

## Examiners Questions

	Question	Section/Para No.	Steering Group Reply
1	More than one representation objects to the assertion in paragraph 6.16 of the Plan that “The NDP provides robust evidence for the forthcoming Green Belt Review about to be prepared by Bromsgrove District Council”. This assertion is wrong because it is not actually the case and neither would it be appropriate for the NDP to present evidence on a strategic issue such as the Green Belt.	Natural Environment Para 6.16	<p>The Steering Group would accept that the final sentence of para 6.16 could be amended slightly to something like:</p> <p>"It is hoped that the NDP will provide useful background information about the area and local residents' concerns when future strategic planning decisions related to the Bromsgrove District Plan Review and other matters are taken by Bromsgrove District Council."</p>
2	It may be reasonable for this part of the text to record the concerns of residents, as in paragraph 6.15, but it is not appropriate for a document on the verge of becoming part of the Development Plan to assert a position on a strategic matter, as in paragraph 6.16. Do you have any comments on this line of thought?	Natural Environment Para 6.15	
3	Representations note related issues within the wording of the Plan Objectives (page 16). An overriding issue is the use of the “We” opening to each Objective; these are the Plan objectives not ones personal to any one body or group. Looking at some of the Objectives individually:	Vision & Objectives Para 4.2	The objectives could be slightly reworded, replacing "We will" with "To". For example "To protect the built, historical and natural environment ..." in Objectives
4	<p>Objective 1: Even though a “where possible” has been included, Objective 1 seeks to protect the Green Belt, which is beyond the scope of a NDP.</p> <p>Further a representation notes that the review of the Green Belt will be looking at its compliance with the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and none of these is about protecting the rural feel of places.</p>	Vision & Objectives Para 4.2	We would agree to replace Objective 1 with; “The plan will aim to protect the built, historical and natural environment ensuring that our green spaces are protected”.

5	Objective 2: How the Parish Councils engage with the Green Belt Review is entirely at their own discretion, but the Plan cannot be used to engage in strategic matters which are beyond the scope of a NDP.	Vision & Objectives Para 4.2	Objective 2 – we could change to: "and use this plan to help the Parish Councils engage in the District Plan Review of Bromsgrove District Council."
6	Objective 5: I believe that the Objective inverts what the Policies are worded to achieve; is not the intention to ensure that infrastructure is provided appropriately for planned development and growth, not the other way around?	Vision & Objectives Para 4.2	Objective 5 - could change to: "to ensure that infrastructure is provided appropriately for planned development and growth and that existing constraints are considered and addressed in new proposals wherever possible
7	Objective 8: This seems to be a restatement of the Vision in different words?	Vision & Objectives Para 4.2	We do not feel that we need to make a change to objective 8. This is an overarching objective and refers to "local distinctiveness and contributes to a sense of place and well-being" which the vision does not.
8	A representation has note the discrepancy in dates between the Vision statement and the Plan period on the front cover – presumably there has been a typographical error in the former?	Vision & Objectives section 4.1	We acknowledge typo-should state 2018-30 not 2038.
9	Whilst its nature and purpose is clear I wonder how much Policy NE1 adds to rather than potentially confuses the guidelines already contained within the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance and the Lickey and Blackwell Village Design Statement; only guidelines 5, 6 & 7 appear to relate to matters specific to the Neighbourhood Area.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	<p>We accept the examiner's point and propose to re-number 5,6,7 as 1,2, 3 whilst retaining the others guidelines and renumbering accordingly.</p> <p>We have taken from the Worcs. Lands. Char. Assmt. (WLCA)To create this policy. We would like to keep this because many of those who could be voting on the NDP at referendum will not have read the original WLCA doc. or other associated documents</p>
10	<p>In guideline 1:</p> <p>The term “primary hedgerows” appears to rely on a definition provided outside of the Neighbourhood Plan rather reinforcing the concern about the interplay between the Policy and Worcestershire Guidance.</p>	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	<p>We would like to retain the term ‘primary hedgerows’ as it is used in the WLCA. Please refer to Worcestershire Council's Landscape Type Advice Sheets for Planning and Development <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/download/809/planning_and_development_advice_sheets">http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/download/809/planning_and_development_advice_sheets</a></p> <p>Primary hedgerows are long established hedgerows.</p> <p>Landscape Type Advice Sheet - Planning and Development Wooded Hills and Farmlands</p> <p>Opportunities for Landscape Gain This notes: "There may be opportunities to plant new hedgerows, restore, strengthen or protect existing hedgerows</p>

			<p>and their patterns, and promote appropriate management – in terms of maintenance regimes and protection from stock. The species composition of existing primary (long established) hedgerows should be noted and used to guide the composition of new hedgerow planting. Fencing and other uncharacteristic boundary treatments could be removed and replaced by hedgerows."</p> <p>Landscapes of Worcestershire Landscape Type Advice Sheet - Planning and Development Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land Use notes:</p> <p>"The defining pastoral land use of these landscapes is becoming diluted due to increased arable cultivation. Hedgerows lose their function and in turn may become neglected. Over the past years hedgerows have been removed, resulting in larger fields and a change in the scale of the landscape and, although the Hedgerow Regulations should now reduce such direct damage, deteriorating management is likely to continue. The loss and deterioration of hedgerows in turn threatens the survival of the hedgerow tree populations. Hedgerow trees, together with linear tree cover associated with watercourses, are particularly important, providing the defining tree cover element of these areas.</p> <p>There may be opportunities to plant new hedgerows, restore, strengthen or protect existing hedgerows and their patterns, and promote appropriate management – in terms of maintenance regimes and protection from stock.</p> <p>The species composition of existing long established hedgerows should guide the com-position of new hedgerow planting. Fencing and other uncharacteristic boundary treatments could be removed and replaced by hedgerows. "</p>
11	Guideline1: Whilst I am not an expert, my understanding is that there are no “native” berberis and pyracantha as is suggested.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	We would delete: ‘native berberis and pyrocantha’
12	Guideline 1: A representation expresses concern that an “appropriate scale” for replacement trees is unexplained.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	We propose to add in : ‘which grows to an appropriate scale within the character of the area’.
13	Guideline 4 refers to “permanent pasture around the edges of existing settlements” but it is unclear and unexplained why these pastures in particular are key to avoiding the merger of settlements. A representation points out that some of these pastures might contribute a sustainable extension to an existing settlement, and this could be achieved without a threat of merging. The part of this guideline relating to historic field patterns ought also to subject to the “where possible” caveat.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	<p>We agree that ‘where possible’ could be added The above advice sheet also sets out that: " The remaining areas of permanent pasture can often be of significant biodiversity interest and initiatives to safeguard them should be strongly promoted in these areas."</p> <p>The advice sheet goes on to explain:</p> <p>"The distinctive settlement pattern of this Landscape Type - scattered farmsteads and groups of wayside dwellings - is best perpetuated by the avoidance of significant new development. Creating clustering or settlement nuclei through new development is inappropriate to the characteristic settlement pattern while current planning guidance precludes dispersed settlement in the landscape in general. Consequently, significant amounts of new development will generally be discouraged from these landscapes, being better sited in those landscapes where settlement clusters and nuclei are appropriate."</p> <p>Landscape Type Advice Sheet - Planning and Development Wooded Hills and Farmlands Opportunities for Landscape Gain</p>

			<p>This notes:</p> <p>"Within the farmed areas, the upper slopes may include areas of permanent pasture of botanical interest."</p> <p>Therefore there are landscape character and biodiversity reasons why primary hedgerows and areas of permanent pasture should be protected.</p>
14	In guideline 5 it is unclear whether viewpoint A is from the top of Old Birmingham Road or whether it is views "from" everywhere else toward that point.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape Map 4	We propose deleting this viewpoint altogether
15	Map 4 that is referenced here surely shows the locations referred to as "viewpoints" rather than, as the title says, "Photographic Locations"?	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape Map 4	We will change the map title to 'Photographic Viewpoints'
16	In guideline 6 there may be many potential interpretations of the term "impacts". I believe that if 'and addressed' is added to guideline 5 after "considered" then the need for the largely repetitious guideline 6 falls away.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	Guideline 6 - could be deleted if "and addressed" is added to 5 as suggested
17	In guideline 9 there appears to be a stray inverted comma.	Natural Environment Policy NE1 Local Landscape	We acknowledge the guideline 9 - typo and we will delete the inverted comma at the end
18	I note that "Wildlife Importance Areas" are divided into two categories: SSSIs and LWSs but on Map 5 the key, confusingly, shows the latter as	Natural Environment NE2 Para 6.23	We propose to change the wording in the text to match the key on the map. In policy NE2 we could change the terminology to 'Areas of Wildlife Importance' from 'local wildlife habitats', we will label everything in the text as 'Areas of Wildlife Importance'.
19	"Areas of Wildlife Importance" and the Policy refers to these as "local wildlife and habitats" and later "biodiversity networks and wildlife corridors"; because of the shifting terminology it is difficult to interpret whether these all mean the same thing or not.	Natural Environment NE2 Para 6.23	We note that the terminology is inconsistent and propose to amend and replace the first paragraph of NE2 with 'Development proposal that impact on Areas of Wildlife importance identified on Map 5 (p.35)...'
20	In paragraph 6.29 it is suggested that "it is important for our [the] NDP to protect the reservoirs and surrounding Green Belt area from development as required in the	Natural Environment Para 6.29	6.29 – we agree - "inappropriate" could be added before development.

	NPPF”; but as is clear from the quotation from the NPPF and representations, there is no absolute protection from all development and accordingly ‘inappropriate’ is needed immediately before “development”.		
21	As noted in paragraph 6.30, “Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of ....designated sites”; therefore the ‘according to their significance’ needs to be added to the first paragraph of Policy NE2.	Natural Environment Para 6.30	WE agree to the suggested changes to Policy NE2 : ‘according to their significance’ needs to be added to the first paragraph of Policy NE2
22	The third paragraph of the Policy says “Ponds are protected” but it is unclear whether this means that higher level policies already protect all “ponds” or whether it is intended that Policy NE2 “protects” ponds; whichever is the case, absolute “protection” should not be implied and it is difficult to see why paragraph 1 would not include ponds. A representation notes that a “where possible” needs to be added to sentence 2 of paragraph 3.	Natural Environment Para 6.30	Policy NE2 third paragraph - could change to "Ponds should be protected"
23	Paragraphs 6.30 and 6.33 appear to be duplicates.	Natural Environment Para 6.30 and 6.33	Noted, we will remove 6.33
24	Paragraph 6.42 says that “Policy NE3 a GI approach to new development....with a higher level of detail relevant to the Neighbourhood Area; I would question whether there is actually any additional detail provided and it is often a lack of detail that will give rise to confusion.	Natural Environment NE3 Para 6.42	We suggest removing ‘with a higher level of detail relevant to the Neighbourhood Area’ in 6.42
25	Paragraph 1 says it relates to “New development” but most if not all of the development for which the Plan provides is on brownfield land and below the scale where these provisions would be relevant.	Natural environment Policy NE3	We should delete ‘New’ Should be ‘Development
26	The target audience for Paragraph 2 is unclear; it reads more as a	Natural Environment	We disagree and think that para 2 in the policy is a requirement for GI networks referencing LBCH

	statement of fact.	Policy NE3	
27	Paragraph 3 refers to “examples” but it is unclear why those “examples” have been chosen; this does not seem to imply a very integrated approach. Would “footpaths, bridleways, cycleways” ever not be appropriate?	Natural Environment Policy NE3	Noted, we would suggest deleting the 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph.
28	Paragraph 6.41 notes the Bromsgrove DC commitment to a GI network but paragraph 4 of Policy NE3 appears to expect the network to be created and sustained by developers?	Natural Environment Policy NE3 Para 6.41	Noted, we would suggest deleting the final line/paragraph
29	I note that the headline here suggests a Policy applicable to a specific, significant part of the Neighbourhood Area. Whilst the geology of the area is described, no mapped detail is included or referenced. The Policy NE4 wording however, appears to be non-area specific and it is difficult to see how the development for which the Plan provides is likely to affect or be affected by geodiversity; I note that the area referenced in the headline is already the subject of higher level protections. Your consideration of where Policy NE4 provides additional detail for the Neighbourhood Area would be helpful.	Natural Environment Geodiversity Policy NE4	We have links to maps to include in the text or the appendices:  for the whole site and explanation <a href="https://ehtchampions.org.uk/ch/worcestershire-sites/lickey-hills-quarries">https://ehtchampions.org.uk/ch/worcestershire-sites/lickey-hills-quarries</a> Map of the geology: <a href="https://ehtchampions.org.uk/ch/wp-content/uploads/Geo-Champs-Panel_50.jpg">https://ehtchampions.org.uk/ch/wp-content/uploads/Geo-Champs-Panel_50.jpg</a>
30	Whilst the context for Policy BD1 is well described, the need for the Policy and the clarity of the wording are much less clear. Given that there is existing material describing the significance of the Conservation Area is Policy BD1 serving any additional purpose?	Built Heritage BD1 Barnt Green Conservation Area	We propose deleting the policy and also providing a reference to the NPPF.
31	Paragraph 1 of Policy BD1, if paraphrased, says ‘proposals impacting on the Conservation Area must demonstrate careful consideration of any potential impacts on the setting of the conservation area’ but surely first	Built Heritage BD1 Barnt Green Conservation Area	

	consideration should be for the nature of their impact on the Conservation Area itself?		
32	There is no specific reference to heritage assets such as listed buildings either within or within the setting of the Barnt Green Conservation Area. The issue addressed by paragraph 1 appears to be addressed with greater clarity within the NPPF.	Built Heritage BD1 Barnt Green Conservation Area	
33	Paragraph 2 requires that the prospective developer “describe” the significance of any heritage asset, but that description and comparative assessment is provided for each designated heritage asset by its official listing. The issue addressed by paragraph 2 appears to be addressed with greater clarity within the NPPF.	Built Heritage BD1 Barnt Green Conservation Area	
34	Paragraph 3 refers to Character Appraisal areas, by which I presume is meant the three areas of Shepley, Fiery Hill and Cherry Wood, though I don’t believe these have previously been termed ‘Character Areas’. Whilst such detail is specific to the Barnt Green Conservation Area the Policy expectation can only be applied by reference to the source Character Appraisal material and I wonder therefore whether Policy BD1 adds any detail to policy material already being implemented. Your consideration of where Policy BD1 provides additional detail for the Neighbourhood Area would be helpful.	Built Heritage BD1 Barnt Green Conservation Area	We suggest deleting the last 6 words - ‘as described in the character appraisals’.
35	Paragraph 7.19 notes that the character appraisal for the Blackwell, Lickey and Cofton Hackett settlements is available as a “background document”; however the wording of several paragraphs of Policy BD2 binds developers to “take into consideration” the appraisals. Despite the prominence afforded to the appraisals the website shows a link to an “unfinished joint Character	Built Heritage & Design Para 7.19 and Policy BD2 Encouraging High Quality Design.	We would like to assure you that work is ongoing with the character appraisals and we will have the completed documents on our website very soon.

	Appraisal for Lickey and Blackwell and Cofton Hackett”; the status of the character appraisal(s) and the use of multiple references therefore need clarification. A representation questions the accuracy of the reference within the Character Appraisal to land at Cofton Lake Road since the private ownership of parts of the land is not acknowledged.		
36	Policy BD2 does appear to have regard for the NPPF expectation (para 59) that Plans should “avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally”. However the wording of the Policy does have shortcomings (beyond the character appraisal issue noted above): Principle 1 inappropriately seeks to bind Bromsgrove DC to a particular approach in their review of the Green Belt.	Built Heritage & Design Encouraging High Quality Design BD2 Principle 1	We suggest removing the last sentence of the guideline.
37	In Principle 2 “significant and unacceptable increases” is open to a wide interpretation. The NPPF says (para 58), whilst acknowledging that policies “should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics”, policies should “optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development”. It may therefore be sufficient for reliance to be placed on an assessment of the “character of the surrounding area”.	Built Heritage & Design Encouraging High Quality Design BD2 Principle 2	We agree and would suggest removing ‘significant and unacceptable’ from the policy.
38	In Principle 3 I am unclear why regard should be had for the WCC Parking Standards “where possible”?	Built Heritage & Design Encouraging High Quality Design BD2 Principle 3	We suggest removing ‘wherever possible’ in line with WCC parking standards



39	In Principle 5 I am uncertain that every development at whatever scale will be able to “identify and include opportunities for positive change”; I think that this is a “where possible”.	Built Heritage & Design Encouraging High Quality Design BD2 Principle 5	We agree and suggest inserting ‘where possible’
40	In Principle 6 it is unclear why the opening reference to the character appraisals is insufficient and why the “Victorian and Edwardian properties” have been singled out for mention, particularly since this sits uneasily with Principle 7 which says that “proposals need not imitate earlier architectural periods or styles”.	Built Heritage & Design Encouraging High Quality Design BD2 Principle 6	We would suggest changing ‘positively’ to ‘sympathetically’ and prefer to make no other changes
41	In Principle 7 it is said that “New buildings should follow a consistent design approach”; I presume this is meant to relate to ‘each development’ rather than ‘every development’ but even then it is difficult to see a justification for this requirement when the “character of the surrounding area” is unlikely to demonstrate such a characteristic.	Built Heritage & Design Encouraging High Quality Design BD2 Principle 7	We suggest deleting the 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last sentence – ‘New buildings...roofline to the building’.
42	It is unclear why the issue of “Backland development” justifies its own Policy when it is the type of issue that might adequately be addressed within the “settlement principles” which are the subject of Policy BD2. This concern is rather reinforced by the confused nature of Policy BD3:	Built Heritage & Design Policy BD3 Garden and Backland Development	We feel that this is an important issue in the BDC area. We propose to delete ‘rear’ & ref 8.198 of BDC district plan. We propose to rename the policy ‘Residential Development in Gardens’ We feel no other change is needed
43	Paragraph 1 says that the Policy is concerned about the loss of “mature trees, hedges and shrubbery” but paragraph 3 requires that “buildings should be sited and designed to protect existing mature trees and hedgerows on the site”. It is also unclear at what point the loss of back garden amounts to a “substantial increase in the density of built form”.	Built Heritage & Design Policy BDP3 Garden and Backland Development	We agree that this requires change – densification/openness is important in our area, we feel that it erodes the character of our local area, could you please suggest how we could reword this?

44	Paragraph 2 appears to extend to all “private gardens” not just rear gardens; there is also a lack of clarity as to how a developer could “support the need for higher density development” other than to show that there is an acknowledged housing requirement for the Neighbourhood Area and Policy H1 supports the provision of additional housing within existing settlements.	Built Heritage & Design Policy BD3 Garden and Backland Development	We suggest changing the wording from ‘where such development schemes are considered acceptable’ to ‘where such development schemes are proposed’
45	The protection of “the residential amenity and privacy of neighbouring occupiers” referenced in paragraph 3 only apparently becomes an issue after “such development schemes are considered acceptable.	Built Heritage & Design Policy BD3 Garden and Backland Development	We propose to remove the word ‘acceptable’
46	A representation notes that the Policy could be self-defeating since it will frustrate the delivery of a sufficient quantum of housing thus making the need for the release of Green Belt land the more likely. Do you have any comments on this line of thought?	Built Heritage & Design Policy BDP3 Garden and Backland Development	<p>We have taken advice from Bromsgrove District Council and would propose not making any changes: Rear garden development was raised as a concern by residents and they believe this is a concern.</p> <p>The revised NPPF also states in para 9 that " Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area." In addition para 122 sets out that "Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account: ...</p> <p>d) the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change." The NDP area is a relatively prosperous area and is not in need of regeneration. Therefore the desire to maintain the area's character and setting is the higher priority. The criterion cross references to Policy BD3 which provides more detailed justification.</p>
47	A Neighbourhood Plan, particularly one on the verge of becoming part of the Development Plan, should not be used as a campaigning document. Accordingly the references to the Parish Council activities around the Green Belt Review, as included in paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9, should therefore be omitted.	Housing Para 8.8 and 8.9	We agree and suggest we Remove the last 2 sentences of 8.8 and in 8.9 delete ‘Both PCs ...Green Belt Review’ (4th sentence).
48	I note that Policy H1 is titled “New Housing within Existing Settlements” but the Policy wording provides also for “Development of previously developed land in the Green Belt”. The NPPF (section 9) does not provide for unconstrained development in the Green Belt even of previously developed land; accordingly I believe that Policy H1 should keep within the	Housing Policy H1	We agree and suggest that we remove ‘Development of PDL in the Green belt’ and replace with ‘Development’

	range described in the title.		
49	Looking at other aspects of the Policy: Is criteria 2 appropriate if all the sites are within existing settlements?	Housing Policy H1	We feel that we should retain the policy as it covers access to more rural areas of the NDP. Not all parts of the built up area have good access to public transport - the point about high levels of car traffic on narrow lanes and the need to provide more sustainable alternatives is made in Section 9.
50	Within criteria 3 I am puzzled as to why "odour" should be a factor for residential development.	Housing Policy H1	Criteria 3 - "odour" could be deleted. Should it be "disturbance"?
51	Is criteria 4 relevant if all the sites are within existing settlements? Your comments on these lines of thought are invited.	Housing Policy H1	We propose to delete this criteria 4 as the actual problem is referred to elsewhere
52	The first paragraph of Policy H2 uses the future tense whereas 'is encouraged' would seem more appropriate.	Housing Policy H2 Housing Mix	We agree with your comment and will change as suggested to 'is encouraged'
53	The evidence from which the approach of paragraph 2 is drawn is all quite old – 2010 and 2011. A representation points out that smaller dwellings are vacated as families grow and move into larger family dwellings. I think the best that Policy H2 can do is the require developers to evidence regard for current, local housing requirements and the needs of older and younger households in particular. Do you have any comments on this line of thought?	Housing Policy H2 Housing Mix	This is supported by BDP7 and the most up-to-date evidence. We agree with your comment and would suggest adding in; 'The mix of housing will be informed by the most recent evidence and should have regard for current, local housing requirements and the needs of older and younger households'.
54	Whilst I can see that Policy H3 is based on some evidence of need, unfortunately a Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015 said: "From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings".	Housing Policy H3 Energy Efficiency	We agree with your comment and propose to change "should" to "are encouraged to".

	Accordingly whilst the Policy might 'encourage' an approach it cannot make it an obligation. Your comments on this line of thought are invited		
55	I note that within paragraph 9.6 there is a repetition of the sentence regarding the popularity of cycling.	Infrastructure para 9.6	We note the typo and will remove second " Cycling is a popular pastime and..."
56	Within Policy INF1 paragraph 2 it is unclear what "measures" to be provided might imply; an obligation re traffic speeds that extends to the whole Plan area is both unreasonable and unrealistic. As a representation notes, the obligation regarding electric charging points might more appropriately be expressed as an infrastructure requirement. The representation from the County Council notes that all developments must meet the requirements of the Council's Streetscape Design Guide, which could be referenced here or within Policy BD2.	Infrastructure Policy INF1 Supporting walking and cycling and improvements in local transport infrastructure	We note your comment and we would suggest:  removing the words 'developers should provide measures which' and replace with 'New development should consider'.  add in 'where possible' to the last para re: electric charging points.  Reference the streetscape design guide and include in appendices
57	The very specific requirements of Policy INF2 are not peculiar to the Neighbourhood Area and largely relate to larger scale developments incorporating open space for which the Plan does not provide. I would have thought it would be sufficient to include this matter briefly within Policy BD2 with a suitable reference for the detail.	Infrastructure Policy INF2 providing Safe and Accessible Environments for all	We agree with your comment and would like to include this in BD2, could you please suggest appropriate wording?
58	Within Policy INF3 there is no purpose in saying that telecoms infrastructure will be "actively" encouraged since such an obligation cannot be put on the officers of Bromsgrove DC. The expectation that "any new development" will have a superfast broadband connection cannot realistically extend to small infill developments; the expectation may be more realistic for larger	Infrastructure Policy INF3 Communication Technologies	Perhaps we should change "actively encouraged" to "supported" Perhaps change "Any" to "Wherever possible". In a built-up area most, if not all, new development could link to existing networks.

	developments.		
59	On the face of it, it would avoid repetition and duplication if Policies CF1 and CF2 were merged;	Community Facilities Policy CF1 Protecting existing community facilities and supporting investment in new facilities	<p>We agree that CF1 and CF2 could be merged. CF1 4th criterion could be deleted.</p> <p>We would suggest adding some supporting text to explain that the PCs will work with Worcestershire County Council on Highways and traffic management.</p>
60	The fourth criterion of Policy CF1 is not a land use issue and therefore ought to be omitted from both Policies.	Community Facilities Policy CF1 Protecting existing community facilities and supporting investment in new facilities	
61	In relation to Policy CF2 I note that Barnt Green Sailing and Fishing Club is located outside the Neighbourhood Area and therefore this should not be included within either Policy.	Community Facilities Policy CF2 Protecting existing open spaces and recreational facilities and supporting investment in new facilities	Part of the sailing club waters are in Cofton Hackett, we propose updating our map of Open Spaces to indicate this.
62	It would seem, prior to viewing their scale and locations, the sites proposed for designation as Local Green Spaces are appropriate. However, Planning Practice Guidance notes, "If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space" (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID 37-011-20140306). Your comments are invited on whether the proposed Local Green Spaces are already sufficiently protected. I would also comment that my Report is going to recommend that the Spaces are identified on larger scale maps so that there can be no ambiguity about the boundaries of the designated areas.	Community Facilities Policy CF3 Local Green Spaces	<p>We propose updating our map of Open Spaces. We have taken advice from Bromsgrove District Council on this point:</p> <p>They feel that it is fine including the Green spaces as it is locally specific. BDP25.3 does protect designated and undesignated areas of outdoor open space, sport and recreation.</p> <p>Open space survey: 7.47 highlights a clear deficiency of provision in the Parish of Cofton Hackett (Bromsgrove North).</p>
63	For clarity I feel that the first part of	Commercial &	We agree and we would suggest that we should start B1 with criterion 4.

	Policy B1 ought to start with the stipulation that it applies to certain parts of the Neighbourhood Area only, rather than leave it to criterion 4 for this to be revealed.	Business Interests Policy B1 Supporting Appropriate Local Enterprise	
64	In Policy B2 the opening words before the colon do not match with the wording of criterion 2. It is unclear whether Policy B2 is to apply across the Neighbourhood Area but paragraph 90 of the NPPF is potentially more restrictive on the reuse of buildings in the green Belt.	Commercial & Business Interests Policy B2 Supporting Home Working	We propose to take out 'it would be part of...' in B2.2
65	The wording here has been overtaken by events but this section might usefully commit to keeping the impact of the Plan monitored and Plan reviews at least every 5 years. Would you agree? Representations note that a commitment to review the Plan following the adoption of the new Bromsgrove Local Plan would be appropriate.	Next Steps	Yes we agree with your point and await your advice.
66	Now that the Plan has completed all its formal consultations, these quotations have served their purpose (and are now out of date). Would you agree?	Appendices National Planning Policy Context	We agree and we suggest removing this section.
67	These leaflets help to add some further insight into the character of the area but it would be useful to know from where they might be obtained or downloaded.	Appendices Lickey and Blackwell Tree Leaflets	We will make sure that they are available on our PC website and include a reference.