

13 October 2025

For the Attention of Laura Taylor
Solihull Council
Planning Department

By email only

Dear Laura,

PL/2025/01572/PPOL OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS FOR ERECTION OF UP TO 130 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING.

LAND OFF OLD STATION ROAD HAMPTON IN ARDEN SOLIHULL

The Parish Council wish to **object** to this planning application on the basis that it fails to comply with SLP 2013 Policies P5, P7, P8, P14 and P15. You may recall that an application (PL2023/00694/PPOL) for development again off Old Station Road, but nearer to Meriden Road, was refused on the grounds that it did not accord with Policies P5, P7, and P15 of the SLP. Since the site currently being considered is further away from the village facilities, it is not unreasonable to arrive at the conclusion that this site should be refused for identical reasons. Outlined below is a little more detail relating to the specific issues with this development on a policy-by-policy basis.

POLICY P5 Provision of Land for Housing

Para 4 states “New housing will be supported on unidentified sites in accessible locations where they contribute towards meeting identified borough-wide housing needs and towards enhancing local character and distinctiveness. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, new housing will not be permitted in locations where accessibility to employment, centres and a range of services and facilities is poor”.

As we will indicate in the next section when we deal with Policy P7 the site is not in an accessible location and does not enhance local character and distinctiveness. We do recognise that the LA cannot show a 5-year land supply that it makes less than a 1% contribution to the Boroughs annual need.

POLICY P7 Accessibility and Ease of Access

Based on the refusal of the earlier application mentioned above this site should be refused on the same basis.

The railway station and bus stop are approximately 1.2km, the village centre, GP surgery, recreational facilities, and primary school are even further. For much of the route between the site and the Meriden Road there is no footpath and little room to create one. We remain to be convinced that land can be taken from the highway to provide such a footpath as is suggested

in para 5.11 of the Design and Access Statement because of the varying width of the road itself. The distances quoted in Para 3.2 of the Design and Access Statement are outside those in Policy P7 and cannot agree with the last paragraph which states *“the site is within an acceptable walking distance of areas surrounding Hampton-in-Arden, as well as some local facilities this area have to offer. Hampton-in-Arden Village can be accessed by foot via existing infrastructure to the south of the site”*.

Local Plan Policy P7 Accessibility and Ease of Access require: -

- *development to be within 800m walk of a primary school, doctors, shops (**this development - 2.1/2.3km from centre of development**).*
- *within 400m walk of a bus stop with high frequency services. Hampton’s bus service is not high frequency and has no service on Sundays (**this development 1.6km from centre**).*
- *within 800m walk of a rail station with high frequency services (**this development 1.6km from centre**).*

Based on the above we fail to see how the applicant in Para 6.18 of the Transport Assessment summarises by saying *“Having regard to the above, it is considered that the site benefits from good levels of accessibility by sustainable modes and has a range of local amenities within proximity. Access to the site on foot and by cycle is of a good standard and there are several bus and train services within proximity providing access to a range of local destinations”*.

The distances highlighted in bold text, far exceed those detailed in the policy, the development is in not in conformity with Policy P7.

Para 155c of the NPPF also states a development is not inappropriate if it’s in a sustainable location. We suggest based on the distance of the site from main facilities, this site is not in a sustainable location and conflicts with the NPPF and fails to meet the criteria in Policy P7 in the SLP 2013 and should be refused.

POLICY P8 Managing Demand for Travel and Reducing Congestion

Para b) of this policy states *“The use of sustainable modes of transport, i.e. walking, cycling and public transport, shall be promoted and encouraged in all developments by:*

- Ensuring the design and management of the development enables and encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport.*
- Ensuring transport planning measures are implemented to help and encourage people accessing the development to use sustainable transport modes.*
- Ensuring the routes to the site from nearby services and local public transport stops are good quality, direct and attractive to use for all users”*.

Based on the information contained in the section above. Based on the location of the site to main village facilities and the public transport network we fail to see how this development meets these criteria.

POLICY P14 Amenity states *“The Council will seek to protect and enhance the amenity of existing and potential occupiers of houses, businesses and other uses in considering proposals for new development and will: e. Permit development only if it respects the*

amenity of existing and proposed occupiers and would be a good neighbour; and para vii says vii. Seek to minimise the adverse impact of noise. Development likely to create significant noise will be permitted only if it is located away from noise sensitive uses or it incorporates measures to ensure adequate protection against noise. Noise sensitive development will be permitted only if it is located away from existing sources of significant noise, or if no suitable alternatives exist, the development incorporates measures to reduce noise intrusion to an acceptable level”.

The layout of the development and its proximity to many of the existing residents we suggest impacts on the amenities currently enjoyed. However, our main concern is one of noise. The applicant suggests acoustic fencing and bunds to mitigate against noise from the railway and the M42, however no information is provided to indicate what type of acoustic fencing will be used and therefore it's difficult to establish the acceptability of it in this rural location. We do have a major concern that this location is subject to significant noise from the activities of Birmingham Airport and whilst mitigation may be able to limit internal noise during winter months residents wanting to open windows during hot weather and wishing to enjoy their gardens will be exposed to significant levels of noise making it almost impossible to enjoy this amenity without significant disturbance. We fail to see how this type of disturbance can be mitigated against but suggest this site is in an inappropriate location.

POLICY P15 Securing Design Quality states “*All development proposals will be expected to achieve decent quality, inclusive and sustainable design, which meets the following key principles:*

- i. Conserves and enhances local character, distinctiveness and streetscape quality and ensures that the scale, massing, density, layout, materials and landscape of the development respect the surrounding natural, built and historic environment”.*

We believe this proposal is in total conflict with criteria in this clause. The effect of the development is that the rural character of the area will be changed with a more developed feel and appearance, urbanising it. The development shown in the illustrative layout shows housing densities out of keeping with the existing environment and cannot be said to be enhancing local character as required by Policy P5 mentioned earlier in this response. The layout of this development creates a totally alien style environment when compared to what currently exists. The proposal does not enhance or conserve local character, it does not ensure that scale and density respect the surrounding environment not in our view create a sense of place.

The NPPF in para 8 states: - “*Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):*

- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure.*
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe*

- places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and*
- c) *an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built, and historic environment, including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy”.*

A 130-home estate is disproportionate to the village's size. It would represent a ~20% increase in housing stock and is out of step with the 'limited and proportionate' growth supported by the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan Policy HOU2 which states “All new developments will have regard to the Hampton-in Arden Village Design Statement and, where appropriate, the Conservation Area Appraisal. New developments in the Parish should:

- *be within the Inset Area noting that any Rural Exception Sites will be outside the Inset Area.*
- *respect the existing settlement pattern and retain the character of the village, including maintenance and extension of footpath links.*
- *maintain overall balance and provision for all sections of the community with appropriate density of land use.*
- *be gradual to allow new residents to be assimilated into village life.*
- *protect and enhance existing open spaces and greens (including Local Green Spaces) within the village.*
- *ensure that new development achieves the highest possible standards of environmental performance through sustainable design and construction including Secured by Design.*
- *retain or enhance the street scene and avoid development to the rear of existing properties which adversely affect them”.*

This development proposal fails to meet this policy in the areas highlighted in yellow for the reasons stated throughout this response.

Traffic Impacts in Old Station Road and on the wider village:

What is currently a little used field access will be transformed into an estate access road with associated constant traffic noise and movement, increasing at peak times. Some 130 dwellings have the potential to result in at least 260 additional cars. This creates increased traffic noise and impacts on the relative 'tranquillity' of this part of Old Station Road. There will be a significant impact on the junction of Old Station Road and Meriden Road, which may well require traffic management of some sort, be it a roundabout or traffic lights, which will create an element of urbanization to this area of the village. In terms of the impact on the village itself. Roads in and out of the village are narrow and increasingly congested and parking is already a major problem around the local village facilities as SMBC Highways are aware. Being a car dependent development we can only see this situation getting worse with apparently no real solution.

Sustainability

Is the development sustainable? Para 8 of the NPPF 2025 states: -

“Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different

objectives):

*a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;*

*b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and*

*c) **an environmental objective** – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy”.*

Taking each objective in turn the first being **Economic Objective** - based on the information relating to Policy P7 and P8 earlier in this response, we suggest that the site fails to be in accordance with this objective.

Social Objective - based on the distance of this site from the village services and public transport (P7/P8 again apply) we suggest that the services are **not accessible**.

Finally dealing with the **Economic Objective** - the development does nothing to protect or enhance the historic village of Hampton in Arden.

The NPPF 2025 requires sustainable development in the right locations whilst protecting and enhancing the countryside. This development fails in meeting some or all areas of these objectives.

Summary

The development fails to meet at least 4 policies in the Solihull Local Plan 2013, Policy HOU2 in the Hampton in Arden Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2028 and therefore the Hampton in Arden Parish Council respectfully requests that this application be **refused**.

Yours sincerely



JULIE BARNES

**Clerk, Financial & Data Protection Officer
Hampton in Arden Parish Council**