
Consultation response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan

15 February 2017

Balsall Parish Council

Balsall Parish Council represents the views of the residents of Balsall Parish. A working party of Councillors have managed the consultation process and independently studied the Draft Local Plan and the evidence base. The Council commissioned independent expert reports based on their research of the Draft Local Plan and evidence base. The Council have conducted an extensive consultation process with our residents. We have had 258 conversations with residents at their homes to listen to their feedback. We contacted every household in the Parish and 283 residents attended and completed feedback forms at an event at St Peter's Hall on 11 February. At this event the Council presented summary information from the evidence base and land promoters made presentations of the three proposed sites for housing around Balsall Common. 13 residents completed feedback forms at the event who had previously provided feedback at their home therefore we base our supporting statements on $258 + 283 - 13 = 528$ total responses.

1. Do you agree that we've identified the right challenges facing the Borough? If not why not? Are there any additional challenges that should be addressed?

The Council would like to reinforce the importance of plans to tackle the following identified challenges which are particularly pertinent to the draft plans impacting the settlement of Balsall Common.

Challenge H – Car use “often” the only form of available transport in rural parts of the Borough.

Challenge N – Mitigating the impacts of High Speed 2.

These are CRITICAL challenges for the remote car dependant current and future residents of the settlement of Balsall Common.

We are particularly concerned at the implications of the highly inaccurate conclusions drawn in the evidence base on the Topic papers (pages 78 and 79). These conclusions are drawn from flawed analysis and mistaken comprehension of the evidence presented in the accessibility study. The conclusion that Balsall Common is medium to high accessibility and therefore suitable for consideration for growth is not justified. Proposed sites for housing to the south and north of Balsall Common have been identified as low accessibility in the accessibility study. The conclusion that the proposed site to the east is of medium to high accessibility is flawed because the analysis includes Berkswell Railway Station as a high frequency transport hub when it does not meet the criteria. However the most significant factor which seems to be completely ignored in the analysis is the fact that the east of Balsall Common will be one of the least accessible locations on the whole of the Borough until at least 2026 because of the impact on the transport infrastructure of the construction of HS2.

New Housing at Balsall Common can only be considered after the construction of HS2 is completed in 2026. The early development of Sites 22 and 23 Solihull Local Plan 2013 has already compromised an existing unsustainable infrastructure capacity. It is the view of Balsall Parish Council overwhelmingly supported by our residents that new housing must be built in a location where facilities such as new school, shops, especially parking, recreation and community space can be accommodated.

Only a Continuous haul route which provides a route for construction traffic to remain within the HS2 construction corridor to avoid construction traffic using the already congested roads of Balsall Common will ensure that existing levels of peak hour congestion are not compounded. We suggest that the haul route is progressed within the Solihull Local Plan to meet challenges H and N.

The haul road for HS2 construction traffic could double as a future relief road, in part at least. This would seem sensible and save a huge amount of money (assuming the location of the haul road was a good one for the purposes of a relief road) but a joined up approach between SMBC and HS2 would be imperative. We understand that Andrew Jones MP Under Secretary of State in the Department of Transport has written to Dame Caroline Spelman MP supporting a scheme: “the LEP are looking at a third phase in the longer term which would extend the link to the west and/or connect it to either the A45 or A452 in order to provide significantly enhanced linkages between Coventry and Warwickshire and UK central which includes the HS2 Interchange, Birmingham Airport and the national Exhibition Centre.”

It is not clear that the need for significant School provision is recognised sufficiently within the challenges. We suggest a specific objective that sufficient school provision is made for increased population of new housing.

2. Do you agree with the Borough Vision we have set out? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

The village centre of Balsall Common does not meet the needs of the existing residents in terms of capacity and access to facilities. There is no space for expansion in the village centre to accommodate facilities for more residents from significant new development on the edge of Balsall Common. The village focus needs to extend towards the railway station and the medical centre.

Opportunities for development need to be considered as part of the master plan for proposed housing to the east of Balsall Common. This was identified in the Scope, issues and options Consultation response by the Council support of growth option A which centred growth within walking distance of the railway station. There is an opportunity for option A to provide a combination of small one and two bedroom affordable housing in combination with retail facilities and parking to meet the needs of the expanding village population. The land next to the medical centre; existing site 19 (Solihull Local Plan 2013) and proposed LPR site ref. 1 closest to Station road would be suitable locations for option A. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents and 88% support building all housing in a location where facilities such as a new school, shops, parking, recreation and community space can be accommodated.

A bypass to relieve the existing and projected increased congestion and to provide access to new developments on the east of the village is critical infrastructure. During our local plan consultation process 72% of residents attending the Local Plan Consultation Event held at St Peter’s Hall on 11 February 2017 support a bypass to relieve the congestion on the roads within our village.

School growth can only be achieved with a suitable site for a new school. Site 1 at Barratt’s Farm has sufficient land to be able to accommodate a new school with extensive green space recreation facilities that can be shared by the community. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 92% support building a new primary school. Many residents expressed the opinion that a second two-form entry primary school and day nursery should be built in the east of the village.

3. Do you agree with the spacial strategy we have set out? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

There is a risk of not sustaining a rural based economy particularly livestock farming.

There is no evidence of the following guiding principles supporting the proposals for Balsall Common.

- Optimising opportunities to bring forward developments that address identified issues within communities and contribute to wider community benefits.
- Making sustainable use of natural resources, including waste and minerals.
- Designing and integrating new developments into existing communities so as to minimise longer term impacts; and
- Contributing to the health and well-being of communities

The proposals in the draft local plan are justified as options E,F and G whereas Balsall Parish Council supported option A with improved train services that justifies the provision of affordable housing that is located to provide good access to employment without the need for a car in Balsall Common.

4. Do you agree with policy P1? If not why not and what alternative would you suggest?

Yes.

5. Do you agree with the key objectives that development is expected to meet as identified in policy P1 are appropriate? If not why not? Are there any others you think should be included?

Yes.

6. Do you agree with policy P1A? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

No comment.

7. Do you agree with policy P2? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

Yes it makes sense to have a policy to develop the retail and commercial centres to build sustainable communities.

8. Do you believe the right scale and location of development has been identified? If not why not?

What is the definition and criteria for a “town centre”? Why not at least apply the principles applied to Solihull, Shirley and Chelmsley Wood centres to Balsall Common? Balsall Common residents have a high proportion of entrepreneurial, educated and professional individuals who use the village as a base and are very mobile. There is an opportunity for a focus of retail activity and services for the local community developed around a much needed improved village centre.

The strategic nature of the increased housing being proposed for Balsall Common is not to meet local growth needs, but to meet the housing needs for Solihull Borough and the wider Housing Market Area. The scale of change facing Balsall Common is potentially overwhelming. It will turn a village into a town. Balsall Parish Council seeks to assist Solihull Council through the Neighbourhood Planning process to manage this growth.

9. Do you agree with policy P3? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

Yes. Additional Land from Green Belt is required for the HS2 line, the M42 junction and the new motorway service station development.

10. Do you believe the right scale and location of development has been identified? If not why not?

No comment.

11. Do you agree with policy P4? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

The 50% affordable housing target needs to be achieved in our village to meet local housing needs. In Balsall Common it would be more sensible that the 50% target is for the whole settlement. A higher percentage of smaller affordable housing should be constructed in developments closer to the station as envisaged in option A in the Scope, Issues and Options consultation. Existing site 19 (Solihull Local Plan 2013) is an excellent location for affordable housing to meet the needs of young and old local people requiring single person households and to meet the market need of newly forming and downsizing households in the village. A dense development of three story apartment blocks would be suitable at this location. During our local plan consultation process 72% of residents attending the Local Plan Consultation Event held at St Peter's Hall on 11 February 2017 supported the need to build more affordable housing within walking and cycling distance of the railway station.

12. Do you agree with the level of affordable housing being sought in Policy P4? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

50% affordable housing as a target for the whole settlement could be achieved by developing a higher percentage of smaller affordable housing in higher density developments closer to the station as envisaged in our preference for option A in the Scope Issues and Options consultation. Option A had the potential to provide affordable housing that meets the needs of local people with a local connection to Balsall Common. Option A has the potential for development of affordable housing that meets the Borough need for older, disabled and young single person households with access to public transport. Option A has the potential to meet the severe shortage of affordable housing for an increasing ageing population and for people with disabilities because of the proximity to the village centre, the medical centre and the railway station. Option A has the potential to provide affordable housing for those on average and lower incomes who currently are unable to find suitable housing in Balsall Common.

The recent 120 houses developed at Kenilworth Road have not achieved the affordable target and have been returned to the market. Recognise the limitations of the less accessible locations for affordable housing and build more high density affordable housing near the station.

13. Which option for the delivering self and custom house building do you favour and why? If neither do you have any other suggestions?

No comment.

14. Do you agree that we are planning to build the right number of new homes? If not why not, and how many do you think we should be planning to build?

We accept your analysis and conclusions for the Borough as a whole but question the distribution of housing and the phasing of housing. Our concerns relating to distribution are addressed in answer to question 16 below.

In the Draft Local Plan it states that phasing also has a role to play in protecting the Borough's communities from an excessive extent of construction traffic associated not only with house building being accommodated, but also from the largest infrastructure project the Borough has accommodated in recent times in the form of HS2.

Balsall Parish Council raised this issue in our response to the Scope, Issues and Options consultation in January 2016. We advised Solihull Council that the phasing of development of new housing in Balsall Common could not be considered until after the construction of HS2 is completed in 2026.

This has not been sufficiently considered in the phasing of housing development in the Draft Local Plan. It is reasonable to expect that of the 15534 new homes to be built in the Borough, that the new homes allocated for Balsall Common are phased to be constructed within the local plan period 2026 to 2033 after the construction of HS2 is completed.

Councillor Courts stated that the response of this consultation will shape the submission version of the plan. Councillor Courts said to the full Solihull Council when introducing the Solihull Local Plan in November 2016 that quote, "HS2 is a massive problem/project. We don't want to see a double whammy with major development in the same area." Balsall Parish Council agrees with Councillor Courts.

Balsall Parish Council suggests that it would be wilfully negligent of Solihull Council to fail to manage the growth by phasing new housing in Balsall Common before 2026. A decision to phase development of new housing in the same area as HS2 construction, creating as Councillor Courts stated "a double whammy", would mean a decision by Solihull Council to actually plan for more chaos.

15. Do you believe we are planning to build houses in the right locations? If not why not, and which locations do you believe shouldn't be included? Are there any other locations that you think should be included?

The urban community that has developed around Balsall Common is to all intents and purposes a single sustainable location. The village of Balsall Common is "divided" artificially by arbitrary Parish boundaries drawn in the past that bear little resemblance to the geographic and urban realities of modern urban living. Whilst differing views may exist between the Parishes about "balancing the share of development" the choice of sites should not be decided on this basis. The decision about which sites to select must be made based on the most appropriate and sustainable sites that serves the holistic urban community. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 88% support building all housing in a location where facilities such as a new school, shops, parking, recreation and community space can be accommodated.

We are concerned that there is great inequity as 1150 houses are proposed for Balsall Common when only 1050 are proposed for Dorridge and Knowle. There are encroachment arguments in relation to the Green Belt at Dorridge and Knowle that we accept. However, Dorridge and Knowle have the infrastructure of two small towns with two highly developed centres full of facilities,

excellent school provision, access to M42, a very frequently served train station and proximity to the employment opportunities of the urban core.

Balsall Common by comparison has very limited facilities of a village in a remote location with underdeveloped infrastructure. Accessibility is a particular problem in Balsall Common and we believe that significant errors have been made in the scores of sites in the accessibility study. The only site which has the potential for good accessibility with the potential to limit the increased use of journeys by car is LPR site ref. 1. However the most significant factor which seems to have been completely ignored in the analysis is the fact that the east of Balsall Common will be one of the least accessible locations in the whole of the Borough until at least 2026 because of the impact on the transport infrastructure of the construction of HS2. This has not been considered in the phasing of housing development. It is reasonable to expect that of the 15534 new homes to be built in the Borough, that the new homes allocated for Balsall Common are phased to be constructed within the local plan period 2026 to 2033 after the construction of HS2 is completed.

The Council suggests that the 115 houses proposed for Frog Lane LPR site ref. 2 is not the right location. We suggest that the ancient medieval Coventry to Knowle road, which forms the existing defensible boundary of Balsall Street and Balsall Street East, should remain the southern border of the village. Breaching the longstanding boundary of Balsall Street East and Balsall Street in one location would in fact make the boundary less defensible for future development south of the road in other adjoining adjacent locations. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 87% support keeping Balsall Street East and Balsall Street as the southern defensible boundary for our village. Release of the strategically critically located land parcel RP59 from the Green Belt would actively threaten adjoining parts and generate pressure for urban sprawl contrary to the green belt purposes. The failure to deliver affordable housing at the recent Crest development of 120 houses in the south of the village is evidence that the Frog Lane will not easily support the desperately needed affordable housing for the village.

At least this number of houses could easily be accommodated by Dorridge and Knowle. Sites that could offer some potential for development and that could warrant additional research are SHLAA site ref. 135 and 104. The sites do not appear to have significant negative SA impacts and the Green Belt has already been encroached into at this point and performs relatively poorly. The sites have acceptable to good levels of access to services and facilities and there is the potential for these sites to deliver up to 170 homes subject to further assessment.

New Housing at Balsall Common can only seriously be considered after the construction of HS2 is completed in 2026. The early development of Sites 22 and 23 Solihull Local Plan 2013 has already compromised an existing unsustainable infrastructure capacity. The accessibility mapping study concludes that sites to the north and south of Balsall Common have LOW accessibility. The piecemeal development of parcels of green belt in the poorly accessible southern location of our village is not a good strategy to integrate new developments into existing communities so as to minimise longer term impacts; and to contribute to the health and well-being of our community. Further development of 200 houses at the Kenilworth Road/Windmill Lane location LPR site ref. 3 with low accessibility should not be considered

We suggest that all housing to achieve the target number of houses for the settlement of Balsall Common can be contained within the development of one location, LPR site ref. 1 Barratt's Farm. This site was identified in the SHLAA in 2012 with the capacity for between 1500 and 2500 dwellings. This location was identified by the Council in support of growth option A in the Scope, Issues and Options consultation which centred growth within sensible walking distance of the railway station.

It is the view of Balsall Parish Council overwhelmingly supported by our residents that new housing must be built in a location where facilities such as new school, shops, especially parking, recreation

and community space can be accommodated. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 88% support building all housing in a location where facilities such as a new school, shops, parking, recreation and community space can be accommodated. The results of the accessibility mapping study conclude that only sites to the east of Balsall Common are of medium to high accessibility.

Existing site 19 (Solihull Local Plan 2013) and LPR site ref. 1 are the only sites with medium to high accessibility. These sites have the potential to build more affordable housing to meet the needs of young and old local people requiring single person households and to meet the market need of newly forming and downsizing households in the village. These affordable homes can be built at site 19 (SLP 2013) and LPR site ref. 1 within walking and cycling distance of the railway station meeting the needs of the local transport plan. This will support the long term goal of the Solihull Local Plan to separate economic growth from increased car use and does encourage a shift to more sustainable forms of travel.

The proposal to concentrate all housing developments within LPR site ref. 1 would also preserve more of the green belt that is immediately adjacent to the current circumference of the village which was considered the most important criteria for site selection by hundreds of residents in their feedback at the site exhibition in August 2016.

16. Do you believe we have identified the infrastructure required to support these developments? If not why not? Are there any additional facilities you believe are required, if so what are they?

Developing the Frog Lane LPR site ref. 2 involves removing the protection of the green belt for the valuable amenity of the playing fields adjacent to Holly Lane. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 96% of residents support keeping the valuable amenity of the Holly Lane playing fields as protected green belt land. The proximity to the primary school is not an advantage because the buildings are at capacity. More housing in this location will increase the congestion. Accessibility scores for this site are not accurate.

Resulting congestion by developing the Kenilworth Road LPR site ref. 3 cannot be accommodated with minor improvements to the A452. Development at this site would require the provision of green space within the development with play equipment for children. The proximity of the primary school is not an advantage because the buildings are at capacity. Accessibility scores are not accurate for this site.

The major infrastructure project of a substantial bypass from the south to north east of the village is required now and would serve as access for proposed housing developments. During our local plan consultation process 87% of residents attending the Local Plan Consultation Event held at St Peter's Hall on 11 February 2017 supported a bypass.

We suggest that all housing to achieve the target number of houses for the settlement of Balsall Common can be contained within one location LPR site ref. 1, Barratt's Farm. This site was identified in the SHLAA in 2012 with the capacity for between 1500 and 2500 dwellings. This location was identified by the Council support of Growth option A in the Scope, Issues and Options Consultation which centred growth within sensible walking distance of the railway station.

The infrastructure requirements such as a new primary school with joint use community recreation green space, cycle paths and footpaths, shops and parking can all be developed as part of one development extending the village at the point which is closest to both the existing village centre and the railway station. There are opportunities within to improve the much needed additional station and community parking within this site. During our local plan consultation process 75% of

residents attending the Local Plan Consultation Event held at St Peter's Hall on 11 February 2017 supported the need for sports and gym facilities; a purpose built community centre.

The concentrated development of new housing with associated new infrastructure and services will facilitate planning from a well designed master plan through to a well structured and controlled implementation.

The proposal to concentrate all housing developments within LPR site ref. 1 would also preserve more of the green belt that is immediately adjacent to the current circumference of the village which was considered most important by hundreds of residents in their feedback at the site exhibition in August 2016.

17. Do you agree with policy P6? If not why not, and what alternative would you suggest?

No comment.

18. Do you agree with the policies for improving accessibility and encouraging sustainable travel? If not why not, and what alternatives would you suggest?

Our residents overwhelmingly support a long overdue bypass for Balsall Common. The village is a notorious borough congestion hot spot and a bypass will relieve existing congestion, and provide better access for new housing developments located as infill within the defensible border of the bypass. The bypass will reduce traffic on the main A452 artery and connecting roads through the village and create the opportunity to incorporate cycle paths within the village to reduce car use for short journeys. During our local plan consultation process 87% of residents attending the Local Plan Consultation Event held at St Peter's Hall on 11 February 2017 supported a bypass to relieve congestion on the roads within our village.

Balsall Common does not currently have a high frequency train service serving the village. At peak times there are only two trains per hour to Birmingham and two trains per hour to Coventry. The waiting period can be 40 minutes even at peak times. This contrasts to the high frequency service at Dorridge where there are seven trains per hour in each direction at peak times. Without an increase in the train service to at least four trains an hour in each direction there is no possibility for the proposed level of housing expansion without a dramatic increase in car use. The Council supported Growth Option A in the Scope, Issues and Options consultation and we support the development of LPR site ref. 1 post 2026 with the condition that the train service is increased to a high frequency service.

Balsall Common does not have a bus service with a daytime frequency of 15 minutes or better. Currently there are two regular bus services that serve the village; the 87 and the 88. The 87 route is between Solihull and Coventry and is an hourly service during the day. There is no evening or Sunday service on this route. The 88 route is between Balsall Common and Solihull and is an hourly service during the day. There is no evening or Sunday service on this route. The current service does not provide an adequate service for existing residents. There needs to be a significant improvement in the frequency of bus service on these routes and additional routes to Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington Spa to provide better accessibility.

Balsall Parish Council in our response to the Scope, Issues and Options consultation in January 2016 advised Solihull Council that there would need to be an upgrading of the train service to Berkswell Station. The Solihull Connect transport policy has no improvement shown for bus or rail transport for

Balsall Common. A realistic plan for how this improvement in public transport is to be achieved must be included in the Solihull Housing Plan. Without this planned improvement there is no justification for the proposed level of housing expansion in the Balsall Common area.

Post 2026 the SPRINT style bus rapid Transit scheme running from central Warwick through Kenilworth and Balsall Common to the Birmingham interchange will provide excellent connectivity to the HS2 line and the Warwickshire towns. The planned introduction of this service post 2026 also supports the rationale that the planned eastern urban extension of the village should not be completed until post 2026.

19. Do you agree with the policies for protecting the environment? If not why not, and what alternatives would you suggest?

In relation to P10 citing feedback from residents attending the Balsall Common Site Exhibition in August 2016 it is critical to establish buffers to any new development so that they connect with existing and created green infrastructure assets. There is an opportunity to achieve this with development at LPR site ref. 1 utilising green space sensibly within the development. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 80% support housing developments with green space between existing households and new housing. Developers should publish a plan to deliver a net gain in biodiversity and geo-diversity.

In relation to P14, we cite the totally unacceptable recent experience of the 120 houses development of Catesby/Crest at Kenilworth Road where a planned children's play area was not delivered and the substitute was only an upgrade of skateboard facilities at Lavender Hall Park. Development of a further two hundred houses at this site would have to include the provision of critical amenity of green space with children's play equipment which was a planning condition that was not met in the early development of sites 22 and 23 (Solihull Local Plan 2013). Catesby/Crest also unnecessarily removed well established trees. Important trees and hedgerows were cited as very important screening by the residents at the Balsall Common Site Exhibition held in August 2016. In relation to P16 the presence of a significant heritage monument the Berkswell Windmill immediately adjacent to LPR site ref. 3 makes it totally unsuitable. The visual amenity of the precious Arden landscape location of this important monument would be severely compromised by more housing developments on this site.

The proposal to concentrate all housing developments within LPR site ref. 1 would also preserve more of the green belt that is immediately adjacent to the current circumference of the village which was considered most important by hundreds of residents in their feedback at the Site Exhibition held in Balsall Common in August 2016.

20. Do you agree with the policies for quality of place? If not why not, and what alternatives would you suggest?

The policies only have value if they are implemented. Unfortunately once again we must cite the dreadful design of parts of the Catesby/Crest development at the Kenilworth Road. Too many buildings are too high and there is over intensification with practically no gardens all compounded by a lack of communal green space. The designs are not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood which was a very important consideration in feedback from residents at the Balsall Common Site Exhibition.

21. Do you agree with the policies health and supporting communities? If not why not, and what alternatives would you suggest?

We strongly support policies P18. A continuous haul route for HS2 construction traffic and a bypass would facilitate the transformation of Balsall Common with cycle paths connecting housing with facilities and the station. This will reduce the effects of pollution on residents, enhance road safety and improve health by encouraging walking and cycling within the village boundary. There will be a significantly increasing elderly population in the village and their mobility will be improved by reducing traffic within the village.

We strongly oppose developing housing south of the Balsall Street East defensible boundary and there is overwhelming support from residents to retain the important green belt protection afforded to the amenity of the playing fields at Holly lane. During our local plan consultation process we have received feedback from 528 residents; 96% support keeping Holly Lane playing fields as protected green belt land. It is recognised that living close to areas of green space directly benefits both physical and mental wellbeing of residents.

There is a risk of an increasingly elderly population in Balsall Common becoming asset rich and cash poor. This will lead to declining housing conditions which could lead to significant impacts of health. We need a vision for Balsall Common and not the piecemeal development of the green belt. The provision of affordable housing for the elderly of the village is a critical consideration in this Local Plan Review. A planned eastern urban extension of the village has the opportunity to create mixed living opportunities of intergenerational relationships for the elderly and young residents of the village. The intelligent development of a high concept community within the eastern urban extension of the village can be planned to enhance wellbeing. The availability of space for new facilities associated with housing and the proximity of the village centre, the medical centre and the railway station make the strategic imperative of growth option A as the best sustainable growth option for Balsall Common.

22. Do you agree with policy P21? If not why not, and what alternatives would you suggest?

Balsall Parish Council supports the general approach to Policy 21. However, the Policy allows for the diversion of funds away from areas with development to other areas of the Borough. We support the principle that all funds raised by development should be spent in the area where they are raised "except in very exceptional circumstances".

Given the scale of proposed development and the infrastructure issues facing Balsall Common Balsall Parish Council considers this approach proportionate. Policy 21 should be modified to prevent the diversion of funds from those areas taking housing "except in very exceptional circumstances".

Balsall Parish Council resolved at our Council meeting on 15 February 2017 to submit this report in response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan consultation ending 17 February 2017.

Glossary of Abbreviations and Terms

Existing site 19 Solihull Local Plan 2013 – land adjacent to the medical centre Hallmeadow Road.

LPR site ref. 1 – Local Plan Review site reference 1; land east of Balsall Common at Barratt's Farm

LPR site ref. 2 – Local Plan Review site reference 2; land south of Balsall Common at Frog Lane

LPR site ref. 3 – Local Plan Review site reference 3; land south of Balsall Common at Kenilworth Road

Land parcel RP59 – land assessed in the Green Belt review bounded by Holly Lane/ Frog Lane

Option A – growth within walking distance of the railway station

Option E – growth by development of UK Central hub and High Speed Rail link interchange

Option F – growth by limited expansion of the rural villages/settlements

Option G – growth new settlements, large scale urban extensions and significant expansion of the rural villages/settlements

Policy P1 – UK Central Hub area

Policy P1A – Blythe Valley Business Park

Policy 2 – Maintain Strong Competitive Town centres

Policy P3 – Provision of Land for General Business and Premises

Policy P4 – Meeting Housing Needs

Policy P6 – Provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers

Policy P10 – Natural Environment

Policy P14 – Amenity

Policy P16 – Conservation of Heritage assets and Local Distinctiveness

Policy P18 – Health and Wellbeing

Policy P21 – Developer Contributions and Infrastructure Provision

SA – Sustainability Assessment

SHEELA – Strategic Housing and Economic Land Assessment

SHEELA site ref. 135 and 104 – Proposed land for development south east of Dorridge

SHLAA – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Sites 22 and 23 Solihull Local Plan 2013 – land brought forward from later phase of the local plan 2013 for early development for 120 houses in the south of the village at Kenilworth Road.