households.
123. The modern, multi-award winning village of Dickens Heath was 'created' in the late 1990s and, guided by an architect-led masterplan. It has since undergone rapid expansion with a variety of architectural styles of development and a village centre. Whilst housing densities are higher around the village centre, the area has an attractive, mature woodland, a Country Park and canalside setting, with a few early cottages adding sporadic visual interest.
124. The centre has a range of community facilities including a two-form entry primary school, library, GP surgery, shops and services. Due to limited land availability the school does not currently have scope to expand on-site. There is a railway station close to the village at Whitlock's End, which benefits from a car park and three services per hour to Birmingham, however pedestrian and cycling access needs to be improved. Dickens Heath has a population of 3,992 residents in 1,757 households.

⁴⁵ Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines: Arden pasture countryside – 'gently rolling topography, smaller hedged fields, numerous hedgerow trees, farmed landscape inc. permanent pasture, 'the effect of so many trees {in the hedgerows} is to create filtered views and a strong sense of enclosure.... Ecology: River Cole on western boundary and River Blythe, and Mount Brook. Smaller ponds, wet grasslands. Stratford-on-Avon canal. Pockets of ancient woodland (Big Dickens Wood, Little Tyburn Coppice) & boundary with Earlswood Lakes and Clowes Wood SSSI.

125. Blythe Valley Park comprises a modern campus style commercial development within an attractive parkland setting. There are several award winning signature buildings providing a contemporary and sustainable working environment. Planning permission has been granted for 1,000⁴⁶ homes at the southern end of the park which will create a new community and increase the diversity of housing types and tenures in the area. Close to Junction 4 of the M42, there is excellent access to the strategic road network, but limited bus services.
126. As a whole, the villages benefit from some key facilities and Whitlock's End Station has been upgraded with 3 services per hour to Birmingham and Stratford. However, the wider sub-area suffers from poor public transport provision with limited bus services between settlements, which perpetuates travel by private car.

The Area in the Future

127. The area will be provided with affordable homes and market housing for a range of people such as families, young professionals and those wishing to down-size.
128. Significant new development at Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, and Blythe Valley Park will add to the vibrancy and vitality of the settlement, whilst retaining the intrinsic character of distinctive villages separated by open countryside.



129. New and existing communities will be integrated and benefit from increased infrastructure provision and enhanced access to natural green spaces and the canal network.
130. Blythe Valley Park will have become a mixed and sustainable community and aspirational place to live, work and play, amplified by its exemplar standard of design and construction and distinctive sense of place. Improvements to local facilities, services and public transport

⁴⁶ 750 dwellings and a housing with care development of 250 units.

will have been realised, encouraging more sustainable travel patterns and improved connectivity to surrounding communities.

131. It is recognised that this area of the Borough has a complex pattern of settlements that are located both in close proximity to each other, but also close to the urban edge. Each has its own sense of identity and this is reinforced by maintaining a reasonable separation between each settlement and/or the urban edge. It is important that adequate separation continues to be provided between these settlements to avoid them coalescing. Whilst some development is proposed in this area it does mean that the gaps between settlements that will remain are now more sensitive to change and it is important that they are protected so that they still provide an adequate separating function.

What is Required for the Area in the Future?

132. **Improved Public Transport** – A higher population gives greater potential for improved public transport services to be viable, e.g. better frequency of bus services.⁴⁷
133. **Pedestrian and Cycling Connectivity** – Cycling and walking links to Whitlock's End station, village centres, local services and Shirley town centre will be improved to facilitate active travel and reduce car dependency, especially for short journeys.
134. **Highway improvements** – It is likely that highway improvements will be required at various locations in the settlement, as well as capitalising on highway improvement initiatives along the Stratford Road. These could include speed reduction measures, access and junction improvements around development sites, highway capacity improvements or adjustments to traffic priority arrangements.
135. **Parking Improvements** – The provision of appropriate additional off-street parking may be considered in Dickens Heath.
136. **New Primary School** – Pupils arising from Site 4 will be accommodated at the recently expanded Tidbury Green Primary school. A new two-form entry primary school, however, will be required to serve Sites 11, 12 and 25. The draft concept masterplans show the school situated on Site 12. Funding for the school will be expected via section 106 agreements associated with the development of the allocated sites.
137. **Health provision** – The Council will work with the Clinical Commissioning Group to establish the impact of new development on local GPs and other services, and how this can be addressed.
138. **Sports and Recreation** - Replacement of any lost recreation / sports provision as a result of development will be required to an equivalent or better standard, including access and use by the wider community where appropriate.
139. **Play and Open Space** - Provision of play and areas of open space within potential development sites will be required. There is also a need to ensure that best use is made of existing green and blue infrastructure assets within development sites, together with provision for linkages to the surrounding area.
140. **Concept Master Plans** – The plans that accompany this consultation, for the principal sites, include a draft concept masterplan. These seek to identify the key existing features of a site that may need to be retained, and show at a high level where development is envisaged within the wider site. This is to ensure that when development proposals move to the planning application stage, there is certainty about the important elements of the

⁴⁷ Capitalise on access to train stations, in particular Whitlock's End, which has been upgraded to accommodate 3 services per hour and has park and ride.

development, e.g. appropriate green infrastructure and other requirements. Whilst this may result in a lower gross to net developable area, this will demonstrate that a quality development can be provided which makes efficient use of land and respects local character.

141. **Green Belt Enhancements** – The revised NPPF makes provision for environmental and/or access improvements to be undertaken to land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. This provides an opportunity for additional accessible open space, particularly in the area south of the existing urban edge and between the new urban extensions and the rural settlements (Dickens Heath & Cheswick Green)
142. **Community Infrastructure Levy** – Presently the parish councils will directly receive 15% of the levy collected in the area. This will increase to 25% once any Neighbourhood Plans are adopted. This will provide a significant source of funding that can be used to take forward appropriate projects that the community have identified as priorities. This can include simple relatively low cost actions (e.g. further traffic regulation orders) through to more substantial projects. It will be for the parish councils to decide how this 'local' element of the CIL receipts is to be spent and there is potential for partnership working to maximise the use of monies from this source.
143. **Affordable Housing** – Affordable housing will be required on development sites in accordance with adopted planning policy.

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

Proposed Approach

144. Given that the opportunities to develop on previously developed land in Blythe are extremely limited, Green Belt release will be required and a redefined Green Belt boundary will need to be established. In accordance with national planning policy, such boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Sites that are close to the existing settlement or are / can be well-served by public transport will be preferable, subject to their performance against the purposes of including land Green Belt as supported in the Green Belt assessment and any other evidence base and constraints.
145. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the area. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.
146. It is important that sites are considered in a comprehensive manner to avoid piecemeal developments occurring. This needn't necessarily preclude a phased approach where one parcel of land or part of a site may be available for development in advance of another, but this should be in accordance with an approach agreed by the Council and all relevant landowners/development promoters. Before being finally included in the plan, it will be necessary for the varied land interests to demonstrate to the Council that they are prepared to work on a collaborative and comprehensive basis to ensure a quality development is possible and can be satisfactorily delivered. This will include joint responsibility for the provision of infrastructure, and this latter point will also be relevant to other sites around

the area which also need to ensure they contribute towards the provision of the required infrastructure.

Proposed Allocations

Site 4 – West of Dickens Heath (capacity 350)

147. This proposed allocation comprises two parcels of land to the west of the existing village. The smaller parcel extends along the north of Tythe Barn Lane and bounded by the Stratford-upon-Avon canal to the north, and hedgerow to the west. The larger site is bounded by Tilehouse Lane to the west, Tythe Barn Lane to the north and Birchy Leasowes Lane to the south.
148. The smaller site is an existing arable field with few constraints. Views onto and access to the Stratford-upon-Avon canal will be enhanced, whilst retaining its important function as a wildlife corridor and key piece of green infrastructure.
149. The larger site is currently occupied by Highgate United FC, Leaffield FC and Old Yardleians Rugby Football Club, and re-provision will be required for these sports pitches. Tythe Barn Meadows Local Wildlife Site to the west will be retained, as will the integrity of Little Tyburn Coppice, a remnant ancient woodland. Tyburn Farm pastures has recently been confirmed as a LWS, it is the area north of Tythe Lane running up to the canal. The LWSs are expected to impact upon the ability to re-provide the playing fields within the site and therefore alternative options for their re-provision will need to be pursued. Development proposals could include options that see the retention of the existing garden centre, or it could be redeveloped to provide residential accommodation.
150. The sites are located within a moderately performing parcel of Green Belt, with the highest score for purpose 1 'to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.' However, the sites are opportunely located in very close proximity to Whitlock's End Station, which has 3 train services per hour to the centre of Birmingham with a short journey time of 20 minutes. Furthermore, local services and shops in Dickens Heath village centre will be easily accessible by foot or bicycle, and it is important that convenient links are provided.
151. The Landscape Assessment (2016) states that the Blythe area has medium landscape value but high overall sensitivity to new development. As such, the draft concept masterplan proposes to retain historic landscape features, such as hedgerows and standard trees, and the meadows and woodland designated as Local Wildlife Sites.
152. Highway improvements will be required to the surrounding roads, and a pedestrian/cycling link north of the hedgerow along Tythe Barn Lane is proposed to provide a safe route to Whitlocks End Station.

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

Site 11 – The Green (capacity 640)

153. This site is not located in the Green Belt and has a long history of accommodating commercial uses, especially those associated with the automotive industry. Since 2004 planning permission has been available for mixed use developments at the site (including B1 uses). However only the non-B1 uses were taken up and the DLP included proposals for increased residential development at the site. Since 1st April 2018 planning permission has either been granted or sought for residential development of nearly 650 units on the basis that the remaining B1 uses on the site will relocate. This will provide an opportunity to

make efficient use of the land for residential purposes and infrastructure planning (mostly notably the provision of a new primary school) should be co-ordinated with sites 12 and 26.

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

Site 12 – South of Dog Kennel Lane (capacity 1000)

154. This consultation proposes to extend Site 12 further east towards Creynolds Lane and the Stratford Road and accommodate up to 1000 dwellings. Site 12 is within a parcel of moderately performing Green Belt, and given the existing field structure, does not have a clear contiguous defensible Green Belt boundary to the south. This will need to be provided by a strong edge to the proposed development e.g. a new road, which will demarcate the built-up area from the surrounding countryside and provide a meaningful gap with Cheswick Green.
155. As with Site 4, the draft concept masterplan proposes to retain historic landscape features, such as hedgerows, standard trees and ponds. Any development around the Grade II listed building will be sensitive to its historic setting. There will be legible and accessible pedestrian and cycling links going north to Site 11 and west towards Shirley town centre, and south towards the Country Park. New development will avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3, and betterment will be sought where possible to alleviate flood risk downstream.
156. The draft concept masterplans propose situating a new primary school in the heart of Site 12, to reduce journey times for pupils from Site 11 and Site 12.

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

Site 26 – Whitlock's End Farm (capacity 300)

157. The DLP included (as site 13) land south of Shirley between Whitlock's End Farm and Dickens Heath Road. This was expected to provide some 600 dwellings. Rather than pursuing this option, the Council now intends to include just the land at the Christmas tree farm land holding (albeit not all of it) which is to the west of site 13. This is now included as site 26.
158. Site 26 will extend up to the western edge of the Borough where the boundary is marked by the Stratford railway line, and being on an embankment at this point the rail line itself will help provide visual separation between the new development and the built up area of Major's Green to the west (which is in Bromsgrove District). Although this site now includes land in a Green Belt parcel that scores highly, it is considered that this represents a trade off with the higher accessibility of the site being located on the urban edge close to where need arises.
159. Most forms of development in this area will reduce the gap between the urban edge and Dickens Heath. This will be reduced to approximately 300m (from 600m) and this should be seen as the minimum necessary to provide a meaningful gap provided it only occurs over a narrow front (i.e. just a pinch point) rather than over a broad front that simply results in a uniform corridor like gap between the urban edge and Dickens Heath.
160. Pursuing an urban extension in this from is expected to result in the following advantages over site 13 as proposed in the DLP:
- Option 26 provides for a narrower front where only the minimum separation between the urban edge and Dickens Heath is provided (by shifting more of the development to the west thus being 'off set' from the built up area of Dickens

Heath). Furthermore it avoids further development in the gap between the urban edge and Dickens Heath along Dickens Heath Road which is the principal route south from the urban edge to the village – as such this is where the perception of the gap should be at its greatest.


- Development under site 26 would also allow the retention of more land as open and accessible space south of Woodloes Road, so that it can connect with open countryside further south. This could form part of the Green Belt compensation enhancements in that access improvements and habitat creation in this area would help off set the loss of Green Belt to the west.
- Shifting the focus of vehicular traffic movements away from the congested Dickens Heath Road to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road.

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

7. Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine-de-Barnes

The Settlements Now

- 161. The rural settlements of Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine-de-Barnes are small villages east of Solihull which are located in close proximity to major transport links joining Birmingham with Coventry. The settlements are divided by the M42 motorway and are broadly bounded by the A45 and A452 trunk roads to the north, by the River Blythe to the east and south and by the Grand Union Canal, Hampton Coppice and the A41 to the west.
- 162. The settlements are situated within the largely pastoral and historic Arden Landscape. This area of Green Belt which separates the wider Birmingham conurbation from Coventry is known as the ‘Meriden Gap’.
- 163. Hampton-in-Arden has been a settlement since Saxon times and is mentioned in the Domesday Book of 1086. The parish currently covers the village itself and associated hinterland, but by virtue of boundary changes that are to take effect in April 2019, the parish boundary will be extended westwards up to the urban edge and all of Catherine-de-Barnes will then be included in the parish.
- 164. The village of Hampton-in-Arden is located to the eastern side of the Parish and has a range of facilities including a primary school, a library, doctor’s surgery and a number of shops including a post office and chemist together with recreational facilities. The village has a train station on the West Coast Mainline which provides access to London, Birmingham and Coventry. The station has a car park accommodating some 72 vehicles. A bus service runs through the village which connects Hampton-in-Arden to Meriden, Catherine-de-Barnes and Solihull.
- 165. The smaller settlement of Catherine-de-Barnes is located west of Hampton-in-Arden, and it contains a range of facilities including a village hall, a public house, a cricket club, a restaurant and a local shop.
- 166. The Parish of Hampton-in-Arden has 803 dwellings and has a population of 1,834 – the majority of which are located within the village of Hampton-in-Arden itself.
- 167. The central part of Hampton-in-Arden was first designated as a Conservation Area by Warwickshire County Council in order to preserve the historic core of the settlement. In 2015, Solihull MBC completed a review of the Conservation Area and expanded its boundaries to include other notable parts of Hampton-in-Arden.
- 168. A neighbourhood plan for the parish was adopted in August 2017.



The Settlements in the Future

- 169. Given the limited ranges of services, it is considered that development options are restricted to what would be limited and proportionate extensions to the settlement. A key aspect to

this is to ensure that the existing infrastructure supporting the village, especially the school, is not overwhelmed from additional demands that may occur from larger expansions.

170. The M42, which separates Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine-de-Barnes, will continue to provide an important part of the strategic highway network. The planned improvements to Junction 6 of the M42 will result in a new road linking the motorway to the A45 via a new junction to be located where Solihull Road currently crosses the motorway.
171. The HS2 line will run through the parish. To accommodate the crossing of the River Blythe (and its floodplain), a viaduct of some 480m in length and over 10m above ground level will be constructed.

What is Required for the Settlements in the Future?

172. Hampton in Arden will require protection from excessive development that may impact upon the character and attractiveness of the village; and the services it provides. Where development is provided, the following issues will need to be addressed:
173. **Constraints & Opportunities** – The Conservation Area, historical environment and Local Wildlife Site provide constraints to the west, whilst the River Blythe, which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and its flood zones are constraints to the east. The former ammunition depot, currently in use for storage is a brownfield site which could be developed alongside the existing allocation (site 24 in the Solihull Local Plan 2013), providing alternative provision is made for open space.
174. **Community Infrastructure Levy** – The parish council will directly receive 25% of the levy collected in the area as there is an adopted neighbourhood plan in place. This will provide a significant source of funding that can be used to take forward appropriate projects that the community have identified as priorities. This can include simple relatively low cost actions (e.g. further traffic regulation orders) through to more substantial projects. It will be for the parish council to decide how this 'local' element of the CIL receipts is to be spent and there is potential for partnership working to maximise the use of monies from this source.
175. **Green Belt Enhancements** – The revised NPPF makes provision for environmental and/or access improvements to be undertaken to land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. This provides an opportunity for additional accessible open space and views would be welcomed from both site promoters and residents as to how this new requirement of the NPPF can be fulfilled.

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

Proposed Approach

176. Other than a limited and proportionate expansion of the village, no other large scale development is considered appropriate.
177. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the settlement. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.
178. Hampton-in-Arden is one of the Borough's communities that will be more acutely affected by HS2, both during the construction phase and with the impact upon the landscape of the line itself.

Existing Allocations

SLP Site 24 – Land off Meriden Road, Hampton in Arden (capacity 110)

179. The adopted Solihull Local Plan (2013) allocated the 2.8ha site off Meriden Road for development of approximately 110 dwellings. As an adopted allocation this remains to be bought forward and is not affected by this consultation.⁴⁸

Proposed Allocations

Site 6 – Meriden Road, Hampton in Arden (capacity 100)

180. This site sits adjacent to that allocated in the SLP 2013 and they should ideally be developed together in a comprehensive manner. It provides an opportunity to re-use the former ammunitions depot which is a brownfield site (and is included on the Council's BLR). Open space provision serving the development as a whole will be an important consideration.
181. The parcel of land immediately east of the village is a lower performing parcel in Green Belt terms, partly as a result of the existing use. A large part of this area is included on the Council's BLR.

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

Site 24 – Oak Farm, Catherine-de-Barnes (capacity 80)

182. This is a new site to be included as a preferred option. It performs well being a brownfield site adjacent to a settlement, although there are only a limited range of facilities available nearby. The boundary for the allocation follows the extent of the site that is considered to be previously developed land. This does mean that there is a gap that will remain in the Green Belt running up to the island. This is considered appropriate as currently all 4 parcels of land fronting on to the island are open (and development free) – the 'entrance' to the built up area of Catherine-de-Barnes is therefore some 60m away from the island.
183. Although this is in a wider parcel assessed in the Green Belt Assessment as making a high contribution to Green Belt purposes, it is considered that due to the presence of built development and encroachment in this part of the parcel that this smaller area actually performs less well in its own right. Additional justification is that the site is included on the Council's BLR.

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

⁴⁸ As this is a site in the adopted plan it is not subject to further consultation.

8. Hockley Heath

The Settlement Now

184. Hockley Heath village is a largely inter and post-war small settlement formed by ribbon development. It is bisected by the A3400 Stratford Road, which is a key connection to Junction 4 of the M42 to the north and Stratford-upon-Avon to the South.
185. Located within Hockley Heath Parish, near the boundary with Stratford and Warwick Districts, this semi-rural settlement lies to the far south of the Borough. The population of the parish is 2,038 in some 794 households with the majority of residents in the parish residing within the village of Hockley Heath.
186. The settlement is characterised by low-density residential areas, many dwellings of detached or semi-detached form. The settlement has a small village centre, which provides a range of shops and restaurants, including a post office. However, it lacks key services such as a Doctor's surgery.
187. The village of Hockley Heath is inset in the Green Belt, which separates it from neighbouring Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath and gives it a sense of remoteness. The Green Belt is also valuable in the settlement's overall environmental quality and contributes to its semi-rural setting. Hockley Heath Recreation Ground provides valuable green space for residents to use within the village. The settlement also benefits from significant blue infrastructure in the form of the Stratford-Upon-Avon Canal, which provides a linear heritage asset with a village wharf.
188. The area has a high quality residential environment and a good, popular school (Hockley Heath Academy). This small, one-form entry primary school accommodates some 250 pupils. However, secondary education needs are met outside of the Parish.
189. Hockley Heath has regular bus services running through the village connecting Birmingham and Stratford and a more frequent service linking Solihull & Dickens Heath. Rail access is limited, with Dorridge home to the closest railway station, connecting the settlement to Birmingham and London.



The Settlement in the Future

190. The A3400 will continue to provide an important part of the highway network enabling vehicles to travel from Stratford-upon-Avon, and to travel to the north, connecting Hockley Heath to Blythe Valley Park and the M42.
191. Due to the proximity to the borough boundary, future expansion of the settlement within Solihull Borough is limited and largely restricted to the north and west of the village.
192. Given the limited ranges of services and the less accessible nature of the settlement, it is considered that development options are restricted to what would be limited and proportionate extensions to the settlement. A key aspect to this is to ensure that the existing infrastructure supporting the village, especially the school, is not overwhelmed from additional demands that may occur from larger expansions.

What is Required for the Settlement in the Future?

193. Hockley Heath will require protection from excessive development that may impact upon the character and attractiveness of the village; and the services it provides. Where development is provided, the following issues will need to be addressed:
194. **School Parking** – Congestion around school pick up and drop off times currently occurs in School Road.
195. **Community Infrastructure Levy** – Presently the parish council will directly receive 15% of the levy collected in the area. This will increase to 25% once any Neighbourhood Plans are adopted. This will provide a significant source of funding that can be used to take forward appropriate projects that the community have identified as priorities. This can include simple relatively low cost actions (e.g. further traffic regulation orders) through to more substantial projects. It will be for the parish council to decide how this 'local' element of the CIL receipts is to be spent and there is potential for partnership working to maximise the use of monies from this source.

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

Proposed Approach

196. Other than a limited and proportionate expansion of the village, no other large scale development is considered appropriate.
197. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the settlement. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.

Proposed Allocation

Site 25 - Land South of School Road

198. The site proposed for development off School Road is considered to perform well in that it is a limited and proportionate expansion adding some 100 or so dwellings (about a 12% increase in the size of the settlement). It would use a strong and defensible boundary (the canal) to limit the extent of development. The development may also allow the congestion issues in the vicinity of the school to be addressed if, through careful design of the site

frontage and access, alternative drop off/pick up arrangements for the school can be provided.

199. The site sits in a Green Belt parcel that extends around the western side of the village and is judged, through the Green Belt Assessment as a lower performing area.
200. Given the change that will be required to the Green Belt boundary to accommodate the above site, it is considered that the existing ribbon development on the north side of the road that has Green Belt 'washed over' it should be reviewed. Given the built development that exists, and that it is largely continuous without significant gaps, it appears logical for this run of development to be removed from the Green Belt.
201. In addition to the site south of School Road that would then fall within the settlement boundary, if the Green Belt boundary were amended as described above, there are also two smaller sites that may then be considered appropriate for development as they would then also be within the settlement boundary. These sites are not being allocated as part of this plan but are being highlighted as they have been promoted for development by the landowner/developer and if the Green Belt boundary is changed they would no longer be subject to Green Belt policy. The principle as to whether development would be allowed on these sites would be established through the planning application process. These are as follows (using the call for site references and the SHELAA for potential indicative capacity):
- 49 Land adjacent to 84 School Road (capacity 21)
 - 328 land at and to the rear of 84, 86 & 90 School Road (capacity 30)

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

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

9. Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath

The Settlement Now

202. Lying around 3 miles south east of Solihull Town Centre, Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath (KDBH) is the Borough's largest rural settlement with a combined population of around 19,800 in some 8,000 households. It is inset in the Green Belt which separates it from the main urban area of Solihull and the surrounding rural villages.
203. Whilst Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath are essentially three villages, the significant post-war development in the area means that they are now physically and functionally linked such that they form one built up area. It is not obvious where one village ends and another one begins and there are strong links between each community as they share many local services and facilities. However, each village has its own shopping provision, park, primary school, community/village hall and churches which help to underpin the sense of individual village identity.
204. The historic medieval core of Knowle is centred on the High Street and the church of St. John the Baptist, St. Lawrence and St. Anne, at the junction of two historic routes. This area is protected by Conservation Area designation and includes 53 statutory listed buildings and a number of locally listed assets. Knowle has a thriving and well used local centre with an extensive range of shops, facilities and services.
205. Similarly, development from the later Victorian and Edwardian periods around and near to Dorridge railway station (Station Approach and Granville Road) also benefit from Conservation Area status. The dated shopping parade at Dorridge has recently been redeveloped to provide up-dated modern facilities and a new public realm that enhances the centre as a whole. It includes food and drink outlets, small business, shops and services.
206. Bentley Heath has a smaller range of shops and services providing more for the day to day convenience needs of residents.
207. Overall, the settlement benefits from an attractive residential environment with leafy green streets, access to a number of parks, open spaces and green spaces within the area, and links to the countryside beyond. Green and blue infrastructure is a valuable attribute, with local wildlife sites and local nature reserves, as well as the canal which provides an important environmental and recreational feature.
208. KDBH is served by four primary schools (including a Catholic primary school) and the Arden Academy and Sixth Form Centre secondary school which has a current capacity of around 1,850 pupils. However, the recent housing developments in the area along with a fluctuating birth rate, is creating pressure on primary school places.
209. The area is valued by residents for the wide range of community services and facilities that are enjoyed and used extensively. These include Knowle Library, Knowle and Dorridge scout huts, sports and recreation facilities, local allotments and commercial premises such as post offices, chemists and public houses that are a vital part of village life. The settlement is also well served in terms of health facilities with 3 GP surgeries and 5 dental surgeries.
210. The settlement as a whole has a high proportion of detached dwellings and low density residential development is a characteristic of some parts of the settlement. House prices are amongst the most expensive in the Borough and affordability continues to be an issue for those seeking access to housing, as does the need to provide a more appropriate range of housing types and sizes to meet future needs.

211. The area has good links to key employment sites at Blythe Valley Park and Solihull Town Centre. The north west of the settlement is crossed by the M42 with junction 5 providing access to motorway network. The main A road through the area is the A4141 running from Solihull through Knowle, on to Chadwick End and out of the Borough towards Warwick.
212. The settlement is well served by public transport with bus services running throughout the area with routes to Solihull, Balsall Common and Coventry. Regular train services from Dorridge Station in the centre of the village provide links to Kidderminster, Solihull, Birmingham and London. However, whilst Dorridge Station car park can accommodate over 100 vehicles, this well used station quickly reaches capacity in the mornings with commuter parking resulting in overspill parking in residential roads nearby. This also affects the availability of parking for local shoppers.
213. The 2013 Solihull Local Plan identified land for housing at 3 sites in the settlement. These were Four Ashes Road, Bentley Heath; Hampton Road, Knowle; and Middlefield, Knowle. The sites at Four Ashes Road and Hampton Road are complete and have delivered a total of 211 dwellings including 51 extra care units, with the site at Middlefield Road providing 110 dwellings is still to be fully completed. Like other areas in the Borough, there have also been a number of windfall developments in the settlement.
214. In July 2015 an application was submitted to Solihull Council for the designation of a Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath (KDBH) Neighbourhood Area to enable the preparation of a Neighbourhood Development Plan for the settlement. As the area is not covered by a Parish Council, the KDBH, Neighbourhood Forum has been established. This is a group of individuals, representative of the community who are authorised to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan. The preparation of the KDBH Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage. It has been subject to public consultation and has been examined by an independent Examiner who has recommended that the plan should proceed to a referendum. If successful at referendum, the Neighbourhood Plan will be formally 'made' by the Council and it will become part of the development plan for the Borough, and used to determine planning applications in KDBH.

The Settlement in the Future

215. Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath is one of two rural settlements in the Borough that has a full range of facilities including both secondary & primary schools, health services and a range of shops, services and facilities. As such it is well placed to accommodate growth in excess of just its own local needs. Given that the area is mainly residential, the opportunities to develop on previously developed land in KDBH are extremely limited and Green Belt release around the settlement will be required to accommodate new development. However, it will be important to maintain separation of KDBH from Solihull and other settlements.



216. Although the settlement does not have significant areas of employment uses (other than service uses) and many of the area's economically active residents travel out to work, there is good access to the motorway and wider road network. However, whilst the main road through the centre of Knowle will continue to provide an important link in this regard, it can be congested at peak times and is likely to experience increased vehicle movements in the future. Similarly, other roads in the settlement such as Station Road, principally around school drop off and pick up times, see the free flow of traffic interrupted and notable parking difficulties. However, in the event that Arden Academy is relocated, it is likely that school related traffic congestion and parking issues in the vicinity of Station Road will be alleviated.
217. The area is however well served by public transport and it will be important to retain and where possible improve the public transport offer. Dorridge railway station will continue to provide an important facility for local commuters. Opportunities for enhancing existing walking and cycling routes and creating new routes should continue to be explored, particularly where these would provide access to schools, local centres and the railway station.
218. It will also be important to ensure that the local centres remain economically strong, vibrant and continue to provide, support and enhance the variety of services and facilities for the local population.
219. The historic core of Knowle will continue to be protected and enhanced and the local character and distinctiveness of the settlements conserved, particularly, the Victorian and Edwardian development around Dorridge railway station.
220. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the settlement. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.
221. Education facilities in the area will remain successful, although pressure on primary schools places will continue. Additional places could be provided through the expansion of existing schools, however, this would depend on whether the school sites are sufficient.

What is Required for the Settlement in the Future?

222. Development in and around KDBH is not only an opportunity for the settlement to play a major part in accommodating the Borough and wider area needs, but also to accommodate a scale of development that is capable of supporting infrastructure provision that can help play a part in dealing with existing issues and provide the necessary facilities for future residents. In particular the following areas have been identified and should be taken forward:
223. **Improved Public Transport** – A higher population gives greater potential for improved public transport services to be viable, e.g. better frequency of bus services.
224. **Parking Improvements** – The provision of appropriate additional off-street parking may be considered in centres. In addition, decked parking at Dorridge railway station could be considered in order to increase capacity and alleviate the impact of commuter parking on surrounding roads.
225. **Highway Improvements** – It is likely that highway improvements will be required at various locations in the settlement. This could include speed reduction measures, access

- improvements around development sites, highway capacity improvements or adjustments to traffic priority arrangements.
226. **Pedestrian and Cycling Connectivity** – Enhancements to encourage and promote walking and cycling in the settlement, particularly towards the local centres, schools and public transport will be required.
227. **New Primary School** – Based on the sites presently favoured for development, and given the existing pressure on primary school places, a new primary school is proposed on Site 9 – Arden Triangle. This would help to relieve pressure on the existing primary schools and ease traffic potential future traffic congestion in the vicinity of other schools in the settlement. Funding for the school will be expected via section 106 agreements associated with the development of the allocated sites.
228. **Play and Open Space** – Provision of play and areas of open space within potential development sites will be required. There is also a need to ensure that best use is made of existing green and blue infrastructure assets within development sites, together with provision for linkages to the surrounding area.
229. **Sport and Recreation** – Replacement of any lost recreation / sports provision as a result of development will be required to an equivalent or better standard, including access and use by the wider community where appropriate. A new community sports hub is proposed on land off Hampton Road should redevelopment of the existing Knowle Football take place.
230. **Concept Master Plans** – The plans that accompany this consultation for the principal sites include a draft concept masterplan. These seek to identify the key existing features of a site that may need to be retained, and show at a high level where development is envisaged within the wider site. This is to ensure that when development proposals move to the planning application stage, there is certainty about the important elements of the development, e.g. appropriate green infrastructure and other requirements. Whilst this may result in a lower gross to net developable area, this will demonstrate that a quality development can be provided which makes efficient use of land and respects local character.
231. **Green Belt Enhancements** – The revised NPPF makes provision for environmental and/or access improvements to be undertaken to land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. This provides an opportunity for additional accessible open space and views would be welcomed from both site promoters and residents as to how this new requirement of the NPPF can be fulfilled
232. **Community Infrastructure Levy** – Presently in areas like KDBH which are not covered by a parish or town council, 15% of the levy collected will be spent in the area. The Local Authority will engage with the local community and agree with them how best to spend the funding. However, where there is a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. a plan that has been subject to a successful referendum and adopted by the Local Authority) for the area, this will increase to 25% of the levy collected. As the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum is currently at an advanced stage in the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the area, subject to the plan being 'made', a significant source of funding could be available to take forward appropriate projects that the community have identified as priorities. This can include simple relatively low cost actions (e.g. further traffic regulation orders) through to more substantial projects.
233. **Affordable Housing and Smaller Market Homes** – Affordable housing will be required on development sites (in accordance with the Local Plan) and smaller market homes for younger people wishing to stay in the area will be sought.

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

Proposed Approach

234. Given that the opportunities to develop on previously developed land in KDBH are extremely limited, Green Belt release will be required and a redefined Green Belt boundary will need to be established. In accordance with national planning policy, such boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Sites that are close to the existing settlement or are / can be well-served by public transport will be preferable, subject to their performance against the purposes of including land in Green Belt as supported in the Green Belt assessment and any other evidence base and constraints.
235. Some of the sites, in particular the land south of Knowle, have multiple and potential complex land assembly issues. It is important that sites such as this are considered in a comprehensive manner to avoid piecemeal developments occurring. This needn't necessarily preclude a phased approach where one parcel of land or part of a site may be available for development in advance of another, but this should be in accordance with an approach agreed by the Council and all relevant landowners/development promoters. Before being finally included in the plan, it will be necessary for the varied land interests to demonstrate to the Council that they are prepared to work on a collaborative and comprehensive basis to ensure a quality development is possible and can be satisfactorily delivered. This will include joint responsibility for the provision of infrastructure, and this latter point will also be relevant to other sites around the village which also need to ensure they contribute towards the provision of the required infrastructure.

Proposed Allocations

Site 8: Hampton Road – (capacity 300-350⁴⁹)

236. This allocation comprises two areas of land either side of Hampton Road. The smaller site to the south of Hampton Road includes the current ground of Knowle Football Club and potentially the adjacent Cricket Club. The larger site to the north is agricultural land.
237. The southern part of the allocation lies beyond the Green Belt boundary, although it is immediately adjacent to the built up area of the settlement and would represent a continuation of the existing development along Hampton Road. Whilst it is recognised that the site lies within a parcel of highly performing Green Belt, it is acknowledged that it comprises a small part of a wider parcel and that built development and/or urbanising influences are present either within the site or in the immediate vicinity adjacent to and opposite the site. The site is relatively well-contained and a defensible Green Belt boundary could be provided.
238. The site currently accommodates Knowle Football Club and Cricket Club and it is noted that that the Football Club is seeking to relocate in order to secure better facilities. This would represent an opportunity to utilise a site for residential development, in an accessible location, immediately adjacent to the existing settlement, whilst planning positively to facilitate the relocation of a sporting and recreational use that could serve the wider community. The site performs very well in overall accessibility terms and there is good

⁴⁹ The capacity estimate has been increased by 50 units to reflect the potential inclusion of the cricket club.

access to all key facilities in Knowle, although, accessibility to public transport is currently low.

239. The larger part of the allocation to the north of Hampton Road also lies just beyond the Green Belt boundary, although it is immediately adjacent to the built up area of the settlement, with residential development on two sides. The site lies within a parcel of moderately performing Green Belt overall and this part of the proposed allocation would constitute a 'rounding-off' of the settlement in a logical manner by continuing the Green Belt boundary on from the rear of the properties along Wychwood Avenue, down to Hampton Road.
240. The site is subject to some constraints including Purnells Brook Woodland Local Wildlife Site, (although this runs along the extreme north western edge of the site) as well as a number of significant trees. These will need to be considered in the design of any future scheme. The site performs very well in overall accessibility terms and there is good access to all key facilities in Knowle, however, accessibility to public transport is currently low.
241. The proposed allocation as a whole is in an area with medium landscape character sensitivity and low visual sensitivity. The landscape value of the area is medium with an overall low landscape capacity to accommodate new development. Development of Site 8 at Hampton Road would be consistent with Option G of the Spatial Strategy for the significant expansion of rural villages.

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

Site 9: Arden Triangle – (capacity 600)

242. Situated beyond the existing Green Belt boundary, the site as whole lies immediately adjacent to the settlement in a moderately performing parcel of Green Belt that is well contained by Station Road, Warwick Road and Grove Road. These strong physical features would establish a logical boundary to define the extent of land to be removed from the Green Belt. The areas of the site closest to the settlement perform very well in terms of accessibility to all key services and facilities, as well as public transport and the scale of any proposed development could see public transport improvements and new facilities such as a primary school provided on site.
243. The site is in an area with medium landscape character sensitivity and low visual sensitivity. The landscape value of the area is medium with an overall low landscape capacity to accommodate new development. The site as a whole includes a number of constraints including a Local Wildlife Site, protected trees and other valued landscape features. These would need careful consideration in the design of any future scheme. Development of the site would be consistent with Option G of the Spatial Strategy for the significant expansion of rural villages.
244. The site currently accommodates Arden Academy and the Council is aware of the school's aspirations to relocate on the site to provide new school buildings and associated facilities. The Council has made no decision on whether the school will relocate as it will need to be demonstrated that such a scheme is viable and deliverable without impacting on the character and appearance of the area or compromising the appropriate and essential infrastructure that will be required to bring forward residential development on the site. Consequently, 2 concept masterplans have been prepared. The first shows Arden Academy retained in its current position with residential development beyond to the south. The

second shows the school relocated to an alternative location on the site, with residential development on the site of the existing Academy and along Station Road.

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

10. Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs

The Area Now

245. Solihull Town Centre is a strong, vibrant and regionally important Centre containing a wide variety of shops, businesses and civic services. The 'mature suburbs' area that forms part of the urban area includes the largely residential suburbs of Elmdon, Hillfield, Lyndon, Monkspath, Olton, Shirley and Solihull. These areas benefit from good schools and strong local centres.
246. The Mature Suburbs adjoin Birmingham to the west and north, with countryside that is part of the Meriden Gap and the M42 to the east, and Green Belt to the south. The combined population of the Mature Suburbs is just under 100,000 in some 41,000 households.
247. The Mature Suburbs are characterised by Victorian and Edwardian development, the Grand Union canal and railway network, a tighter urban grain, extensive gardens and parks. There are also substantial recreational facilities, such as Olton, Robin Hood and Widney Manor golf clubs and Olton Mere. More modern housing estates are characterised by an open plan, cul-de-sac layout with on-plot parking and a predominance of detached and semi-detached properties. Shirley Town Centre provides for much of the needs of the west of the area, and has benefitted from significant investment at its heart, whilst there are district centres at Hobs Moat, Hatchford Brook, Shelly Farm and Olton. This area is home to a variety of employment opportunities located in the Solihull and Fore Business Parks and JLR, as well as in the established Cranmore and Monkspath area.
248. Solihull Town Centre is enriched by its attractive historic core of St. Alphege church, the Square and the High Street, and contains retail, commercial and cultural facilities. To the north and south of the Town Centre, the more modern retail developments of the 1960s precinct style Mell Square and the early 21st Century Touchwood development broaden its offer. To the south and east lie Malvern and Brueton Parks, which provide extensive areas of land for informal recreation within walking distance of the Town Centre. Tudor Grange Park to the south-west provides opportunities for more formal sport and recreation.
249. Both the 2006 UDP and 2013 SLP identified large scale development opportunities for Shirley town centre that made provision for significant new residential development to be provided. The Parkgate scheme opened in 2014 and redevelopment of the Powergen site has commenced.
250. There is an extensive educational campus to the south-west of Solihull Town Centre containing Alderbrook, St Peter's and Tudor Grange secondary schools, together with Solihull College. Immediately to the north of the Town Centre is Solihull School. On the edge of the Mature Suburbs to the south of the Town Centre is the Sixth Form College. These establishments are



located within walking distance of Solihull Town Centre. The north of the area is catered for by Lode Heath and Lyndon schools, whilst Langley and Light Hall schools provide secondary education in the west and south. Many of the schools suffer from traffic congestion at opening and closing times.

251. Solihull rail station on the western edge of the Town Centre provides services to Birmingham, Leamington and London, together with the Borough's main bus interchange. This rail line also serves Olton and Hillfield/Monkspath at Widney Manor. There is also a rail station west of Shirley with services to Birmingham and Stratford.

The Area in the Future

252. The Mature Suburbs are substantially developed with few opportunities for significant growth. Being mainly residential, there are relatively few brownfield land opportunities. The Town Centre, which has grown significantly for a generation, is likely to experience some restructuring with opportunities for a wider range of uses including residential in the future.
253. Both Solihull rail station and the Town Centre road system are already congested at peak times and are likely to experience increased passenger numbers/vehicle movements in the future. The improvements to Junction 6 of the M42, involving a new dual carriageway to the west of the motorway, may increase pressures for growth on the green belt land to the east of the Mature Suburbs.

What is Required for the Settlement in the Future?

254. There are limited opportunities for growth in the Mature Suburbs reflecting the built up nature of the area and the importance of maintaining the attractive open spaces that are so important to the Borough's character and well-being.
255. **Restructuring of Solihull Town Centre** – A refreshed master plan for Solihull Town Centre will highlight opportunities for alternative uses whilst ensuring that sufficient land is retained for retail and commercial uses. The masterplan highlights the potential for the identified opportunity sites to accommodate significant levels of residential development, and there are likely to be other windfall sites that come forward..
256. **Redevelopment of Solihull Rail Station** - Solihull rail station will be redeveloped to provide more modern facilities capable of handling the predicted increase in passengers in future years, following the decision not to pursue its relocation to the south-east. Improvements to the pedestrian route to and from the Town Centre, some of which have already been implemented, will make the redeveloped station more accessible to commuters, students and visitors.
257. **Improving accessibility to and around Solihull Town Centre** - A key challenge will be to manage the anticipated increase in traffic in the area, especially around Solihull Town Centre and the major road corridors. The Council is undertaking studies looking at key junctions within and close to the Town Centre. However, encouraging more people to use public transport, cycling and walking, rather than the private car for journeys to the Town Centre will be essential. Improving routes to/from the Town Centre and links to the adjacent parks for cyclists and pedestrians would help to make these alternative modes of travel more attractive.
258. **Development Opportunities in Shirley Town Centre** – Following completion of the Parkgate development and redevelopment of the Powergen site there are limited opportunities for further large scale developments, and therefore any further residential dwellings are likely to arise from windfall developments.
259. **Re-use of Land allocated for Business/Retail Purposes** – There are areas of older industrial estates that may be recycled for new uses, such as at Cranmore to the west and Lode Lane to

the north. Most of the available land for business use has been developed, and some business areas may be available for alternative uses.

260. **Provision of affordable housing** – This will be challenging given the lack of significant opportunities for new housing in the Mature Suburbs. However, opportunities for housing will be identified through the refreshed Town Centre master plan and the urban extension to the east, which will provide a proportion of affordable housing.
261. **Concept Master Plans** – The plans that accompany this consultation include draft concept master plans for the sites proposed in the DLP2016.
262. **Green Belt Enhancements** - The revised NPPF makes provision for environmental and/or access improvements to be undertaken to land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. This provides an opportunity for enhancements to the green belt in the vicinity of Site 16 East of Solihull.

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

Proposed Approach

263. Whilst significant retail or commercial growth in the Town Centre is unlikely, retaining the existing Town Centre boundary will provide opportunities for a broader range of uses. Given that the Town Centre is the most accessible location in the Borough, it will be important that uses that attract significant numbers of visitors will be able to find sites there. However, there are likely to be opportunities for significant residential or mixed residential and commercial uses. Higher densities can be accommodated as owning a car in this highly accessible location will not be essential. The refreshed masterplan will provide the necessary evidence for the quantum of growth for different uses.
264. A small number of opportunities for new housing development elsewhere in the Mature Suburbs were identified in the Draft Local Plan. These are focussed on sites that are likely to become available upon the relocation of existing uses or replacement facilities. There are also opportunities on the edge of the Mature Suburbs, or just beyond, as potential urban extensions.
265. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the settlement. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.
266. Some of the sites, in particular site 16 (east of Solihull), have multiple and potential complex land assembly issues. It is important that sites such as this are considered in a comprehensive manner to avoid piecemeal developments occurring. This needn't necessarily preclude a phased approach where one parcel of land or part of a site may be available for development in advance of another, but this should be in accordance with an approach agreed by the Council and all relevant landowners/development promoters. Before being finally included in the plan, it will be necessary for the varied land interests to demonstrate to the Council that they are prepared to work on a collaborative and comprehensive basis to ensure a quality development is possible and can be satisfactorily delivered. This will include joint responsibility for the provision of infrastructure, and this latter point will also be relevant to other sites around the village which also need to ensure they contribute towards the provision of the required infrastructure.

Proposed Allocations

Site 16 – East of Solihull (capacity 600)

267. This site would comprise of an urban extension close to Solihull Town Centre. It will be located on land to the rear of the ribbon development that fronts the northern side of Hampton Lane. As a revision to the site put forward in the DLP, the northern boundary of the site is now intended to be formed by the Grand Union canal. This will enable the land between Lugtroat lane and the canal to come forward for development. The eastern boundary of the site will be formed by Field Lane.
268. The site is located within a parcel of lower performing Green Belt and has the potential to use strong defensible new boundaries.
269. Existing playing pitches on the site will either need to be retained or reprovided elsewhere.

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

Site 17 – Moat Lane/Vulcan Road (capacity 200)

270. This site is located in the urban area and is formed from the existing Council depot and industrial estate, which are expected to become available during the Plan period. They are located in an accessible location which is well served by public transport.

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

Site 18 – Sharman's Cross Road (capacity 100)

271. This site is in a largely residential area close to Solihull Town Centre. A previous planning application was refused solely because the proposals did not provide sufficient affordable housing, thus indicating that the principle for the development was considered acceptable.
272. Whilst the former sports ground has been disused for a number of years, compensation for the loss of playing pitches will be required.

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

273. Developments in Solihull Town Centre

274. The Draft Town Centre master plan, 2016 identifies potential for housing development in a number of the Opportunity Sites. The refreshed master plan will update the opportunity sites to reflect changes since the original was prepared.

11. Meriden

The Settlement Now

275. Meriden is located approximately 9km to the east of Solihull Town Centre and the wider parish forms the north-eastern corner of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council, bordering Coventry to the east and North Warwickshire to the north. It lies in the rural 'gap' between the Coventry and Birmingham conurbations (known as the 'Meriden Gap').
276. The main settlements within the Parish are Meriden Village itself (where approximately two thirds of the population of the Parish live), Millison's Wood (approximately 1.5km to the east of Meriden Village) and Eaves Green. The population of the parish is around 2,800 with some 1220 households.
277. The A45 (Birmingham to Coventry Road) crosses through the Parish just to the north of Meriden Village. The entrance to the National Exhibition Centre (NEC), Birmingham International Airport and Birmingham International Rail Station is located approximately 2.5km to the north-west of the village at junction 6 of the M42. There is a frequent bus service to Coventry and Birmingham which becomes less frequent in the evenings and an hourly daytime only service to Solihull.
278. The settlement derives its special character from its rural setting and its historical roots. There are two conservation areas: Meriden Green Conservation Area (including the village green at the centre of the settlement) and Meriden Hill Conservation Area with its cluster of listed buildings including the church of St Laurence.
279. The area surrounding the village of Meriden is predominantly Green Belt. It is a mix of agricultural land and woodland (parts of the former Forest of Arden) with some large sand and gravel extraction quarries to the west.
280. The village has a small local centre around the village green with a range of shops and services including a recently developed sports and play facility on the south west side of the Green. The Meriden Practice GP Surgery is located on Main Road to the east of the main village centre. The village also has a primary school which accommodates approximately 220 pupils. The nearest secondary school is Heart of England Secondary School located in Balsall Common.



The Settlement in the Future

281. The moderate impact on the Green Belt to the west and the accessibility of the village indicate that this settlement is suitable for consideration for limited growth, which could be focussed in an area to the west close to services and public transport. However, the distinctive historic character of the settlement will need to be conserved and where possible enhanced, particularly the Meriden Green and Meriden Hill Conservation Areas.

282. Meriden is generally accessible with sites being of medium to high accessibility in the Accessibility Mapping Study and also supports a range of facilities. Any additional facilities should be focused in the Village centre so as to be sustainable and cater for the needs of the population.
283. The main constraints to development are the surrounding Green Belt, the Borough boundary (located immediately to the north of Meriden Village) and the mineral safeguarding area (sand and gravel) to the west. The Green Belt Assessment rates areas to the west of the settlement as the area performing most poorly, with land to the north and east performing moderately.
284. Meriden Parish Council is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Any future development will need to be in accordance with this Plan, as when it is adopted it will form part of the Development Plan for Solihull. The Neighbourhood Plan includes a Local Housing Needs Assessment which will therefore need to inform any housing proposals for the settlement.
285. The High Speed 2 (HS2) route will be approximately 3km to the west of Meriden leading into the new Interchange Station located adjacent to the NEC/Birmingham International Airport. The new Interchange station will be approximately 4km to the north west of Meriden. Enabling and construction works are due to commence in January 2019 ready for the line to open in 2026.

What is Required for the Settlement in the Future?

286. Any development within the village is an opportunity for the settlement to play its part in accommodating its own needs.
287. **Local Housing Need** – Site 10 in the Draft Local Plan (DLP) 2016 located to the west of Meriden Village (between Birmingham Road and Maxstoke Lane) would provide affordable/special needs housing and possible refurbishment of the existing Firs development. Further survey/assessment will indicate what provision is necessary. Extra guidance will also be available in the emerging Meriden Neighbourhood Plan and Solihull Council is working with the Parish Council and the community to bring forward the Plan for adoption.
288. **Concept Master Plan** – The plans that accompany this consultation include a draft concept master plan for Site 10 of the DLP (2016). This indicates the overall site could accommodate around 100 dwellings with an area of public open space provided around the existing pond in the centre of the site. The Masterplan sets out the opportunities for the site to create a gateway development into Meriden.
289. **Local Infrastructure Requirements** – The settlement has a good provision of local services to meet local needs. However, any development would need to include assessment of this infrastructure. In particular of school capacity and local medical facilities.
290. **Local Aspirations** – The emerging Meriden Neighbourhood Plan will set out the current aspirations of local people for the future of the settlement. Comments on the Draft Local plan highlight the Parish Council's desire to maintain Green Belt and rural communities, have improvements to public transport and infrastructure (particularly with the developments associated with the HS2 Interchange Station), reduce air pollution and increased provision of smaller homes for the elderly and affordable homes. Local aspirations can also be evidenced in the Meriden Parish Plan (2009), Meriden Parish Design Statement (2011), Meriden Parish Council's straw poll results to the Call for Sites, Meriden Neighbourhood Plan Survey 2016.

291. **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)** – Presently the parish council will directly receive 15% of the levy collected in the area. This will increase to 25% once any Neighbourhood Plans are adopted. This will provide a significant source of funding that can be used to take forward appropriate projects that the community have identified as priorities. This can include simple relatively low cost actions (e.g. further traffic regulation orders) through to more substantial projects. It will be for the parish council to decide how this 'local' element of the CIL receipts is to be spent and there is potential for partnership working to maximise the use of monies from this source.
292. **Green Belt Enhancements** – The revised NPPF makes provision for environmental and/or access improvements to be undertaken to land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. This provides an opportunity for enhancements to existing or additional open space and other enhancements as needed.

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

Proposed Approach

293. The settlement is suitable for consideration for limited growth, which could be focussed in an area to the west close to services and public transport.
294. A mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will be provided in the settlement. This will seek to align the types and sizes of homes to be made available and the needs of the community. However, there will need to be a careful balance struck between making the most efficient use of land and respecting the character of the local area.

Proposed Allocation

Site 10 West of Meriden (between Birmingham Road and Maxstoke Lane) (Capacity 100)

295. This site relates to land currently bounded by Maxstoke Lane (both the original section and that that has been realigned) and Birmingham Road. It is located opposite frontage development that already occurs along Birmingham Road and would, at least in part, be rounding off development off Maxstoke Lane.
296. The site is in an accessible position with regard to the centre of the village. The Birmingham frontage part of the site is located within a Green Belt parcel that has been assessed as making no contribution towards the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, and that part of the site to the rear is in an area that makes a low contribution.

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

12. North Solihull, Marston Green and Castle Bromwich

The Settlements Now

Castle Bromwich and Marston Green

297. Castle Bromwich and Marston Green are popular mature residential suburbs which are generally affluent in character with good schools, strong local centres and lower than average unemployment levels in the Borough. Both areas are largely characterised by high house prices and consequently a lack of affordable housing. Modern estates within both of these suburbs tend to be open plan with a cul-de-sac layout and with a mix of predominantly semi-detached and detached properties.
298. Castle Bromwich has had a more historic pattern of development characterised by traditional Victorian and Edwardian development.
299. Marston Green is more mixed in character benefitting from natural areas making up the setting of the river and a Green Belt buffer running through the area. It is bounded by significant commercial development at Birmingham Airport and Birmingham Business Park and has areas occupied by more traditional business premises. The railway runs through the edge of the area with Marston Green Station providing access to Birmingham International and Birmingham stations.

North Solihull

300. In contrast to the rest of the Borough the area known as North Solihull (covering the wards of Chelmsley Wood, Kingshurst & Fordbridge and Smith's Wood) has a high proportion of local neighbourhoods within the 10% most deprived in the country and some in the bottom 5%. The area is largely characterised by 1960's housing estates arranged around parking courtyards, small green spaces and precinct shopping areas. The separation of pedestrian and car access via a mix of subways and dual carriageways has resulted in poorly overlooked amenity spaces and pedestrian routes. This has contributed to antisocial behaviour, an increased fear of crime and an overall reduction in the quality of environment.



301. Since 2005 the area has been the subject of a large regeneration programme led by the North Solihull Partnership and supported by the policies in the 2013 Solihull Local Plan (SLP). This programme has delivered significant improvements to the area providing more than 1,710 new homes on 40 different sites as well as a range of other improvements including

two new villages centres, six new primary schools, six parks and improved green space and play facilities. Development has included the demolition of a large amount of unsuitable housing stock including 5 high-rise blocks. Alongside the physical regeneration, socio-economic programmes have been developed to support local community and voluntary organisations. Important improvements have been secured in Key Stage 2 and 4 educational attainment and locally based job creation.

302. The area does benefit from a network of natural spaces including woodlands, nature reserves and parks which make up the setting of the River Cole. These are important features which influence the availability and focus of further opportunities for development in the future.
303. The North Solihull area has also been identified as part of the wider UK Central proposals (as one of the four interconnected economic opportunity zones) as an area with potential to benefit from the significant development proposed at the adjacent UK Central Hub. This will be dependant on addressing accessibility barriers both in terms of transport links in and out of the area and a relatively poor skills / training base within the area.

The Settlements in the Future

304. The residential areas of Castle Bromwich and Marston Green are already largely built up and as such there are limited opportunities for further development without compromising the quality of the environment and existing open spaces.
305. In the Marston Green area industrial restructuring may mean brownfield sites currently occupied by traditional employment uses could become available later in the plan period however there is considerable uncertainty over this. The NEC and Birmingham Airport are significant assets on the edge of the area which together with the UK Central proposals including the HS2 interchange station will provide extensive economic growth during and beyond the plan period. The wider benefits of the proposals may result in opportunities for redevelopment within Marston Green. However it will be necessary to ensure any development both within and adjacent to the area is sensitive to the existing residential character. The need to ensure an appropriate buffer between neighbouring large scale proposals and the existing built form should be incorporated into proposals.
306. In North Solihull the success of the extensive regeneration programme continues to be built upon with schemes being developed to improve existing facilities including Chelmsley Wood Town Centre. The SLP had a particular focus on the North Solihull Regeneration Area and it released a number of Green Belt sites to support the regeneration programme, and these have now been developed out. As a consequence of this strategy the opportunities that now remain will largely be focussed on redevelopment opportunities and village/town centre enhancements.
307. Access to employment opportunities, improving the skills base and environmental enhancements will be key issues when assessing potential opportunities.

What is required for the Settlements in the Future?

308. The suburbs would benefit from opportunities to expand the mix and affordability of housing however the lack of sites will impact on the extent to which this can be achieved.
309. Development in the North of the Borough is largely focused around the remaining regeneration opportunities, in particular those presented through the redevelopment of older housing stock and precincts. As part of this there is the opportunity to further address existing issues relating to:

310. **Improving the skills base and access to employment**– The North Solihull area itself has very limited employment and commercial floor space and with car ownership lower than in other parts of the Borough access to jobs is limited. North Solihull forms one of the four zones identified through the UK Central programme which seeks to redistribute the benefits of the wider scheme.
311. **Improving the mix and quality of housing** – Although the regeneration programme has made significant progress the area continues to require improvements in the quality of the housing stock and to ensure a mix in the type and tenure. Where the existing housing is in a mix of private and public ownership the ability to deliver improvements may be limited and require more complex delivery mechanisms.
312. **Improvements to Chelmsley Wood Town Centre and Kingshurst Village Centre** – A master plan is emerging to redevelop and enhance the existing centre which is characterised by older, poorer quality 1960s retail and residential units. This may present opportunities for providing additional housing in the area. A master plan is also being prepared for Kingshurst Village Centre.
313. **Improving access to public transport** - The provision of a well integrated public transport system is key to provide access to jobs and facilities outside the area. It is proposed that as part of the development of the UK Central Hub there will be improvements which will provide access to the facilities and opportunities presented by the new development.
314. **Public space enhancements** – There are still pockets of the built up area which would benefit from environmental enhancement to improve amenity and sense of place. It is important that public realm improvements continue to be pursued as part of the redevelopment of the remaining sites and that any further regeneration opportunities do not compromise existing public open spaces such as playing pitches, unless the impacts can be mitigated. The supply of open space is already constrained therefore finding replacement facilities in the local area will be challenging.

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

Proposed Approach

315. There have been no suitable sites identified in Castle Bromwich and any future development is likely to be confined to smaller previously developed infill sites with potential limited opportunities to increase the mix and affordability of the housing stock. These would be more likely to come forward as windfall sites.
316. In Marston Green the availability of sites is further constrained by the presence of significant recreation assets which make up the setting of the settlement. In addition the Green Belt in this area provides an important open space buffer between built up areas and commercial premises to the south and east of the area thus preserving the identities of the settlements.
317. In terms of North Solihull the proposed developments for this part of the Borough are focused on the remaining regeneration opportunities largely identified by the North Solihull Partnership. These options are mainly on brownfield sites which support the Council's strategic vision for making best use of previously developed land.

Existing Allocation

SLP Site 3 – Simon Digby, Chelmsley Wood (capacity 200)

318. This site was an allocation in the adopted 2013 Solihull Local Plan. Since then more work has been carried out to reassess the boundaries of the site in terms of its removal from the Green Belt particularly with regard to securing a suitable access (likely to be provided on Chelmsley Road). Other issues which need further consideration are presented by the flood plain in this area and any potential impact on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site. As an adopted allocation this remains to be brought forward and is not affected by this consultation.⁵⁰

Proposed Allocations

Site 7 – Kingshurst Village Centre (capacity 100)

319. This site is subject to an emerging masterplan for the redevelopment of the former Kingshurst village centre. This will include the demolition of the existing retail and residential units and redevelopment for mixed use. Further work is being undertaken to determine the capacity of the site dependant on the suitable replacement of existing homes and businesses. The mechanism for delivering the development whilst accommodating the short term relocation of residents and businesses needs to be determined.

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

Site 15 Jenson House / Auckland Drive, Smiths Wood (capacity 50)

320. Work is currently in progress to determine whether and to what extent this site may be available to accommodate residential development. For present purposes a reduced indicative capacity has been included in the land supply. The site also includes a playing field which if lost as part of a development proposal would need to be mitigated and this may reduce capacity of the site.

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

Sites No Longer Proposed

Site 5 – Chester Road / Moorend Avenue, Fordbridge (capacity 100)

321. This site was initially identified as a gateway site by the North Solihull Partnership to be developed alongside other connected sites. Development is dependant on the reconfiguration of the traffic junction as part of a wider traffic improvement scheme which on currently available evidence is now unlikely to be feasible. As there is uncertainty over the ability for the site to be delivered it is now no longer included.

Site 14 – Arran Way, Smiths Wood (capacity 50)

322. This site has planning permission for the demolition and redevelopment of the existing shop units for housing. The site doesn't need to be included as an allocation as it now appears in the land supply as a planning permission.

⁵⁰ As this is a site in the adopted plan it is not subject to further consultation.

13. UK Central Hub

The Area Now

323. The area known as the UK Central Hub is focussed on the main economic assets located around junction 6 of the M42. The principal elements are as follows (and includes land currently located in the Green Belt):
- Arden Cross Land including the HS2 interchange
 - Birmingham Airport
 - The NEC
 - Jaguar Land Rover
 - Birmingham Business Park
324. Although this supplementary consultation is focussing on housing numbers and updating proposed allocations, it is important to note the role the Hub area has in contributing to the Borough's land supply. In doing so it is useful to set out the context that this element of the residential land supply will be provided within. This is provided principally for information purposes as consultation has been undertaken on this as part of the Draft Local Plan in December 2016.
325. The Hub forms part of the wider UK Central proposals which comprise of four interconnected economic opportunity zones. Together with the UK Central Hub which makes up Zone 1 the UKC programme also include; Zone 2 – North Solihull, Zone 3 – Solihull Town Centre and Zone 4 – Blythe Valley Business Park.
326. The Council has developed a vision and set of place making principles with key stakeholders to transform The Hub into a distinct place with a strong sense of identity; combining growth aspirations, integrated landscapes, and strategic infrastructure to create a connected destination for business, leisure and living. This vision is set in the context of maximising the benefits of the sites connectivity.
327. Alongside the economic benefits the development of the hub is an opportunity as part of the wider UK Central proposals to improve links with the surrounding area in particular North Solihull with the prospect for improved access to employment.
328. Due to the scale and nature of what is proposed a bespoke approach to planning and delivery at the Hub is required reflecting its complicated land ownership and mix of uses. As such the UK Central Urban Growth Company (UGC) was established by the Council in 2016 to lead the delivery of the project. Through the UGC the Council has been working closely with the range of landowners responsible for the site which reflect both public and private interests. There is collective support for the overall vision and a commitment to actively working towards delivering it.
329. In order to realise the development potential of The Hub a significant amount of land has been made available to deliver the growth envisaged. To support development investment programmes are in place that will assist to enhance connectivity including the HS2 station, improvements to the M42 and A45, investment in airport capacity and rebuilding of Birmingham International Station. Other factors supporting growth at the Hub include the announcement that the West Midlands is to become the UK's first ever multi city test bed for 5G mobile technology. Events planned at the 2022 Birmingham Commonwealth Games will take place at the NEC showcasing opportunities presented at the Hub.
330. Jaguar Land Rover continues to invest in its operations located within The Hub area with recent expansion to the North East of the site for a dispatch area and planning permission

for a logistics facility. To allow for further expansion and to support the significant local supply chain and associated automotive industries supporting JLR, land on the south eastern side of Damson Parkway / Old Damson Lane is proposed for future employment development.


The Area in the Future

331. It is anticipated that the UK Central Hub site will make a significant contribution towards the delivery of homes and economic development in the Borough during the plan period and beyond. The extension of High Speed rail to the West Midlands will be significant, reducing journey times to London to 38 minutes and enhancing existing connectivity provided via Birmingham airport and via the region's extensive road and motorway network. As the site of the first railway interchange station outside London The Hub is uniquely placed to capture these benefits.
332. The Hub is therefore a unique site with the potential to deliver major growth on a nationally significant scale both to meet the economic growth aims of the Borough as well as the wider growth aspirations of the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP and the West Midlands Combined Authority...
333. It is clear that co-ordinating the development ambitions of all stakeholders and delivering a range of growth opportunities will provide multiple benefits for the Borough and wider area including:
- The delivery of a significant amount of jobs
 - A greater range and choice of new homes for The Hub, Solihull and the wider Housing Market Area
 - New and unique forms of high quality development
 - The creation of healthy neighbourhoods
 - Joined up green infrastructure
 - The delivery of strategic infrastructure
334. The Hub site was included in Policy P1 of the Draft Local Plan for high quality, high density mixed use development with the potential to provide 1,000 homes (in the plan period). Since then, further work carried out with the UGC has indicated that there is capacity for the site to accommodate a higher level of growth.
335. Work undertaken to date is indicating that the residential component will be focussed on two areas within the Hub: land at Arden Cross and land at the NEC.
336. These two areas are now expected to provide up to 5,000 homes, with 2,500 being delivered in the plan period. The NEC Masterplan includes provision for 2,500 dwellings and these can start to be delivered earlier (potentially from 2022) than the Arden Cross site, which won't be fully available until after HS2 has been completed.
337. Land is also set aside in the Draft Local Plan for further employment at Damson Parkway to allow for the future expansion of Jaguar Land Rover. The Local Plan will also need to provide a framework to support the extensive supply chain associated with JLR.

What is required for the Area in the future

338. **Coordinated approach** - The delivery of the site is complex and a coordinated approach by all stakeholders is necessary led by the UGC. The UGC and the Council have therefore been working closely with all key stakeholders including: Birmingham City Council, the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA), Arden Cross Company Limited Consortium, the National Exhibition Centre (NEC), Birmingham Airport, Jaguar Land Rover Birmingham Business Park, Highways England, relevant utilities companies and HS2 Ltd.

339. The UGC published an updated UK Central Hub Growth and Infrastructure Plan (January 2018) and an updated Framework Plan (February 2018) to align the growth aspirations of all these key stakeholders and provide an overall view of how development and infrastructure can be delivered across the Local Plan period. A



primary focus of this is to ensure that constraints to development such as crucial infrastructure requirements are addressed in the early stages to ensure the high economic growth aspirations of the site can be delivered.

340. In terms of delivering the vision and objectives for the site and address the key challenges the Hub framework is based on five key place making principles. These have been designed to guide a common approach to development across the site:

- Improve accessibility
- Establish a high quality green and blue network
- Create sustainable, high quality communities
- Leverage land with temporary uses
- Generate a clear sense of place

341. **Garden community** - A funding proposal has been put forward to support the development of The Hub as a garden community. Incorporating garden community principles will be key in delivering the overall place making vision for The Hub supporting the development of the site as a sustainable high quality environment and ensuring that the necessary infrastructure is in place to deliver and support the growth aspirations for the site. It will assist in supporting key components of the proposal such as the establishment of a network of high quality green and blue infrastructure.

342. **Transport Infrastructure** - A significant amount of transport infrastructure will be required to assist in the delivery of the site. Primary road infrastructure upgrades are already being

pursued including changes to Junction 4 of the M6, Junction 6 and a new Junction 5A of the M42 providing links to the site in preparation for the implementation of HS2.

343. HS2 will be providing an Automated People Mover (APM) connecting the interchange station with the NEC, Birmingham International Station and Birmingham Airport. A Metro tram route is planned from Birmingham City Centre through East Birmingham and Solihull to Birmingham Business Park, Birmingham Airport, Birmingham International Station, the NEC and HS2 Interchange site.
344. **Social and community infrastructure** – It is important that the full range of facilities necessary to support the creation of a high quality sustainable community at The Hub are provided. These include healthcare and education facilities to serve residents of The Hub but also the potential to capture the wider benefits of the scheme by enhancements to infrastructure serving the wider community. This also includes improving access to jobs and working towards improving the skills base.
345. **Green infrastructure** – It is proposed that a network of green infrastructure will be integrated throughout the development with the intention to provide a high quality sense of place designed around the idea of the Garden community. The provision of GI is a particularly important element as it will allow existing features to not only be retained, but enhanced as part of an integrated approach.

Proposed approach

346. The Green Belt boundary will need to be amended to accommodate the land at Arden Cross (140 hectares) in order to deliver the HS2 interchange station and wider development at The Hub. This will facilitate the delivery of the site alongside development at the NEC which is already outside the Green Belt. These proposals are site specific as they are dependant on the delivery of HS2 and the interchange station and will assist in delivering the needs of key economic assets supporting the local and regional economy. The land is bounded by main roads that provide strong defensible Green belt boundaries. The exceptional circumstances for releasing the Arden Cross Land from the Green Belt are therefore justified.
347. The delivery of The Hub site is complex and the Local Plan may also need to take forward other relevant elements of the wider proposals being developed by the UGC and key stakeholders to realise development. Land at Damson Parkway will also need to be released from the Green Belt in order to accommodate expansion related to Jaguar Land Rover.
348. It is anticipated that HS2 will be operational from 2026. Subject to the delivery of HS2 the proposals are likely to come forward towards the end of the plan period. It will therefore be necessary for the Local Plan to retain a degree of flexibility in dealing with the site to take account of the emerging plans.
349. Further work since the Draft Local Plan was published has identified the capacity to bring forward a higher level of housing on the site to better support the level of economic development proposed. It is important that this mix is delivered in a co-ordinated way with the aim of achieving a high quality sustainable environment.
350. The site will have wide implications in terms of economic growth serving a large geographical area across the Borough's administrative boundaries. The Council will continue to engage with neighbouring authorities as well as other local authorities across the region as the proposals go forward to understand the impact.
351. In bringing forward development at The Hub regard will also be given to proposals affecting the wider site:

352. **The National Exhibition Centre (NEC) Master plan (December 2018)** – The creation of “NEC City” is proposed through an £8.5 million redevelopment of 75 hectares of the wider 175 hectare NEC campus site over the next 20 years. It aims to respond to the ‘need for the region to have internationally competitive opportunities for investment’. It seeks to provide a destination combining entertainment, leisure, exhibition space, and commercial and residential floorspace to create an ‘ultimate visitor experience’. It is envisaged that this will be achieved via the creation of five components: the Global exhibition centre (NEC), an Entertainment Zone, Lakeside, the Commercial gateway, and through creation of a Rapid transit loop all underpinned by the development principles of connectivity, activity and design. The delivery of the masterplan, as with the wider UK Central Hub, is reliant on a coordinated approach to the delivery of infrastructure and the development of the site through a phased approach. A key element of the strategy is to release surface car parking land for development and re-provide this capacity in on site multi storey car parks. A phased replacement plan is being developed to enable the release of land. NEC City has been conceived to fit in with the wider aspirations for the UK Central Hub and reflect the overall vision for the area.
353. **Jaguar Land Rover expansion** – Land at Damson Parkway is currently set aside to accommodate future expansion at JLR. Whilst it is unclear at this stage the exact nature of future proposals the site will be a key element of the UK Central Hub proposals.
354. **Birmingham Business Park** – The park already occupies an important role as a prime employment location. It is important that the wider proposals for The Hub builds upon this.
355. **Birmingham Airport** – The master plan for the airport is currently being updated to identify what development will be needed to support operations at the Airport over the next 25 to 30 years. This is in the context of maximising the benefits of HS2 and wider proposals for UK Central.

Proposed Allocations

Site 19 – HS2 Interchange

356. As described in the DLP, this land release is driven by the location of the HS2 station and the potential this gives to making more efficient use of the land. The ability to provide residential development as part of a mixed use development remains an important component.
357. The release of this c140ha site from the Green Belt to accommodate the HS2 Interchange is not to simply serve local needs but is part of the contribution the Borough is making to the wider West Midlands area that will benefit economically from this important infrastructure provision.

Site 20 – Land at Damson Parkway

358. This is an employment led land release of some c94ha which is covered in the DLP and need not be explored further as part of this present consultation which focuses on residential development.

14. Green Belt

359. Approximately 66% of the Borough is located in the Green Belt and this represents a very important policy matter for the Council. The NPPF sets out the following advice in relation to Green Belts:

“The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”*

360. The Council has undertaken a study⁵¹ to determine how well the different parts of the Green Belt perform against the first four⁵² purposes of including land in the Green Belt. In overall terms, this assessment identified that most of the Borough's Green Belt performs very well against these purposes, although there are some small areas that do not perform so well. And this is reflected in the site selection methodology described earlier.



361. In addition it is noted that the Strategic Growth Study (2018) undertaken by GL Hearn carries out a 'strategic Green Belt review' of all of the Green Belt in the HMA area. One of the reports outputs was to identify areas of the Green Belt that make a 'principal' contribution to Green Belt purposes and those areas that make a 'supporting' contribution. Virtually all of the Green Belt in the 'Meriden Gap' is recognised as making a 'principal contribution'⁵³.
362. It is clear from these assessments that the Borough's Green Belt performs both strategic purposes (e.g. containing sprawl and maintaining separation between the Birmingham/Solihull urban area and the city of Coventry) and more local purposes (e.g. maintaining separation between the rural settlements in the Blythe area).

⁵¹ [Green Belt Assessment Report 2016](#) (Atkins)

⁵² It is normal practice that only the first four purposes are included in such assessments as the 5th purpose is taken to be uniformly applicable to all areas on an equal basis.

⁵³ In this context, this is the area of Green Belt in the Borough between the edge of the built up area around Solihull and up to the Coventry boundary (extending as far north and south as the Borough boundaries with North Warwickshire and Warwick District Councils respectively).

363. The NPPF sets out that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered if it can be demonstrated that there are 'exceptional circumstances' for doing so.

Need for Green Belt Release

364. The DLP set out to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist that justify the removal of land from the Green Belt. Since then the NPPF has been updated and provides additional advice in this respect as follows:

"137 Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. This will be assessed through the examination of its strategic policies, which will take into account the preceding paragraph, and whether the strategy:

a) makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land;

b) optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and

c) has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground."

365. In relation to making as much use as possible of brownfield sites it is useful to refer to the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment that was published in 2016. It followed a call-for-sites exercise that generated nearly 250 submissions. When they were analysed it demonstrated that 96.5% of the dwellings that could be provided on these sites that promoters were making available would be on Green Belt land – i.e. only 3.5% were non-Green Belt sites. Since then further call-for-sites submissions have been made, but these largely replicate those submitted in the first wave – i.e. the vast majority promote the use of Green Belt sites and that there are very few opportunities for non-Green Belt land are available.
366. There is a clear paucity of land available for development within the urban area of the Borough, or within the built up areas of the rural settlements. The typically higher land values and relative lack of contamination issues, means that non-Green Belt sites tend to come forward for development.
367. The production of Brownfield Land Registers (BLR) became mandatory for all Council's in 2017. These registers seek to identify Previously Developed Land (PDL) which is suitable, available and achievable for development, and they are updated on an annual basis. The Council's BLR can be found [here](#).
368. When compiling its first BLR, the Council was keen to make sure it was as robust and comprehensive as possible so that its efforts in this regard would help demonstrate compliance with paragraph 137 (a) of the NPPF. It therefore decided to pursue two non-statutory stages in producing the BLR as follows:

- **Dedicated Call-for-Sites** – In July 2017 the Council ran a dedicated call-for-sites exercise inviting the submission of sites that promoters believed would be suitable for inclusion on the register.
- **Publishing a Draft BLR** – The Council published a [Draft Brownfield Land Register](#) to invite comments on its robustness and completeness. Comments made on the draft were taken into account before the register was formally adopted.

369. The latest BLR has been used to identify what contribution such sites could make to the Borough's land supply, thus relieving pressure on Green Belt land release. Elsewhere in this document a table has been provided showing land supply in the Borough. This includes a total of approximately 200 units that can be provided on PDL sites from the BLR that are neither (a) forming part of a planning permission or (b) forming part of a local plan allocation. These have been excluded to avoid double counting. An appendix to this document includes a schedule of such sites.
370. The BLR was also useful to identify PDL sites in the Green Belt that could be included in potential allocations. The site hierarchy in the site selection process chapter shows how, where these sites are in an accessible location, they are given a high priority in that process. It is also worth bearing in mind that if such sites are then removed from the Green Belt as part of a local plan allocation, then it would allow the capacity of the site to be increased, as otherwise any redevelopment proposals would be likely to be restricted to those that don't have a greater harm on the openness of the Green Belt.
371. With respect to paragraph 137 (b) of the NPPF, densities have been optimised by encouraging and supporting higher density developments in and around centres⁵⁴ and seeking 35 dpa⁵⁵ of the net deliverable area of allocated sites which are not located in town centres.
372. Paragraph 137 (c) relates to the potential for HMA authorities to accommodate any of the identified need to avoid releasing land from the Green Belt. In this respect it is noted that the Strategic Growth Study (referred to in an earlier chapter) took a sequential approach when looking for options to accommodate the needs the study identified. It did this through looking at options relating to increasing densities and at options that may sit in the HMA but beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. It concluded there was insufficient capacity in these options and substantial Green belt release would still be required.

Conclusion on Exceptional Circumstances

373. The Council believes that exceptional circumstances exist for some land to be released from the Green Belt to accommodate the Borough's own needs and a contribution to the unmet needs arising from the wider HMA. This is on the basis that there are significant unmet needs that can not be accommodated without using land in the Green Belt.
374. The extent of land to be released from the Green Belt should also be seen in the context of ensuring that it would not have an undue adverse impact as a whole on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt – i.e. that the integrity of the Green Belt remains at both a strategic and local level. This may result in the areas of Green Belt that remain being more

⁵⁴ For instance, the redevelopment of the former Powergen site in Shirley will achieve a density of 97 dph (374 units on a 3.84 ha site).

⁵⁵ The GL Hearn study concluded (paragraph 6.60) that if densities in the HMA outside of Birmingham & the Black Country were to be set at a minimum of 35 dph this would help contribute an additional 13,000 dwellings by using land more efficiently.

sensitive to change and increasing their importance. This illustrates that whilst some Green Belt land release is possible, it should only be what is reasonable.

Washed Over Green Belt

375. A number of settlements in the Borough have 'washed over' Green Belt, which is in contrast to the typically larger settlements that are 'inset'. Within inset settlements Green Belt policies do not apply to development proposals, whereas the policies do apply to those settlements that are washed over. The current status of washed over settlements in the Borough dates back to the 1997 Unitary Development Plan which was prepared under Planning Policy Guidance note 2 (PPG2 Green Belts) the principal relevant Government policy at the time. This had more of a focus on establishing which settlements in the Green Belt should be considered appropriate for infilling and which should not. Whereas the NPPF now has an approach that allows limited infilling in all villages.
376. Given the potential change in circumstances to have occurred since then, and the scale of Green Belt release being promoted through this plan, it is appropriate that this status is reviewed now to (a) ensure that logical and consistent Green Belt boundaries are provided; particularly in respect of changes now proposed or to reflect the nature of changes that have occurred in the locality, and (b) to allow the potential of any appropriate development opportunities within such settlements to come forward. In the main this will be through windfall developments, which may otherwise have been restricted to infill developments. However it is noted that some call-for-sites submissions have been made in some areas contained washed over Green Belt and if the washed over status is removed then these sites could form part of the land supply.
377. The advice in the NPPF is now that:
- "If it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt."*
378. The following washed over settlements/areas have been identified for potential removal from the Green Belt as they do not have an open character that makes a contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This does not mean that they do not have a rural character or other positive character attributes.
- **Cheswick Green** – A settlement of some 900 dwellings with most of the settlement being washed over Green Belt, the exception being the new development (of over 200 dwellings) at Mount Dairy Farm (marketed as Cheswick Place). Having two different approaches to how the village is subject to Green Belt policies is not logical. The size and density of the original settlement does not add to the openness of the surroundings. If the washed over status were to be removed then this would allow the settlement to potentially accommodate development other than just infill. For instance development r/o 575-587 Tanworth Lane⁵⁶ which was promoted through the call-for-sites exercise.
 - **Millison's Wood** – A redeveloped site that now accommodates around 200 dwellings in a fairly compact form that does not add to the openness of the wider area.

⁵⁶ That subject to an appropriate layout could provide approximately 30 dwellings.

- **Tidbury Green** – A settlement of around 400 dwellings largely accommodated in a linear form along Norton Lane, Lowbrook Lane, Fulford Hall Road (which form a compact triangle) and Tilehouse Lane. The extended nature and continuous character of the built frontages do not add to the openness of the wider area. Two major developments (Lowbrook Farm and Tidbury Green Farm) sit adjacent to the village on either side of it in areas not subject to Green Belt status. Both of these new developments will accommodate at least 200 dwellings each and having two different approaches to how the village is subject to Green Belt policies is not logical.
- **Whitlock's End** – Frontage developments on Tilehouse Lane and Houndsfield Lane that accommodates around 30 dwellings and the park & ride station just to the north. Whilst the car park of the station has an open (albeit urbanised) character, the frontage developments do not add to the openness, especially when seen in conjunction with the release of site 4 (land west of Dickens Heath) which is directly opposite on the other side of Tilehouse Lane. If the washed over status were to be removed then this would allow the settlement to potentially accommodate development other than just infill. For instance development r/o 146-152 Tilehouse Lane⁵⁷ which including some previously developed land, that was promoted through the call-for-sites exercise and has been the subject of a previous planning application.
- **Widney Manor Road** – Mainly ribbon development of up to around 100 dwellings that are located between the rail line and Widney Manor Road. This side of the road does not add to the openness of the wider area and instead of using the railway line as the Green Belt boundary, the road itself would be used. If the washed over status were to be removed then this would allow the settlement to potentially accommodate development other than just infill. For instance development r/o 114-118Widney Manor Road⁵⁸, which was promoted through the call-for-sites exercise and has been the subject of a previous planning application.

379. If any call-for-sites submissions have been made in relation to these areas of washed over Green Belt these are set out in a later chapter.

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

380. Settlements where their washed over status remains appropriate as they do contribute to the openness of the Green Belt, and their status should remain:

- Barston
- Chadwick End
- Berkswell
- Bickenhill

381. In addition to the above, there are 'ribbons' of development extending from the urban edge, or from 'inset' settlements, that contain often long stretches of development that present a virtually continuous frontage (save for the normal gaps between dwellings) to the road. These include Lady Byron Lane and Grove Road. If these areas were removed from the Green Belt then it is likely to produce illogical boundaries to the Green Belt. It is therefore considered that their status should remain, but it be acknowledged that in

⁵⁷ That subject to an appropriate layout could accommodate around 40 dwellings.

⁵⁸ That subject to an appropriate layout could accommodate around 20 dwellings.

accordance with the NPPF that appropriate, limited infilling would not amount to inappropriate development.

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

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

Sports Uses

382. Some of the local plan allocations will require replacement playing pitches to be provided on land beyond the allocated site that is located in the Green Belt. For instance this includes site 8 (Hampton Road in Knowle) that includes relocated sports pitches to be provided between the new development and the canal. One option to treat areas such as this, where they are known as part of the proposals being promoted, would be to remove this land from the Green Belt as well. However the Council does not favour this approach as it wishes to see such areas & uses benefit from the protection afforded by Green Belt designation; and so that logical and appropriate boundaries to the Green Belt will be provided.
383. This does mean that for Development Management purposes some of these developments may contain elements that would amount to inappropriate development as defined by the NPPF. As they are required to fulfil and bring forward development proposals on allocated sites, the Council believe that this argument could be used to establish the 'very special circumstances' that need to be demonstrated if such proposals are to be supported.
384. It is considered that paragraph 141 may also lend support to such proposals as it states:
- "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land."*

Compensation

385. The new NPPF introduces the potential for compensatory provision to be made when land is removed from the Green belt. It states (at paragraph 138) that development plans:
- "should also set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land."*
386. These improvements could take the form of creating recreational areas where land is laid out to provide access to open areas, or biodiversity improvements to remaining open land. Ideally these opportunities should be provided close to where the land is removed from the Green Belt so that communities affected by this can take advantage of the compensatory provision.
387. As this is a new opportunity provided by the revised NPPF, there is no local practice to set out how such opportunities should be brought forward, particularly in terms of establishing a proportionate yet meaningful contribution.
388. The Council is keen to hear stakeholder's views on this issue, including from those promoting sites for development that have been included in this plan, especially where the

whole of a site may be being considered appropriate for development – i.e. where else would the compensatory provision be made?

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

Concept Masterplans

389. The approach to concept masterplans is described elsewhere in this document which broadly speaking show the extent of development envisaged for each site, and importantly which existing features are to be retained. They will also be useful to clearly establish the new boundaries of the Green Belt which, as the NPPF advises, should be through development plans that *“define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable.”* Through commenting on the concept masterplans the Council is also keen to hear views on where the new Green Belt boundaries should be drawn.

15. Omitted Sites

Amber Sites

390. The Site Selection chapter described the process the Council has undertaken to assess submitted sites; it explained:

"In carrying out this assessment it should be noted that of the sites that have not been included, some nevertheless performed better than others. As part of this supplementary consultation the Council believe it is useful to identify these 'less harmful' sites (that are shown as amber) so that residents and stakeholders are able to comment on their omission, and whether this is justified."

391. The amber omitted sites that the Council is interested in receiving comments upon are detailed below under the settlement headings used in the previous chapters.

Blythe & Shirley

Land r/o 575A to 587 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (ref A1)

392. This is an amalgamation of the call for sites referenced 4, 78 and 235. Taken together they were assessed as site 1004 in the SHELAA. Development would take the form of a comprehensive backland development with an access onto Tanworth Lane likely to be formed by the demolition of one of the existing dwellings. As such development would take place to the rear of existing frontages and would not impact on the openness of the undeveloped Green Belt opposite the site.

393. For this development to come forward the washed over Green Belt status of Cheswick Green would need to be amended, the approach to which is described in the Green Belt chapter of this plan. The SHELAA identifies a capacity of 36 dwellings.

Land at Mount Dairy Farm, Cheswick Green (ref A2)

394. This site sits just to the south of the main vehicular entrance on to Tanworth Lane from the new Cheswick Place development.

395. For this development to come forward the washed over Green Belt status of Cheswick Green would need to be amended, the approach to which is described in the Green Belt chapter of this plan. The SHELAA identifies a capacity of 10 dwellings.

Land r/o of 146 to 152 Tilehouse Lane, Whitlock's End, Tidbury Green (ref A3)

396. This is an amalgamation of the call for sites referenced 18 and 116. Taken together they were assessed as site 1013 in the SHELAA. Development would take the form of a comprehensive backland development with an access onto Tilehouse Lane using the access used by the former storage use on the site. As such development would take place to the rear of existing frontages and would not impact on the openness of the wider undeveloped Green Belt. Part of the site is included on the Council's Brownfield Land Register under reference BLR/021.

397. The site has also been the subject of previous planning applications which were refused due to the Green Belt status of the land. It was noted at the time that a review of the status of the site ought to take place in the context of the Local Plan Review rather than via an ad hoc favourable determination of a planning application.

398. For this development to come forward the washed over Green Belt status of Whitlock's End would need to be amended, the approach to which is described in the Green Belt chapter of this plan. The SHELAA identifies a capacity of 18 dwellings.

Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath

Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (ref A4)

399. This is site 59 in the call for sites/SHELAA. The site is located a short distance to the east of the centre of Knowle and is therefore in a very accessible location. It has not been included as a preferred site as it falls within a Green Belt parcel that scores very highly (overall score 11) and would result in the village encroaching via a projection into the open countryside to the east without any form of 'rounding off' that would be achieved by development elsewhere in the same parcel that forms part of DLP site 8. If this site had have been included as a preferred option, the new Green Belt boundary would be formed by Kixley Lane to the north, the canal to the east and Kenilworth Road to the south. The SHELAA identifies a capacity of 250 dwellings.

Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5)

400. The original call for sites submission in this area was referenced 104 and included just the land immediately behind the frontage properties. Further submissions have now been made to include more land extending further eastwards which now includes land at the rear of properties fronting Grove Road and a parcel of land fronting Norton Green Lane. The extended site is referenced 413 under the call for sites schedule.
401. The site is located a short distance to the east of the centre of Dorridge. The site sits in a Green Belt parcel that is lower performing (overall score of 4) which is partly as a result of ribbon development that is already in existence. If this site had have been included as a preferred option, the new Green Belt boundary would be formed by Grove Road and Norton Green Lane. A vision document prepared by the site's promoters identifies a capacity of 340 dwellings over 9.7ha.

Solihull

Rowood Drive, Solihull (ref A6)

402. This is site 188 under the call for sites/SHELAA. Those promoting the site have indicated that until approximately 2011 it was used for 'little leagues football' and although Lode Heath School maintain the site they haven't used the facility since the early 1990's. Whilst the site is located in the urban area and would be well suited to residential development, the need for potential mitigation as a result of it's former use as playing fields remains to be established and it is hoped that as a result of the site being highlighted as an 'amber site' that this will enable its potential to be explored in more detail through this consultation. The SHELAA indicates that the site has a capacity of around 30 units.

Land r/o 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road, Solihull (ref A7)

403. This site was assessed as site 134 in the SHELAA. Development would take the form of a comprehensive backland development with an access onto Widney Manor Road. As such development would take place to the rear of existing frontages and would not impact on the openness of the undeveloped Green Belt opposite the site.
404. For this development to come forward the washed over Green Belt status of this area would need to be amended, the approach to which is described in the Green Belt chapter of this plan. The SHELAA identifies a capacity of 22 dwellings.

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

Red Sites

405. An appendix sets out a schedule of all sites that have been assessed and which have been discounted and omitted as 'red' sites.

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

16. Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix

Approach in Draft Local Plan (November 2016)


406. Since the adoption of the 40% affordable housing target (Policy H4 in the Solihull UDP, February 2006 and Policy P4a in the Solihull Local Plan, December 2013), a wide range of privately led residential developments have made provision at this level. The implementation of the policy has had due regard to the suitability of each site and its capacity to provide affordable homes.
407. Evidence of housing need from the 2016 SHMA, the higher national threshold and the requirement to provide Starter Homes as a part of the affordable housing resulted in the Council reviewing the affordable housing target. The target in the Draft Local Plan (November 2016) proposed affordable contributions 50% affordable dwelling units on each development site. This reflected the requirement that 20% must be provided as Starter Homes as required by the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The remaining 30% of the affordable housing obligation would be shared as evidenced by the SHMA by social rent of 22% and shared ownership of 8%.



408. The Council recognises that provision of affordable housing will result in a cost to developers and so the implementation of this policy requires a reasonable and flexible approach, reflecting individual site characteristics. Where there are factors that could threaten the viability of developments as a result of site specific constraints or circumstances these will be considered in negotiations. However, the overall target was that 50% of all new housing built in the Borough will be affordable housing.
409. The 2018 National Planning Policy Framework confirms that the statutory requirement for 20% Starter Homes as required by the Housing and Planning Act 2016 will not be enacted. The Council will respond should this change through any secondary legislation.

The Need for More Smaller Market Housing

- 410. As discussed in an earlier chapter the standard methodology uses the latest household projections published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) as the starting point, and then applies a percentage increase based on a formula that uses a local affordability ratio. The affordability ratio compares average house prices in the Borough with average earnings in the Borough.
- 411. The rationale for using house prices and earnings as an affordability factor is that if average house prices are over four times average earnings (which makes mortgages less sustainable) then house prices aren’t considered to be affordable and a greater number of dwellings is required in order to address the balance.
- 412. The 2016 SHMA Part 2 breaks down the Boroughs housing need by bedroom size, type of dwelling and tenure. The Boroughs housing need by bedroom size, type of dwelling and tenure is shown in Figure 6.1 in the SHMA part 2 and is the requirement for all new housing between 2014 and 2033. This is replicated below.



- 413. The Meeting Housing Needs SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) sets out the Council’s existing approach to market housing requiring between 30% to 50% of market provision to be provided as 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation. This was based on the need to provide increased numbers of smaller houses, in areas where most existing open market housing was larger. Analysis of planning approvals has shown this policy of providing more 2 bedroom accommodation has led to increased provision of larger 4, 5 and 6 bedroom detached houses from new developments.
- 414. The Meeting Housing Needs SPD also states at paragraph 5.42 that:

In general, the Council expects that the size and type of the affordable housing dwellings on a site will be broadly the same as the market provision. This reflects the level of housing need across all sizes and types of property. To this end, the Council will take into account the relative internal size dimensions of the market and affordable housing and the total sum of bedrooms in the market and affordable tenures.
- 415. In 2018 the Independent Review of Build Out by Rt Hon Sir Oliver Letwin MP identified that in order “to give the greatest possible chance of significant change in the build out rates and quality of large scale development” he recommended that in places with high housing

demand that there needs to be a higher degree of diversity in types of properties delivered along with good design to promote more rapid market absorption and rapid build out rates.

Affordable Housing contributions as 40% of total on-site square meterage/habitable floorspace/habitable rooms

416. The Council is aiming to reinforce its market housing approach in accordance with the SHMA by looking at complementary measures to incentivise more smaller market housing and secure 40% of development as affordable housing.
417. This consultation is seeking views and comments on changing affordable housing contributions on qualifying sites to 40% of habitable development area. This could be on-site square meterage (sqm), or base this on habitable floorspace or habitable rooms. Habitable space refers to bedrooms, cooking, eating and living areas.
418. Moving from a percentage calculated on unit numbers will incentivise developers to build more smaller homes and therefore increased numbers of open market houses (also increasing density). This will also support the Council delivering the affordable housing it needs.
419. Analysis has shown that although often developments provide 40% of units as affordable, the affordable square meterage provided may be much less. Market dwellings will normally have a larger number of bedrooms than affordable dwellings. For dwellings with the same number of bedrooms, market housing will usually have a larger floor space than an affordable dwelling.
420. The existing policy of a percentage calculated on unit numbers leads to an incentive on a developers to increase the size of units and reduce numbers. This means more land than necessary has to be released from the Green Belt due to low densities being delivered on allocated sites. It also leads to inadequate housing provision as a result, particularly fewer first time buyer homes, as well as fewer affordable.
421. The Council wants to see more first time buyer homes and smaller homes and is keen to incentivise this through the affordable housing policy. The existing Meeting Housing Needs SPD for affordable housing requires the private and affordable to be similar in size and will allow this policy to be achieved and increase densities on both brownfield and Green Belt releases.

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

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

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

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

17. Responding to this Consultation & Schedule of Questions

Any Other Matters?

422. Throughout this document there are a number of targeted questions about issues discussed in each of the chapters. However if you wish to raise any matters that are not directly related to any of the questions in the preceding chapters then please respond to the following question.

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

Responding to the Consultation

423. An online portal is available where the Draft Local Plan Review can be viewed and comments submitted. Please visit the website at www.solihull.gov.uk/lpr or go directly to the portal <http://solihull.jdi-consult.net/localplan/> when making your response. Responses should be made by **15th March 2019**.

Schedule of Questions

Local Housing Need

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

Site Selection Methodology

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

Balsall Common

- 3 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Balsall Common, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 4 Do you believe that Site 1 Barratt's Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 5 Do you believe that Site 2 Frog Lane should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 6 Do you believe that Site 3 Windmill Lane should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 7 Do you believe that Site 21 Pheasant Oak Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 8 Do you believe that Site 22 Trevallion Stud should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 9 Do you believe that Site 23 Lavender Hall Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 10 Do you have any comments to make on potential changes to the Green Belt boundary east of the settlement that would result in the removal of the 'washed over' Green Belt from those areas not covered by a formal allocation?

Blythe

- 11 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Blythe, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 12 Do you believe that Site 4 Land west of Dickens Heath should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 13 Do you believe that Site 11 The Green should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 14 Do you believe that Site 12 south of Dog Kennel Lane should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 15 Do you believe that Site 26 Whitlock's End Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Hampton in Arden

- 16 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Hampton in Arden, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 17 Do you believe that Site 6 Meriden Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 18 Do you believe that Site 24 Oak Farm should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Hockley Heath

- 19 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Hockley Heath, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 20 Do you believe that Site 25 land south of School Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 21 Do you have any comments to make on potential changes to the Green Belt boundary north of School Road that would result in the removal of the 'washed over' Green Belt from this ribbon of development?

Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath

- 22 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 23 Do you believe that Site 8 Hampton Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 24 Do you believe that Site 9 land south of Knowle should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs

- 25 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Solihull and The Mature Suburbs, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 26 Do you believe that Site 16 east of Solihull should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

- 27 Do you believe that Site 17 Moat lane/Vulcan Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 28 Do you believe that Site 18 Sharmans Cross Road should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Meriden

- 29 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Meriden, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 30 Do you believe that Site 10 west of Meriden should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

North Solihull, Marston Green & Castle Bromwich

- 31 Do you agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for North Solihull, Castle Bromwich & Marston Green, if not why not; or do you believe there are any other matters that should be included?
- 32 Do you believe that Site 7 Kingshurst Village Centre should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?
- 33 Do you believe that Site 15 Jenson House/Auckland Drive should be included as allocated site, if not why not? Do you have any comments on the draft concept masterplan for the site?

Green Belt

- 34 Should the washed over Green Belt status of these settlements/areas be removed, and if so what should the new boundaries be? If not why do you think the washed over status of the settlement should remain?
- 35 Should the washed over status of these settlements/areas remain? If not why not?
- 36 Are there any other areas of the Borough where washed over status should be reviewed, if so which areas and why?
- 37 What compensatory provision should be made for land being removed from the Green Belt? Where relevant please give examples that are specific to individual sites proposed for allocation.

Omitted Sites

- 38 Do you have any comments on these amber sites, i.e. is it right they should be omitted, or do you believe they should be included, if so why?
- 39 Are there any red sites omitted which you believe should be included; if so which one(s) and why?

Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix

- 40 Would the above approach of requiring affordable housing contributions of 40% of total square meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace incentivise developers to build more smaller market housing?
- 41 If so, what is the most effective approach? Is it to calculate affordable housing as: (a) 40% of bedroom numbers, (b) 40% of habitable rooms, or (c) 40% of habitable square meterage?

- 42 What is the best way of measuring developable space for this purpose: bedroom numbers, habitable rooms or habitable floorspace?
- 43 What other measures would incentivise developers to build more smaller market housing?

Any Other Comments

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

Data Protection

424. The information you provide will be collected and held by Solihull Council to help prepare the review of the local plan and will be shared with third parties (such as the Planning Inspectorate for England and Wales) who may be involved with the local plan process.
425. Please note that the Council is obliged to make representations available for public inspection. This means that with the exception of personal telephone numbers, email addresses and signatures, your comments and other personal details that you provide will be publicly available for inspection at the Council's principal offices and will also be published on the internet.
426. Your information may also be shared with other Council services and partner organisations to ensure our records are kept accurate and to help us to identify services or benefits you may be entitled to or interested in. We may also need to share your information for the prevention and detection of fraud and/or other crimes or as the law requires. For further information about how we use your information please refer to our Privacy Notice at the following link: <http://www.solihull.gov.uk/About-the-Council/Data-protection-FOI/Solihull-Council-statement/Managed-Growth-and-Communities/Policy-Engagement> or contact: psp@solihull.gov.uk

A. Housing Completions 2001/02 to 2017/18

Recent Levels of House Building in Solihull

427. The following table sets out housing completions⁵⁹ for each year from April 2001.


Year	Additional Dwellings Provided (Gross)	Dwellings Lost Through Demolitions or Conversions	Net Additional Dwellings Provided
01/02	663	33	630
02/03	414	32	382
03/04	477	68	409
04/05	608	75	533
05/06	921	60	861
06/07	796	50	746
07/08	604	75	529
08/09	601	146	455
09/10	434	283	151
10/11	323	107	216
11/12	419	135	284
12/13	396	60	336
13/14	419	286	133
14/15	689	28	661
15/16	714	37	677
16/17	620	42	578
17/18	767	57	710

428. Average completions per year has averaged as follows over the time periods indicated:

- 488 dwellings per year as an average of the 17 years from 2001/02 to 2017/18
- 420 dwellings per year as an average of the 10 years from 2008/09 to 2017/18
- 657 dwellings per year as an average of the 4 years from 2014/15 to 2017/18

⁵⁹ These figures exclude communal establishments to match the basis of the MHCLG publication: '[live tables on dwelling stock](#)' (table 122).

429. The net completions from this table are illustrated in the following graph:



B. Population & Households in the Borough

430. The following table indicates the population and number of households for the rural (or part rural) settlements/parishes in the Borough. All figures are taken from the 2011 census. The figures are not necessarily those of the settlement alone as the wider area will contain a number of dwellings. The figures are provided to provide a general size comparison between settlements.

Area	Population	Number of Households
Urban area of the Borough	153,945	64,488
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath ⁶⁰	19,780	8,068
Balsall Common ⁶¹	9,675	3,883
Bickenhill Parish ⁶²	7,153	2,835
Balsall Parish	6,536	2,634
Dickens Heath Parish	3,992	1,757
Berkswell Parish	3,139	1,249
Meriden Parish	2,719	1,221
Cheswick Green Parish	2,197	891
Hampton in Arden Parish	1,834	803
Hockley Heath Parish	2,038	794
Tidbury Green Parish	1,130	432
Barston Parish	553	223

431. Approximately 75% of the Boroughs 206,674 population and 86,056 households are located within the urban area.

⁶⁰ Using the wards of Knowle and Dorridge & Hockley Heath less Hockley Heath Parish

⁶¹ Adding the figures from Balsall and Berkswell Parishes

⁶² Includes Marston Green which is part of the urban area.

C. Schedule of Allocated Sites

432. This is a summary table listing the residential sites to be allocated in the plan⁶³.

Area ⁶⁴	Ref.	Site Name	Green Belt	Site Area (ha)	Indicative Capacity ⁶⁵
Balsall Common	1	Barratt's Farm	Yes	93	900
	2	Frog Lane	Yes	6	110
	3	Windmill Lane/Kenilworth Road	Yes	11	220
	21	Pheasant Oak Farm	Yes	12	100
	22	Trevallion Stud	Yes	11	300
	23	Lavender Hall Farm	Yes	4	60
Catherine-de-Barnes	24	Oak Farm	Yes	2	80
Dickens Heath	4	West of Dickens Heath (off Tythe Barn Lane, Tile House Lane and Birchy Leasowes Lane)	Yes	41	350
Hampton in Arden	6	Meriden Road	Yes	7	100
Hockley Heath	25	Land south of School Road	Yes	6	100
Kingshurst	7	Kingshurst Village Centre	No	4	100
Knowle	8	Hampton Road	Yes	13	300
	9	South of Knowle (between Station Road, Warwick Road and Grove Road)	Yes	46	600
Meriden	10	West of Meriden (between Birmingham Road and Maxstoke Lane)	Yes	3	100

⁶³ In addition to these sites, the 2016 Draft Local Plan also included employment or mixed use allocations as follows: 19 – HS2 Interchange (c140ha) and 20 – Land at Damson Parkway (c94ha).

⁶⁴ The area or settlement the allocation is in or adjacent to (not necessarily the ward or parish it falls within).

⁶⁵ Number of residential units.

Area ⁶⁴	Ref.	Site Name	Green Belt	Site Area (ha)	Indicative Capacity ⁶⁵
Shirley	11	TRW/The Green , The Green, Stratford Road	No	19	640
	12	South of Dog Kennel Lane	Yes	64	1000
	26	Whitlock's End Farm	Yes	21	300
Smith's Wood	15	Jensen House, Auckland Drive	No	4	50
Solihull	16	East of Solihull (between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton Lane)	Yes	39	600
	17	Moat Lane/Vulcan Road	No	5	200
	18	Sharmans Cross Road	No	3	100
<i>Non Green Belt Sites</i>				<i>35</i>	<i>1,090</i>
<i>Green Belt Sites</i>				<i>379</i>	<i>5,220</i>
Total				414	6,310

433. The site reference numbers⁶⁶ from the DLP (Nov 2016) have been retained for those sites that remain as preferred options. Sites numbered 21 to 26 are new sites.
434. Sites 5 (Chester Road/Moorend Avenue, Fordbridge), 13 (South of Shirley) and 14 (Arran Way, Smith's Wood) from the DLP are not carried forward as preferred options.

⁶⁶ Which were numbered from 1 to 20.

D. Sites from the Solihull Local Plan, Brownfield Land Register and Land Availability Studies

Solihull Local Plan (2013)

435. The following table is a schedule of the SLP allocated sites which have not yet commenced development and will be retained as allocations.

Ref ⁶⁷ .	Site Name	Site Area (ha)	Indicative Capacity
3	Simon Digby, Chelmsley Wood	4.57	200
8	Solihull Town Centre		861 ⁶⁸
19	Riddings Hill, Balsall Common	1.61	65
24	Meriden Road, Hampton-in-Arden	2.79	110
Total			1,236

Brownfield Land Register

436. The following table identifies the sites included on the Council's latest Brownfield Land Register that can be included in the land supply. It excludes sites that are on the BLR which are also included as an allocated site. This is (a) to avoid double counting and (b) to allow a more appropriate capacity to be assigned to them as part of the allocation. This latter point is in recognition that the indicative capacities of sites on the BLR reflects the current policy position that they have. In relation to sites that are located in the Green Belt this means that to be policy compliant redevelopment of the site should not have a greater impact on openness than the existing structures. Such a restraint would not arise for those sites to be removed from the Green Belt as part of the allocation process.

BLR Ref.	CfS Ref ⁶⁹ .	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Minimum capacity	Maximum capacity
BLR 013		Widney Manor House, Bentley Heath	1	1	2
BLR 014	CfS 84	Glider Yard, Houndsfield Lane, Whitlock's End	0.13	2	4
BLR 015	CfS 86	Land east of 106-118 Old Station Road, Hampton in Arden	0.5	1	2

⁶⁷ Site reference number as used in the SLP.

⁶⁸ The SLP was based on 950 units coming forward in the plan period. The updated masterplan described in the Draft Local Plan (2016) revises this to 861.

⁶⁹ If also submitted under the general call for sites exercise.

BLR Ref.	CfS Ref ⁶⁹ .	Site Name & Address	Site Area (ha)	Minimum capacity	Maximum capacity
BLR 017	CfS 178	National Motorcycle Museum, Coventry Road, Bickenhill	3.6	50	125
BLR 018	CfS 138	Windmill Lane, Balsall Common	0.3	2	3
BLR 020		Whitehouse Kennels, Back Lane, Meriden	0.83	2	4
BLR 021	CfS 18 CfS 116	Land r/o 146-152 Tilehouse Lane, Tidbury Green	0.87	5	10
BLR 024	CfS 148 CfS 157	1806 Warwick Road, Knowle	3.01	1	3
BLR 025		1817 Warwick Road, Knowle	1.46	1	3
BLR 040		Four Winds, Catherine-de-Barnes Lane, Solihull	0.74	2	4
BLR 057		354 Stratford Road, Shirley	0.228	30	75
BLR 062		Land at Highlands Road, Solihull		25	200
	CfS 48	Earlsmere House, Warings Green Road, Warings Green	0.85	1	2
	CfS 108	Blythe House, Widney Manor Road, Bentley Heath	1.85	1	2
Total				124	439

437. To provide a reasonable and robust figure to be included in the land supply from this source, it has been decided to discount the potential supply from site BLR/017 (National Motorcycle Museum) as the Council is not aware that the site is being promoted for redevelopment, and it would therefore be prudent to discount it at this stage. This would result in a potential land supply being between 74 and 314 units. As 200 is approximately at the mid point of this range this is the figure used in the land supply table.

Land Availability Assessments

438. The following table identifies sites that have been assessed through land availability assessments as being suitable, available and achievable as at 1st April 2018⁷⁰. They are sites that do not need a policy change (e.g. removal of Green Belt designation) to be bought forward. Sites identified in this manner are typically small sites that are likely to accommodate less than 50 dwellings as larger sites have been included as allocations to give more certainty.

CfS Ref. ⁷¹	Site Name & Address	Capacity
SHLAA (2012)		
107	Hobs Moat Site 2, Campden Green	3
254	Garages at Anglesey Avenue, Smith's Wood	13
298	107 Kelsey Lane, Balsall Common	5
301	Land at Shirley Depot, Haslucks Green Road, Shirley	37
SHELAA (2016)		
7	Corbetts Close, Hampton in Arden	28
125	Wychwood Roundabout, Knowle	20
155	St George & St Teresa School, Dorridge	31
163	Former Rectory & Glebe Land, Solihull	17
220	Chapelhouse Depot, Fordbridge	30
54	Clopton Crescent, Fordbridge	20
Total		204

439. This table represents an updated position to that provided in the DLP Topic Paper 3 – Housing which had a similar table at paragraph 268. The updates take the form of excluding sites that have either now got planning permission or those where the Council is aware that they are no longer available.
440. The table below identifies sites that have been assessed through the 2016 land availability assessment as being suitable, available and achievable. Unlike the sites in the preceding table, they do need a policy change (a change in their Green Belt status) if they are to be bought forward. The sites in this table would no longer be in the Green Belt if its boundaries

⁷⁰ Some of these sites may have had subsequent planning permissions and this will be reflected when this data is next updated. This is so that the dates are consistent with the figures in the supply table which does not yet include planning permissions granted after 1st April 2018.

⁷¹ The references under the 2012 SHLAA and 2016 SHELAA are a different sequence, with the later using Call for Site (CfS) references from the exercise undertaken from November 2015 onwards.

were altered to accommodate the principal allocations (generally sites over 100 units) described in earlier chapters.

CfS Ref.	Site Name & Address	Capacity
1	Springhill, 443 Station Road, Balsall Common	21
36	Land adj to Oakwood House, Lavender Hall Lane, Balsall Common	7
43	Land adj to Old Lodge Farm, Kenilworth Road, Balsall Common	40
49	Land adj 84 School Road, Hockley Heath	21
101	Land at Old Waste Lane/Waste Lane, Balsall Common	40
328	Land at and r/o 84, 86 & 90 School Road, Hockley Heath	30
333	2 Lavender Hall Lane, Balsall Common	1
Total		160

E. Schedule of Assessed Sites

441. The table below sets out all of the sites assessed for residential development and indicates the conclusion of the 'step 2' assessment using the methodology as described in an earlier chapter. A fuller version of this schedule with the site's attributes etc. can be found in the [Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation Site Assessments](#) and an [index plan](#) to the sites has also been published. This table is ordered by ward and if more than one parish is present in the ward, then by parish.
442. It should be noted that if a site is considered appropriate for development it is not necessarily the case that the whole site is to be included as there may be reasons (e.g. to retain existing on site features, or to preserve a gap between settlements) why only part of a site is included.

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
Bickenhill						
25	Land at Barston Lane	0.52	17	Bickenhill	Barston	R
26	Land at 210 Henwood Lane	0.29	7	Bickenhill	Barston	R
64	Land at Barston Lane/Oak Lane	1.69	36	Bickenhill	Barston	R
332	West Midlands golf club	13.25	310	Bickenhill	Barston	R
131	Birmingham Business Park, adj. Coleshill Heath Road	9.27	250	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
132	Land at HS2 Triangle	141.16	1,982	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	G ⁷²
193	Land at the rear of 74 - 108 Coleshill Heath Road	4.76	111	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
196	Land at Bickenhill Road	21.15	Estimated 494	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
237	Land at Bickenhill Road	0.24	Estimated 4	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
239	Land at Church Lane, Bickenhill	1.51	38	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
337	Land off Coleshill Heath Road	0.65	21	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R

⁷² Included as DLP 19

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
341	Land between 70 & 84 Chelmsley Road	1.97	50	Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
6	Land off Old Station Road, Hampton in Arden	3.20	90	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
7	Land off Corbetts Close	1.38	28	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	G ⁷³
23	Land adj. to "Woodlands"	5.37	126	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
24	Vacant land off Friday Lane	5.37	126	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
46	Land fronting B4102 Meriden Road	2.94	35	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
83	Land at Catherine de Barnes	0.39	13	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
86	Land at Old Station Road	0.93	30	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
94	Land at Diddington Lane, Hampton in Arden	1.28	37	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
117	Meriden Road Depot	3.61	110	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	G ⁷⁴
129	Land off Meriden Road, Hampton in Arden	1.60	40	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	G ⁷⁴
136	Oak Farm, Catherine de Barnes	3.43	80	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	G ⁷⁵
171	Hampton Manor	18.00	15 (part of site only)	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
307	Land at Eastcote Road/Bellemere Road	10.34	242	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
321	The Limes, Solihull Road, Hampton-in-Arden	0.40	15	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
322	145 Old Station Road, Hampton-in-Arden	7.17	168	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
411	Friday Lane Nurseries, Catherine de Barnes	2.76	66	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
418	Diddington Lane, Hampton-in-Arden	51.35	901	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden	R
2	Land adj. 339/337 Lugtrout Lane	2.09	49	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R
10	Playing fields at Lugtrout Lane	7.59	178	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R

⁷³ Planning permission now granted on this site.

⁷⁴ Included as part of DLP 6.

⁷⁵ Included as DLP 24

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
11	Land adjoining SE side of Damson Parkway	0.65	10	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	G ⁷⁶
15	Former Pinfold Nursery (inc. 67 Hampton Lane)	5.29	Estimated 124	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	G ⁷⁶
16	Land south of Hampton Lane	5.02	181	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R
17	Land west of Ravenshaw Lane/south of Hampton Lane	1.96	49	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R
20	Land adj to Solihull bypass, south of Hampton Lane	3.57	84	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R
21	The Paddock	0.24	Estimated 8	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R
28	Land to west of 227 Lugtrout Lane	0.88	20	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	G ⁷⁶
67	Land to rear of 81, 81A and 83 Hampton Lane	0.82	Estimated 24	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	G ⁷⁶
147	Land at Hampton Lane	27.79	Estimated 650	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	G ⁷⁶
230	Land at Lugtrout Lane	16.31	Estimated 382	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	G ⁷⁶
300	Land adj. 50 Hampton Lane	0.39	14	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden (April 2019)	R
325	Land adj. 157 Hampton Lane, Solihull	0.36	13	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden April 19	R
326	Land RO 157 Hampton Lane, Solihull	2.01	47	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden April 19	R
327	Land adj. 378 Lugtrout Lane	4.96	116	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden April 19	R

⁷⁶ Included as part of DLP 16

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
339	Land adj. 161 Lugtrout Lane	3.41	80	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden April 19	G ⁷⁶
410	147 Lugtrout Lane	0.27	10	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden April 19	G ⁷⁶
412	Red Star Sports, Lugtrout Lane	1.60	40	Bickenhill	Hampton-in-Arden April 19	R
12	Land to north of Lugtrout Lane	0.52	4	Bickenhill		R
85	Land adj. to 179 Hampton Lane, Catherine de Barnes	2.01	2	Bickenhill		R
96	Land on north side of Lugtrout Lane	1.21	24	Bickenhill		R
106	Land at Oakfields Way, Catherine de Barnes	2.14	50	Bickenhill		R
143	Land adj. 161 Lugtrout Lane	0.51	17	Bickenhill		G ⁷⁶
195	Land at Damson Parkway	55.14	950	Bickenhill and Elmdon	Hampton-in-Arden	R
Blythe						
4	Land to RO houses in Tanworth Lane	0.35	Estimated 13	Blythe	Cheswick Green	A ⁷⁷
44	Lodge Paddocks	1.38	11	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
45	Field surrounding Lodge Paddocks	5.71	160	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
48	Earlsmere House	0.85	11	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
61	"Hilltop", 353 Tanworth Lane, Shirley	0.46	13	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
62	Land adjacent to Shirley Golf Course, Stratford Road	8.50	200	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
78	Land to RO 575a to 587 Tanworth Lane and land at 587 to 597 Tanworth Lane	1.24	Estimated 36	Blythe	Cheswick Green	A ⁷⁷
99	Land at Tanworth Lane, Shirley	6.94	Estimated 162	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R

⁷⁷ Discussed under reference A1

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
100	Land at Mount Dairy Farm	0.45	10	Blythe	Cheswick Green	A ⁷⁸
122	Land south of Dog Kennel Lane	120.25	Estimated 2,300	Blythe	Cheswick Green	G ⁷⁹
123	Brooklin	1.84	36	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
133	Creynolds Lane, Shirley	0.76	21	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
146	Blythe Valley Park	64.37	PA approved	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
168	Land at Illshaw Heath	4.62	86	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
173	Winterton Farm/Land to the north of Blythe Valley Park	42.23	600	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
184	Rear of Cheswick Green Primary School	2.72	Estimated 64	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
217	Land at Creynolds Lane	15.79	Estimated 369	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
235	Land at Tanworth Lane	0.67	Estimated 22	Blythe	Cheswick Green	A ⁷⁷
302	Land on SW side of Stratford Road, Shirley	1.43	41	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
334	Land at Illshaw Heath Road	0.31	11	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
342	Land RO 32 Creynolds Lane	0.17	6	Blythe	Cheswick Green	R
345	Extension to SHELAA 1004, Tanworth Lane	1.55	39	Blythe	Cheswick Green	A ⁷⁷
126	Land to north of Birchy Leasowes Lane	7.00	120	Blythe	Dickens Heath	G ⁸⁰
130	Land at Tythe Barn Lane	3.55	83	Blythe	Dickens Heath	G ⁸⁰
140	Land at Dickens Heath Road	8.17	175	Blythe	Dickens Heath	R
176	Land to the west of Dickens Heath	36.61	400	Blythe	Dickens Heath	G ⁸⁰
318	The Uplands, 74 Dickens Heath Road	2.08	49	Blythe	Dickens Heath	R
340	Land at Three Maypoles Farm, Dickens Heath Road	12.13	284	Blythe	Dickens Heath	R

⁷⁸ Discussed under reference A2

⁷⁹ Included as DLP 12

⁸⁰ Included as DLP 4

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
405	Land adj. 237 Tythe Barn Lane	0.46	16	Blythe	Dickens Heath	G ⁸⁰
8	103 Birchy Leasowes Lane	0.57	18	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
18	Land to RO 146/152 Tilehouse Lane	1.21	Estimated 15	Blythe	Tidbury Green	A ⁸¹
22	Land to the south of Houndsfield Lane (former Clementine Farm)	0.69	Estimated 22	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
37	Bowyer Farm	2.71	63	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
39	Field adj. to Tudor Croft	0.73	5	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
42	Big Cleobury Farm	10.72	251	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
58	Land at Cleobury Lane, Dickens Heath	2.85	67	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
69	Norton Lane, Earlswood	2.93	90	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
70	Kidpile Farm	3.52	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
71	Land at 149-163 Wood Lane	1.23	35	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
73	Earlswood Caravan/Ambleside Nursery, 448 Norton Lane	1.92	59	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
74	Land at and RO of 162 Tilehouse Lane	0.29	8	Blythe	Tidbury Green	A ⁸¹
84	Land at Houndsfield Lane	1.52	Estimated 36	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
116	Land at and to the rear of 146-152 Tilehouse Lane	1.75	Estimated 18	Blythe	Tidbury Green	A ⁸¹
192	Jordan Farm	15.16	355	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R

⁸¹ Discussed under reference A3

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
206	Land at Norton Lane, Tidbury Green	5.07	Site excluded from study - backland development	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
209	Tidbury Green Golf Club	20.87	488	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
310	Land fronting Lady Lane and Cleobury Lane	3.66	86	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
313	Fulford Hall Farm	76.53	2,410	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
316	Land Fronting Dickens Heath Road & Cleobury Lane	2.24	52	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
404	Land at Fulford Hall Road	11.20	262	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
415	149-163 Wood Lane Earlswood	0.88	29	Blythe	Tidbury Green	R
141	Land around Earlswood Station	26.28 (in Solihull)	3,000	Blythe (and Stratford DC)	Tidbury Green	R
346	Land inc. BVP & adj. to Jct 4 M42	124.00	TBC	Blythe and Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Cheswick Green and Hockley Heath	R
41	Land at Whitlocks End Farm	54.50	1,300	Blythe and Shirley South	Dickens Heath	G ⁸²
223	Land at Tanworth Lane, Sans Souci and Woodloes Road	18.02	380	Blythe and Shirley South	Dickens Heath	R
Chelmsley Wood						
53	Bluebell Recreation Ground	7.64	161	Chelmsley Wood	Chelmsley Wood	R
221	Onward Club and Chelmsley Wood Town Council Offices	3.44	80	Chelmsley Wood	Chelmsley Wood	R
232	Simon Digby Campus	5.11	200 in 2013 Local Plan	Chelmsley Wood	Chelmsley Wood	G ⁸³

⁸² Included as DLP 26

⁸³ Included as SLP 3

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
52	Chester Road/ Moorend Avenue, Roundabout	3.84	90	Chelmsley Wood	Fordbridge	R
54	Clopton Crescent Depot & British Legion Club	1.72	43	Chelmsley Wood	Fordbridge	R
56	Lambeth Close & Centurion PH	1.19	35	Chelmsley Wood	Fordbridge	R
Dorridge & Hockley Heath						
13	Land to RO 2214 Stratford Rd	3.39	Estimated 81	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
14	Land at 2440 Stratford Rd	1.06	17	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
38	Ashford Manor Farm, Stratford Road	2.96	90	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
49	Land adjacent 84 School Road	0.65	21	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	G ⁸⁴
57	Land adjoining 2102 Stratford Road	0.12	Estimated 4	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
120	Land at Ashford Lane, Hockley Heath	8.12	190	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
121	Land west of Stratford Road, Hockley Heath	3.45	Estimated 81	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
139	Land south of School Road, Hockley Heath	5.96	Estimated 139	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	G ⁸⁵
145	Land at School Road	1.70	43	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
175	Land to the south of School Road, Hockley Heath	3.14	Estimated 74	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	G ⁸⁵
180	Site rear 122 School Road, Hockley Heath	1.75	44	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
208	Land at School Road/Ashford Lane	3.90	64	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R

⁸⁴ Included as part of land supply assumptions if Green Belt boundaries amended to accommodate a nearby allocation.

⁸⁵ Included as DLP 25

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
328	Land at and to RO 84,86 and 90 School Road	0.91	30	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	G ⁸⁴
416	Land north of School Road	1.84	46	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
417	Land west of Stratford Road	16.84	394	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	Hockley Heath	R
135	Land at Dorridge Road, Dorridge	6.77	91	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	N/A	R
344	Land off Grange Road, Dorridge	2.11	49	Dorridge & Hockley Heath	N/A	R
29	The Orchard, Earlswood Road	1.21	14	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
72	Land at Widney Road and Browns Lane	0.39	14	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
88	Land at Widney Manor Road	6.54	153	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
108	Blythe House	1.85	16	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
127	Woodford, Grange Road	0.62	10	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
155	St George and St Teresa Primary School	0.95	31	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		G ⁸⁶
181	All or part of 20 Browns Lane, Knowle	0.18	Estimated 3	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		G ⁸⁷
182	18 Browns Lane	0.18	Estimated 3	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		G ⁸⁷
199	Land at Four Ashes Road, Dorridge - Box Trees	4.83	50	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R

⁸⁶ Include in land supply assumptions through being identified in a land availability assessment

⁸⁷ Not included in land supply as it's a restricted site with no clear evidence or reasonable assumption that an appropriate layout can be achieved.

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
207	Land bounded by Brown's Lane, Smiths Lane & Widney Manor Rd	15.37	300	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
210	Land between 39 and 79 Earlswood Road	1.52	31	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
241	Arden Lodge Field, Arden Drive	1.22	10	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
247	Manor Farm, Four Ashes Rd	1.15	33	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
329	Land to east and west of Darley Green Road	0.19	7	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
330	Land to west of Darley Green Road	0.66	22	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
419	60 Four Ashes Road	2.54	59	Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
Elmdon						
336	Land off Coventry Road, Elmdon	3.53	83	Elmdon and Bickenhill	Bickenhill & Marston Green (Part)	R
226	Land at Damson Parkway and Coventry Road	32.11	751	Elmdon and Bickenhill	Only small part in Bickenhill & Marston Green	R
Kingshurst & Fordbridge						
54	Clopton Crescent Depot, Clopton Crescent	1.72	30	Kingshurst and Fordbridge	Fordbridge	G ⁸⁸
220	Chapelhouse Depot, including Conservative Club and former Boys Club	1.03	30	Kingshurst and Fordbridge	Fordbridge	G ⁸⁶

⁸⁸ Included in land supply assumptions as being identified through land availability assessments (in so far as this relates to the depot and not open space land)

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
218	Endeavour House, including Pavilions Sports Club and Allotments	4.52	106	Kingshurst and Fordbridge	Kingshurst	R
Knowle						
19	Land adj. to Bakehouse Lane/Wheeler Close	1.69	43	Knowle	Chadwick End	R
32	Land at Netherwood Lane	5.28	47	Knowle	Chadwick End	R
40	Olton, Stable Cottage, Chadwick End	0.27	5	Knowle	Chadwick End	R
242	Land east of Chadwick Manor	2.78	50	Knowle	Chadwick End	R
243	Land north of Chadwick Court	0.79	15	Knowle	Chadwick End	R
246	Land at Warwick Road	1.12	32	Knowle	Chadwick End	R
303	Stripes Hill Farm	4.31	101	Knowle	N/A	G ⁸⁹
5	Land at Grove House, Jacobean Lane	0.50	16	Knowle		R
27	Land at rear of 36 Lady Byron Lane	0.08	Estimated 1	Knowle		R
59	Land at Golden End Farms	15.11	250	Knowle		A ⁹⁰
68	Land off Jacobean Lane	2.38	54	Knowle		R
93	Land at Heronfield	0.47	17	Knowle		R
98	Land to the rear of 1761 Warwick Road	1.54	39	Knowle		R
104	Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (Oak Green)	6.89	80	Knowle		A ⁹¹
107	Land at Gentleshaw Lane	7.41	150	Knowle		R
109	Land south of Grove Road	2.12	60	Knowle		A ⁹¹
110	Land to rear of 114 Kenilworth Road	15.23	356	Knowle		R
118	Fields adjacent to Rotton Row Farm	5.48	128	Knowle		R
125	Land at Wychwood Roundabout	1.98	20	Knowle		G ⁸⁶
148	Lansdowne	8.45	Estimated 198	Knowle		G ⁸⁹

⁸⁹ Included as DLP 9

⁹⁰ Discussed under Amber chapter – see reference A4

⁹¹ Discussed under Amber chapter – see reference A5

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
149	Lansdowne Farm Part D	8.45	Estimated 198	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
150	Lansdowne Farm Part A	2.28	Estimated 53	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
151	Lansdowne Farm Part B & 1928 Warwick Rd	7.99	Estimated 187	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
152	Lansdowne Farm Part C & Jacknett Barn	4.93	Estimated 115	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
153	Proposed new Arden Academy Site	9.04	Put forward for education.	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
154	Potential site for a new 2FE Catholic Primary school	1.21	Put forward for education.	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
156	Arden Academy	6.14	Estimated 144	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
157	Land to east of Knowle forming part of Arden Triangle	49.54	Estimated 1,158	Knowle		G ⁸⁹
166	Land north and south of Hampton Road, Knowle	3.36	79	Knowle		G ⁹²
167	The Memorial Clubhouse and Grounds	14.68	400	Knowle		R
213	Land north of Hampton Road (1)	9.50	150	Knowle		G ⁹²
214	Land north of Hampton Road (2)	5.23	100	Knowle		R
215	Land north of Hampton Road (3)	5.64	100	Knowle		R
244	Land at Tilehouse Green - Copt Heath Golf Club	1.05	30	Knowle		R
319	Land at 1939 Warwick Road	10.09	236	Knowle		R
323	Land off Jacobean Lane, Knowle	0.32	12	Knowle		R
324	Land rear 15 Jacobean Lane, Knowle	0.90	29	Knowle		R
413	Land at Oak Green, Dorridge	27.09	602	Knowle		A ⁹¹
424	Whale Tankers, Jn5 M42	17.59	412	Knowle		R

⁹² Included as DLP 8

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
3	The Chase Field, off Smiths Lane	2.51	59	Knowle and Dorridge & Hockley Heath		R
Meriden						
47	Land south of Kelsey Court	0.39	5	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹³
60	Land at Wootton Green Lane	1.72	Estimated 40	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
75	Land at Frog Lane	5.44	162	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁵
82	Land at Kenilworth Road	1.85	47	Meriden	Balsall	R
112	Field at rear of Fernhill Court	1.40	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Meriden	Balsall	R
138	Land at Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane	11.01	225	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹³
142	Grange Farm, Balsall Common	49.60	Estimated 1,161	Meriden	Balsall	R
158	Land RO Kenilworth Road, Balsall Common	0.52	Estimated 17	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
159	Land fronting Wootton Green Lane	0.63	Estimated 20	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
160	Land adj. 32 Wootton Green Lane	0.22	Estimated 8	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
161	Land at Wootton Green Lane	6.65	Estimated 156	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
162	Land at the Hollies, Kenilworth Rd	1.44	Estimated 41	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
172	Service Station Site, Kenilworth Road	0.13	Estimated 5	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
183	Wootton Green Barn	0.93	28	Meriden	Balsall	R
198	Land north-west of Balsall Common, Solihull	11.53	Estimated 270	Meriden	Balsall	R
201	Brook Farm	1.50	38	Meriden	Balsall	R
204	Land at Oaklands Farm	1.19	34	Meriden	Balsall	R
233	Land north-west of Balsall Common	65.67	Estimated 1,537	Meriden	Balsall	R
238	33 Wootton Green lane	1.00	16	Meriden	Balsall	R

⁹³ Included as part of DLP 3

⁹⁴ Included as part of DLP 22

⁹⁵ Included as part of DLP 2

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
240	Land at Wootton Green Lane and Kenilworth Road	11.31	Estimated 265	Meriden	Balsall	G ⁹⁴
304	Land at Oakes Farm	7.50	176	Meriden	Balsall	R
315	New Holly Lane Farm	42.03	856	Meriden	Balsall	R
338	Land at Kenilworth Road, Balsall Common	5.85	137	Meriden	Balsall	R
421	Silver Tree Farm, Balsall St	0.44	16	Meriden	Balsall	R
422	Rose Bank, Balsall St	0.77	25	Meriden	Balsall	R
1	Springhill, 443 Station Road, Balsall Common	0.72	21	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁸⁴
9	Land RO Lavender Hall Farm	3.83	63	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁶
30	Land rear of 67-95 Meeting House Lane	2.41	Estimated 56	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁷
31	Solihull Blooms Garden Centre, Kenilworth Road	3.00	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Meriden	Berkswell	R
33	Barratts Lane Farm	50.65	Estimated 1,185	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁷
36	Land adj. to Oakwood House	0.20	7	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁸⁴
43	Land adjacent to Old Lodge Farm	1.36	40	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁸⁴
66	Land NE side of Back Lane	9.13	200	Meriden	Berkswell	R
76	Berkswell Quarry - potential extension land	70.26	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Meriden	Berkswell	R
79	Land fronting Waste Lane, Balsall Common	0.73	24	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁸
89	Village Farm, Berkswell	0.74	15	Meriden	Berkswell	R
90	Land at Coventry Road, Berkswell	3.18	20	Meriden	Berkswell	R

⁹⁶ Included as DLP 23

⁹⁷ Included as part of DLP 1

⁹⁸ Included as part of DLP 21

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
91	Home Farm, Berkswell	2.29	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Meriden	Berkswell	R
92	New Mercote Farm	13.01	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Meriden	Berkswell	R
101	Land at Old Waste Lane/Waste Lane	1.64	40	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁸⁴
102	Land at Meeting House Lane and Waste Lane	6.37	Estimated 149	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁷
169	Blessed Robert Grissold	1.87	Estimated 47	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁷
170	Pheasant Oak Farm	3.51	80	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁸
212	Land at Berkswell Quarry	96.67	Assessed For Employment only In SHELAA	Meriden	Berkswell	R
216	Land at Lincoln Farm Truckstop	4.20	98	Meriden	Berkswell	R
227	Land at Hallmeadow Road	1.81	65	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁹
236	Land off Oxhayes Close	4.25	Estimated 99	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁷
305	North of Balsall Common	20.83	366	Meriden	Berkswell	R
320	Land at Balsall Common, Pheasant Oak Farm, South View Farm and land fronting Waste Lane	8.04	188	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁸
333	2 Lavender Hall Lane	0.03	1	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁸⁴
408	Land at Waste Lane	0.72	23	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁸
414	Land at Hob Lane	12.73	298	Meriden	Berkswell	G ⁹⁸
425	Land at Windmill Lane, Balsall Common	6.56	154	Meriden	Berkswell	R
426	Land south of Broad Lane	31.43	735	Meriden	Berkswell	R
314	Leam Corner House	2.07	49	Meriden	Berkswell & Balsall	G ⁹³
35	Green Meads	1.97	60	Meriden	Meriden	R
81	Land at Fillongley Road, Meriden	3.73	100	Meriden	Meriden	R

⁹⁹ Included as SLP 19

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
105	Land on Maxstoke Lane, Meriden	1.43	43	Meriden	Meriden	R
119	Land at Birmingham Road, Meriden	1.02	30	Meriden	Meriden	G ¹⁰⁰
128	Area G, Meriden	43.32	959	Meriden	Meriden	R
137	The Firs, Meriden	2.24	38	Meriden	Meriden	G ¹⁰⁰
144	Land at Fillongley Road, Meriden	6.66	118	Meriden	Meriden	R
179	Hampton Lane, Meriden	1.78	43	Meriden	Meriden	R
186	Land to east of Leys Lane	0.91	Estimated 21	Meriden	Meriden	R
187	Land to the east of Leys Lane	1.27	Estimated 37	Meriden	Meriden	R
197	Land south of Meriden	34.56	200	Meriden	Meriden	R
211	Land between Main Road and Fillongley Road, Meriden	29.95	Estimated 700	Meriden	Meriden	R
311	Meriden Hall Mobile Home Park Site 1	0.27	10	Meriden	Meriden	R
312	Meriden Hall Mobile Home Park Site 2	0.73	24	Meriden	Meriden	R
420	Land at Meriden - IM Land	7.27	170	Meriden	Meriden	R
Olton						
224	Brookvale	0.54	17	Olton		G ¹⁰¹
400	Western parcel of land at Moseley Cricket club, Streetsbrook Road	1.89	48	Olton		R
Shirley South						
124	Former TRW site, The Green	19.32	226	Shirley South		G ¹⁰²
Silhill						
301	Vulcan Industrial Estate	1.96	55	Silhill	N/A	G ¹⁰³
188	Land at Rowood Drive and associated with Lode Heath School	0.95	31	Silhill		A ¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Included as DLP 10

¹⁰¹ Previously assumed that site would be available for redevelopment for residential purposes, now understood to be redeveloped as a care home so not now included in land supply.

¹⁰² Included as part of DLP 11

¹⁰³ Included as DLP 17

¹⁰⁴ Discussed under Amber sites – see reference A6

Site Ref	Site Name	Gross Area (Ha)	Indicative Capacity	Ward	Parish	Step 2 Conclusion
222	Moat Lane Depot and Vulcan House Industrial Estate	3.05	71	Silhill		G¹⁰³
Smith's Wood						
229	Kingshurst Village Centre	3.56	83	Smiths Wood	Kingshurst	G¹⁰⁵
50	Land at Arran Way	2.24	52	Smiths Wood	Smiths Wood	G¹⁰⁶
51	Jenson House, Auckland Hall and Kingfisher PH	4.27	100	Smiths Wood	Smiths Wood	G¹⁰⁷
219	Land at Buckingham Road	1.33	38	Smiths Wood	Smiths Wood	R
St Alphege						
231	Land at Widney Manor Road	6.76	158	St Alphege	N/A	R
245	Former Rugby Club, Sharmans Cross Road	2.67	62	St Alphege	N/A	G¹⁰⁸
306	Land at Sharmans Cross Road and Arden Tennis Club	4.33	113	St Alphege	N/A	G¹⁰⁹
308	Land between Widney Manor Station & Widney Manor Road	0.31	12	St Alphege	N/A	A¹¹⁰
309	804 Warwick Road	0.18	7	St Alphege	N/A	G⁸⁷
111	Land at Widney Manor Road	4.04	120	St Alphege		R
134	114-118 Widney Manor Road	1.19	22	St Alphege		A¹¹⁰
163	The former Rectory and Glebe land	1.67	17	St Alphege		G⁸⁸
407	Land at Widney Manor Road	1.03	30	St Alphege		R
423	Lovelace Hill, 123 Widney Manor Road	0.99	32	St Alphege		R
331	Widney Manor golf club	44.36	1,038	St Alphege and Blythe		R

443. The indicative capacity is taken from the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)

¹⁰⁵ Included as DLP 7

¹⁰⁶ Site now has planning permission so included in land supply as a site with consent

¹⁰⁷ Included as DLP 15

¹⁰⁸ Included as DLP 18

¹⁰⁹ Not include in land supply as no clear evidence that site is available

¹¹⁰ Site discussed as an Amber site – see reference A7

This page is left intentionally blank

This page is left intentionally blank



**Policy & Delivery
Managed Growth and Communities Directorate
Solihull MBC
Council House
Manor Square
Solihull
B91 3QB**

Email: psp@solihull.gov.uk

Tel: (0121) 704 8008

Web site: www.solihull.gov.uk/lpr

**Online portal for responding to consultation:
<http://solihull.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>**