

Minutes of meeting held on 27/7/2016

Present: Steve Lyle, David Wallis, Louisa Jakeman, Tony MacClelland, Andrew Freeman, Gill Griggs

Apologies: Lis Hedley

1. Review report on Survey/ start thinking about Housing Policies for our Plan

A review of the “About You” and “Housing” sections of the Survey created a lively discussion out of which came several views about future issues:

- a) Once the results of the PBA report (copy required) are known and the housing requirements become clearer we will need to start reviewing what a revised built up area boundary might look like.
- b) We also need a copy of the SMBC Green Belt study, which should be completed very soon.
- c) We should try to arrange for us to be invited to future relevant Parish Council Meetings.
- d) Agreement was reached that, from a Housing point of view, our draft policy should reflect the views of the Survey and other resident inputs, even if these appears to be in conflict with policies likely to be contained in the SMBC Local Plan.

Action – All to review proposals from AF for “Housing Related Policy Topics” and “Housing Policies – First Draft”, consider in relation to other Plans and suggest any amendments.

Action – SL to contact JA and BH to investigate thoughts on creating a Plan Preparation Group to guide and coordinate input from 3 sub committees. (Possibly use work already created by AF as a starting point?).

Action – GG to chase SMBC for copies of Green Belt and PBA reports and request our inclusion on Parish Council meetings where appropriate.

2. Start investigating text comments on Housing issues from Survey

As it was felt we needed sight of the analysed text information this was deferred until the next meeting.

Action – SL to ask JA for update from Simon

3. Initial analysis of Developer Day Feedback Forms from Andrew

AF had prepared three documents – a numerical summary of responses received; an analysis of those responses together with a schedule of the comments; an initial post code analysis.

The second document proved to be of most interest. However, the outcome was deemed rather inconclusive overall as there were a lot of conflicting views: e.g. there were a total of 1072 votes for sites deemed “Suitable” and 1077 “Unsuitable”; 7 of the “Most Supported” sites were also on the “Most Opposed” sites list and 3 of the “Most Opposed” sites also appeared on the “Most Supported” sites list! However, the data obtained will still be incorporated into our ongoing Site evaluations.

Action – AF to update documents 1 & 2 with data from the late returns and forward to SL for distribution (done).

4. Review initial Site Assessment proposal from Andrew

AF had also created a “Call for Sites Evaluation” covering all those sites submitted within our area. This included: Potential Capacity, “Fit” with the Resident’s Survey, Developer Showcase score, a general commentary, additional comments, a suitability Categorisation and Recommended Action. Each site was then discussed in detail with a variety of changes and additions being proposed.

Action – AF to update and reflect changes agreed.

5. *Discuss possible further Developer/Builder meeting to help understand dynamics of planning relationships with SMBC*

This proposal was put forward by SL following discussions with the MD of Taylor Wimpey Midlands. After due consideration it was decided that, although such a meeting might be of interest to some, there were enough people on our committee who understood the procedures involved to render a meeting unnecessary.

6. *Consider Earlswood Road Planning Application (Sites 29/210?)*

GG had prepared a proposed letter to Mr Preece rebutting the above. After reading it through a few minor amendments were suggested but it was generally viewed as being relevant, balanced and appropriate.

Action – GG and AF to discuss further and agree some of the legal points then submit to JA for approval before sending to the SMBC (N.B. this needs to arrive no later than 4th August)

7. *Feedback from Applegreen Public Exhibition on M42 J4 Service Area (Site 103?)*

Several members of the committee had visited the above. The general view was: a) the proposal indicated considerable effort had been made to minimise any visual impact on the surroundings, b) there were slight reservations about traffic flow planning (the only access appeared to be off the westbound carriageway), c) it would not significantly affect the separation of KDBH and Shirley/Solihull as a substantial amount of land still remained between the two. Whilst accepting this is not actually a housing related issue, we agreed to await sight of the actual Planning Application once submitted and add details of the issue to the next open Neighbourhood Forum meeting in order gain feedback from residents on their views.

8. *AOB*

A query was raised about the Business and School surveys.

Action - SL to check with JA on the timings of these two surveys and what involvement, if any, Simon was going to have.

Next meeting Wednesday 31st August at 19:30

(No clash with Dorridge Day which is on Sunday 11th September)