

Results of NDP 2018 Consultation.

In April 2018 the Parish Council published a Consultation Paper inviting views on possible policies and sites for development for inclusion in a Neighbourhood Development Plan. Every household was sent a summary of the Consultation Paper and a questionnaire with a prepaid envelope to return the questionnaire. The Parish Council organised two open days – one in Tanworth and one in Earlswood – at which residents could ask questions and discuss the issues. In addition the two Residents Associations held public meetings.

A copy of the questionnaire is attached

Questionnaires; Households

289 questionnaires were returned. One was not completed and simply criticised the process

25 households returned 28 extra questionnaires. The Parish Council had anticipated that households containing different views might want an extra questionnaire and could ask for them. However, the extra completed questionnaires are often identical and do not show noticeably different views. For this reason, and because the views of the extra 28 questionnaires broadly reflect the overall results, we have concluded that it is simplest to analyse the results on the basis of one questionnaire per household.

So, 260 completed questionnaires which is 20% of all households in the Parish. All except 19 respondents provided their addresses so that we can analyse the responses by area. Generally speaking views on the issues did not vary much across the Parish

	Earlswood	Tanworth	Wood End	Rest of Parish	No address
Returned Questionnaires	106	40	42	44	28

Very strong response rate from Earlswood

Questionnaires: Businesses

There was a very poor response – only three completed questionnaires were received from nearly a 100 sent out.

Results

The results are set out in detail in Appendix B broken down by village and other settlements. The questionnaire invited comments and Appendix C summarises these..

Respondents were also invited to suggest other sites that should be considered for housing development. Appendix C lists these

Overall views

The questionnaire asked whether respondents agreed with the statement “*Overall I would support the adoption of an NDP that includes the proposals within the Consultation document.*”

The results were extremely positive, with the possible exception of Tanworth, but even here only 22% disagreed.

	Agree Strongly/Agree	%	Neutral	%	Disagree/Disagree strongly	%	
Earlswood	73	69	18	17	15	14	
Tanworth	23	58	8	20	9	22	
Wood End	30	71	7	17	5	13	
Rest of Parish	32	71	8	18	4	9	
No Address	19	68	4	14	5	18	
Total	177	68	45	17	38	15	

Environment : Proposals 1 to 4

There was overwhelming support for these proposals.

Business and Infrastructure: Proposals 8 to 12.

There was overwhelming support for these proposals.

Housing: Proposals 5 to 7

This was expected to be the contentious issue and to some extent it is but there is nevertheless strong support for the general thrust of giving priority to more affordable homes. The issue becomes a bit more contentious when individual sites are considered and there is an element of respondents being less supportive of the development of a local site than of other sites further away.

65% of respondents agree *“that there is a local housing need for more affordable homes in the Parish with only 19% disagreeing and 17% being neutral.”*

	Agree/Agree Strongly	%	Neutral	%	Disagree/Disagree strongly	%
Earlswood	68	64	14	13	24	23
Tanworth	24	60	8	20	8	20
Wood End	27	64	8	19	7	17
Rest of Parish	31	69	6	13	8	18
No Address	18	64	5	18	5	18
Total	168	65	41	16	50	19

Consistent with this 55% of respondents consider that *“the Parish Council should promote a Local Housing Needs scheme on one of the three sites”*.

Of the three possible sites identified the views about their suitability for development were as follows:

Site A: The Common			Site B: Broad lane			Site C: The Butts		
Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
112	61	87	133	65	62	94	73	93

The site behind the Warwickshire Lad would seem to be the most acceptable. The main reasons for considering this site unsuitable would appear to be concerns over access to Broad Lane and traffic.

Unfortunately the questionnaire did not distinguish between the alternative sites in The Common and therefore did not allow respondents to distinguish between the two sites in their responses. It would seem however from some of the comments that opposition is focused on the loss of the existing allotments site. There were several letters to the Parish Council from allotment holders expressing concern that they would have to start all over again. A number of respondents commented that housing on the allotments would not be suitable because of proximity to the Reservoir Pub. Notwithstanding a majority consider a site in the Common to be suitable.

Predictably the Butts lane site is considered least suitable. In part this is due to the outstanding permission for housing on Cank farm, including six affordable homes, and a sense that this is enough for Tanworth. There was also confusion between the very limited possible housing identified as a possibility in the Consultation paper and the Duchy Homes proposals for the site and adjoining land which are much more extensive and which became known during the consultation period. They were invited to speak at the Tanworth Residents Association and it was clear that the opposition to their proposals spilled over onto the much more modest possibility identified in the Consultation paper.

There was strong support for the NDP applying Green Belt policies to development outside the three LSVs.

Possible Supportive Actions by the Parish Council

Residents were asked about possible actions the Parish Council could take in support of the NDP.

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Promote Local Housing Needs Scheme	141	53	66
Work with District Council to improve mobile and broadband	225	33	2
Promote one or more stations to achieve better service	179	64	17
Carry out a study of parking and traffic flows in Tanworth	190	60	10
Influence development on borders to minimize traffic impact on parish	240	16	4

Summary of Written Comments.

The questionnaire issued to every household as part of the consultation exercise invited written comments. The following summarises the comments made. The number in brackets refers to the number of respondents making the same comment.

Housing

Housing Need

- Need smaller houses for downsizing in the area close to parish with better facilities & services
- Need more smaller properties for locals to downsize, (small properties run by a trust) (6)
- Review infill perhaps for smaller dwellings (for downsizing) instead of one/two large properties.
- No support for any housing being built in a Green Belt/rural area. (11)
- No, local housing need should be met by new developments just over the border. (11)
- Local housing needs affordable for local young people/families to stay in the area (with priority for locals (15)
- No social housing.(2)
- Concern about building by the pub and associated security.
- Affordable homes referred to as developers charter. (3)
- *
- Consider smaller plots for housing
- Disagree with Orbit selling off local properties
- We need a mix of affordable/market rate housing

Possible Sites for Housing

- Allotments or land adjacent to 141 The Common
- Allotment land should be used for affordable family homes/downsizing, and relocate allotments to land next to 141 The Common. It is best for smaller homes as amenities close by. (4)
- Building on land next to 141 The Common would impact wildlife and rural life also risk of backland development behind 133 The Common.(2)
- Build on land adjacent to 141 The Common rather than the allotment site. (4)
- Allotment land would be backland development* and impact the “protected view” of the lake boundary. (4)
- Allotment land is trust land, the terms being no housing development
- Allotment holders have spent time and money developing plots. (3) [and many allotment holders wrote individually making the same point]
- Allotments part of village life.

Land behind the Warwickshire Lad

- Wood End site least intrusive on the Green Belt, local services around, for affordable lower cost housing. (8)
- Site unsuitable because traffic on Broad lane at saturation point. (3)
- More suitable for station car park
- Wood End Lane very narrow, poor access onto Broad Lane, wild landscape damaged if widened.(2)

Butts Lane, Tanworth

- Positive impact on village, assuming onsite parking & walk to school. (4)
- Village cannot take any more traffic. (3)
- Disagree with building there. (11)
- Depends on what affordable housing is delivered at Cank farm.(3)
- Affordable homes on Cank farm site outline permission. (2)
- Further diminish the character of the village. (3)
- Any houses should not spoil the views from the churchyard. (4)
- Development here could meet the need for downsizers

Other Sites were suggested

- Danzey Green Lane has houses after the station and towards Tanworth. The other side has only Robin Hood Farm. Fields there should be opened up for development as an extend “in-fill” project.
- Two plots either side of Abbey Farm, the Common
- Land at Tithe Barn Lane (Wych Wood, Butterfield Farm)
- Re-consider Copes site at Forshaw Heath
- National Trust land opposite The Reservoir- National Trust say no
- Build in areas of lower density of population- Wood End/ Butts Lane
- What happened to proposal to use land behind the co-op?
- Develop the site in Valley Road
- Land opposite Rose Cottage in Apsley Heath Lane/Blind lane
- Brownfield site adjacent to Danzey Green station *
- Field below the school
- The triangle between Broad lane/Blind Lane/Arden Leys
- Garden development sites- affordable housing (family members) and design to area

- Paddock by New Cottage, Forshaw Heath Lane (2-3 homes)

Design Guide

- New building design in keeping with existing properties
- Concern on design guidelines as not using modern materials, techniques may result in developments fitting in resulting in poor pastiche rather than progressive attractive development.
- Do not need design guide because Conservation Area is protected and the rest of the Parish is mixed

Transport and Infrastructure

- Parking at Whitlocks End and Wood End) is inadequate.
- No need for increasing parking at statiandons as would be taken by outsiders.
- Increase parking at Wood End station & stations generally remove request stops (3)
- Traffic volume on the Common, and the junction by the Reservoir has frequent accidents so extra traffic a problem if building at allotments. (7)
- No suitable sites in the area. Roads cannot sustain further traffic. (5)
- Traffic volume and speed a problem. (5)
- Parking at Danzey station fine
- Improve rail services especially at Earlswood. (5)
- Improve bus services
- Many new housing sites in the area with no new infrastructure to cope with increased demand. (2)
- Need to develop infrastructure- schools, roads, medical services.
- Lack of local amenities & services.
- Improve broadband.(2)

Environmental Issues

- Protect the Greenbelt and woodland. (8)
- Concerns about housing and light pollution

Business and Local economy

- **Businesses to be owned only by parish residents**
- **Encourage, demand for local business in the area**

Other

- De-list the village halls and the telephone exchange so improvements to the building isn't prevented- historic environment
- Historic environment- include Glebe Farm, Vicarage Hill former country vet premises

SUPPORTIVE ACTIONS BY THE PC

Residents were invited to comment on things the parish Could do to support the NDP

- Tackle traffic issues on the Causeway issues. (4)
- Pay for private security patrols
- Parking issues (2)
- Extra parking at Earlswood Centre crossroads.
- Action on drugs in Earlswood/Anti Social Behaviour. (5)
- More active role with neighbouring authorities concerning housing/infrastructure
- Speeding and traffic/ traffic flow/road safety in Earlswood, Wood End & Tanworth village (speed humps)Forshaw Heath (14)
- Enlarge Tanworth Village School car park
- One way system down Well Lane, along Butts lane & up Doctors Hill. (5)
- Stop WCC painting white lines on the side of road as in Dyers Lane
- Keeping TiA a village and not becoming a suburb of Solihull
- Stop parking on the pavements in TiA
- Residents parking permits for The Green in Tanworth
- No more parking, speed signs in TiA village
- Traffic calming Poolhead Lane.
- Lorry traffic on lanes / damage to lanes & verges
- Maintain the status quo. (2)
- Develop M40 south junction with A3400 to reduce traffic through Hockley Heath
- Extend average speed camera sites in HH to the parish
- M42 J3 road markings to discourage lorries using Poolhead lane. (2)
- Relocate Tanworth school to a new site on east side of Butts Lane. This would relieve traffic issues in the village and site used for housing.

Appendix C Other Sites suggested for housing Development

Residents were invited to identify other possible sites for housing. The following suggestions were made

Vicarage Hill Mr Truslove (owner) Considered and rejected by NDP team because of damage to openness of Green Belt

Doctors Hill Mr Truslove (owner) Considered and rejected by NDP team because of damage to openness of Green Belt

Copes Scrap yard

Merewood Bank Owner. Special circumstances best dealt with as a planning application

Land opposite Rose Cottage, Aspley Heath Resident. Not considered so far – is outside an LSV?