

## **December 2016 UPDATE**

### **Schedule of Modifications to Bromsgrove District Plan**

The schedule below is intended to record and highlight minor editorial corrections, amendments, factual updates and clarifications to the Bromsgrove District Plan. These alterations are not considered to represent changes that would need to be consulted upon as they do not have any material effect on the meaning or direction of the plan and its policies. They represent instead an opportunity to make minor alterations to the plan to improve its readability, clarity and accuracy.

New wording in italics- *italics*

Deleted wording is struckthrough- ~~struckthrough~~

Minor typos not included below

Page Number	Policy/Paragraph/table	Proposed wording/correction	Reason for change
1	Contents	<b>1. Introduction and Context</b> Background Content What has influenced this Plan? Duty to Cooperate The Local Enterprise Partnership <del>What happens next? 5</del> <del>Can I still get involved? 5</del>	Update for intended adoption version
1	Contents	9. Implementation and monitoring	Correction
2	Introduction and Context 1.5	The Plan reflects national and local aims for reducing carbon emissions. It also contributes to the Council's agenda of improving the quality of life and health of the residents of Bromsgrove which is set out in the Bromsgrove Priorities section of the Single Sustainable Community Strategy for Worcestershire 2011-2021. The Plan will be the starting point for the development of Neighbourhood Development Plans by local communities and for decisions on all new development proposals. <i>As there are a substantial number of Parishes in the District (19) it is anticipated that Parish Councils will continue to play a prominent role in this process. There will also be support for Neighbourhood Planning initiatives proposed in non-parished areas.</i>	Highlight importance of neighbourhood planning
3	Introduction and Context 1.9	<b>Evidence from a number of studies about the District, including but not exclusively:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment Land Review 2008/2012</li> </ul>	Correction

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012</li> <li>• Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment</li> <li>• Strategic Flood Risk Assessment levels 1&amp;2 (2008 and 2012)</li> <li>• Water Cycle Study Outline (2012)</li> <li>• Settlement Hierarchy Study 2012</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Baseline Report 2012</li> <li>• Retail Study 2013</li> <li>• Viability Assessment 2014<del>3</del>?</li> <li>• Annual Monitoring Reports ongoing</li> </ul>	
4	Introduction and Context 1.11	<p><b>Involvement of key stakeholders and local communities, including consultation on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues and Options - 2005</li> <li>• Issues and Options - 2008</li> <li>• Redditch Growth Joint Consultation - 2009</li> <li>• Draft Core Strategy - 2010</li> <li>• Draft Core Strategy 2 - 2011</li> <li>• Housing Growth Joint Consultation 2013</li> <li>• Bromsgrove District Plan (2011-2030) – 2013 <i>Proposed publication Submission</i> Version (current)</li> </ul>	Correction
4	Introduction and Context 1.12	A summary of the consultation carried out and how it has influenced the Plan is contained in the Consultation Statement which is a separate evidence base document. <del>A brief summary of the key consultation issues is detailed in each policy under the sub heading of consultation feedback.</del>	Update for intended adoption version
5	Introduction and Context 1.21 -1.27	<p><b><del>What happens next?</del></b></p> <p><del>The Bromsgrove District Plan (Proposed Submission) will go out to publication for the statutory 6 week period, during which time representations from all interested parties on issues of soundness will be welcomed. All of the main issues raised will then be summarised and responded to.</del></p>	Update for intended adoption version

		<p>In due course the final version of the plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State and the submitted document will be made available.</p> <p>Once submitted, the BDP will be subject to independent examination to ensure the Plan is sound and for compliance with Duty to Co-operate, legal and procedural requirements. Soundness of a Plan is defined in the NPPF as being “positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with National Policy”.</p> <p><b>‘Positively prepared’ means that the Plan must:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements</li> <li>● Be consistent with achieving sustainable development</li> </ul> <p><b>‘Justified’ means that the document must be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Founded on a robust and credible evidence base</li> <li>● The most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives</li> </ul> <p><b>‘Effective’ means that the document must be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Deliverable</li> <li>● Based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities</li> </ul> <p><b>All Local Plans will be tested to make sure that they are legally compliant. They must:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Be prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme (a timetable) and in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the relevant local planning Regulations;</li> <li>● Be subject to Sustainability Appraisal meeting the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive;</li> <li>● Have regard to national policy in the NPPF;</li> <li>● Have regard to any Sustainable Community Strategy for its area.</li> </ul> <p>The submitted document will then be considered at an</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Examination in Public to be conducted by an independent</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inspector who will determine whether the plan is sound.</li> </ul> <p><b>Can I still be involved?</b> The preparation of the Plan has been progressing for some time and you may already have been involved in earlier consultation periods. The Plan includes a summary of key issues from previous consultations and describes how this has influenced the Plan. Whether or not you have been involved in any of these earlier stages however, there is still the opportunity for you to be involved by commenting on the soundness of the Plan as detailed above.</p> <p>Publication of the District Plan is timetabled for <b>30 September 2013</b> and the publication period will run <b>for 6 weeks</b>. We will need to consider all of your representations on soundness before a final submission version can be issued and therefore if you have any comments on soundness they must be received by the District Council by <b>5pm on Monday 11th November 2013</b>.</p> <p>Please send the completed form to: <b>The Strategic Planning Team, Planning and Regeneration, The Council House, Burcot Lane, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B60 1AA</b></p> <p>Or alternatively email a copy of the completed response form to <b>strategicplanning@bromsgrove.gov.uk</b></p> <p>To find out more about the Bromsgrove District Plan (2011-2030) Publication Version you can visit the Council's web page at <b>www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/bdp</b> Alternatively you may wish to speak to an officer on <b>01527 881316</b>.</p>	
10	2.31	...a high quality multi-modal interchange at Bromsgrove is currently planned ( <i>now</i>	Update

		<i>built 2016)...</i>	
11	Key Challenges 3.1	3) Meeting the growth needs of the District up to 2030 and beyond by ensuring that there is an <del>adequate</del> a supply of appropriate housing and employment land thus providing certainty for the development industry.	Clarification
11	Key Challenges 3.1	12) Celebrating and conserving the District's individuality as an attractive and safe place with a unique historic built environment and landscape which is <i>geologically and</i> biodiversity rich.	Clarification
13	Vision 4.12	These include the Lickey, Clent and Waseley Hills, canals, ancient woodlands, areas of nature conservation, biodiversity, <i>geodiversity</i> and landscape character, together with Conservation Areas, listed buildings and their settings, all of which will have been carefully protected, conserved and enhanced.	Clarification
15	6.2	The context for each policy is first provided, <del>then a brief feedback on consultation and the Sustainability Appraisal is given</del> and then finally the actual policy is highlighted in bold typeface.	Updated document
15	Key Diagram 7	<b>Key Diagram and Policies Map</b>  The Key Diagram (at the bottom of this page) diagrammatically illustrates, the spatial strategy set out within the document. <i>Where possible, the policies of this Plan appear in greater detail on the Policies Map. The Policies Map should be read in conjunction with the Bromsgrove District Plan.</i>	To provide greater clarity
16	BDP1 8.5 - 8.8	<b>Consultation Feedback</b> <del>8.5</del> Consultation feedback was generally very positive in relation to this policy with many supporting the policy in its current form. Some did feel that the policy should be removed as it repeated national policy however following the publication of the NPPF it was considered that the policy went beyond the level of detail provided in the new national guidance. It is considered that the policy draws on a wide range of planning issues to provide a clear and concise list of criteria against which all applications can be assessed.  <del>8.6</del> Some felt the policy could be strengthened to make it more deliverable and also be more positive in relation to the natural environment, making a specific reference to the significance of historic assets	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>and their settings and clearly referencing walking, cycling and public transport. Some also considered that there should be an explanation in relation to the final bullet point that refers to the economic implications for the District. Some minor wording changes were included to add further clarity and strength to the policy but some of the wording changes were considered to overlap and repeat other policies. The wording 'In considering all proposals for development regard will be had to the following' has not been amended as stronger wording could be considered too onerous, as all of the criteria will not be relevant to all applications.</p> <p><del>8.7</del> The policy has been expanded significantly to include a version of the model policy on the presumption in favour of sustainable development to ensure conformity with the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>The policy was assessed against the SA objectives and was one of the strongest performing policies due to the overarching nature of the policy. The policy performed well against social, environmental and economic objectives. There were no recommendations for mitigation.</p>	
	BDP1	<b>BDP1 Policy Sustainable Development Principles</b>	Correction
	BDP 2	<b>Small 'Settlement'  (population circa  50-2500)  Adams Hill  Belbroughton  Beoley  Blackwell  Bournheath  Burcot  Clent  Cofton Hackett</b>	Reordered in alphabetical order and insertion of Rowney Green and Lower Clent to align with previous policy

		<b>Dodford</b> <b>Fairfield</b> <b>Finstall</b> <b>Holy Cross</b> <b>Hopwood</b> <b>Lower Clent</b> <b>Romsley</b> <b>Rowney Green</b> <b>Stoke Prior</b>	wording
18	BDP2 8.14-8.17	<b>Consultation Feedback</b> <del>8.14 The inclusion of a settlement hierarchy was supported although some felt that it was based solely on population size and therefore further supporting evidence was needed. Some felt that a fourth tier should be added to the hierarchy to better define the types of settlements and include greater clarity over the types of development permitted within each type of settlement. Some considered that Blackwell, Cofton Hackett and Stoke Prior should form part of a higher tier and all other smaller settlements the fourth. However it is not considered that this approach is entirely robust as some of the smaller settlements, whilst they do have a lower population sometimes have a greater range of services and facilities, such as Belbroughton and Romsley, than the three identified allegedly 'higher order' settlements. It is however considered that there is sufficient flexibility within the policy to allow appropriate development to come forward in the settlements not 'washed over' by Green Belt. Furthermore to exactly define what types of development that would be allowed in each settlement type was considered too inflexible and following the publication of the NPPF, being prescriptive about the types of allowable development would not be in conformity with the spirit of this guidance. Some also raised concerns over the position of particular settlements within the hierarchy and the omission of certain settlements, for example, Tardebigge and Hunnington. The settlement hierarchy evidence acknowledges that not all settlements are included in the hierarchy, particularly the smaller settlements within the Green Belt which are sometimes purely ribbon development and/or with very limited sustainability credentials.</del>	Text not required in final version of the Plan



		<p>8.15 There were concerns raised that the policy effectively prohibited garden land development which can form an important part of housing supply and that mention of this aspect was inappropriate in the settlement hierarchy policy. Whilst the discussion of the issues around brownfield land was originally considered valid in this policy, following a redraft of the policy this issue has been relocated to the high quality design policy.</p> <p>8.16 Some considered that it was not necessary to make reference to the maintenance of a 5 year supply as it was repetition of national policy. Others considered that the release of development sites should be carefully managed through the plan period. It was also suggested that some of the proposed development sites should be retained as ADRs. On reflection it was considered that these issues would be better dealt with in the policy on Future Housing and Employment Development.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.17 The strength of the policy is that it underpins the sustainable development strategy for the District in that future development will be focussed on the most sustainable settlements which contain a range of services and facilities. The policy therefore provides the basis for focusing growth in sustainable locations whilst acknowledging the importance of allowing some growth in the villages.</p>	
22	BDP3 8.26 & 8.27	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.26 In accordance with the responses received, the plan period has been extended so that it in excess of a 15 year period is covered. In addition the Council has amended the housing and employment targets so that they are based on the most up to date evidence as suggested by some respondents. Concerns were also raised over the failure to address the growth needs of Redditch and Birmingham. The policy has been altered to reflect the concerns in relation to cross boundary growth. The key evidence for this is the Worcestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012 (SHMA) and the Employment Land Review Update (2012).</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>  8.27 The policy performs well against a number of social and economic objectives due to the delivery of housing and creation of new jobs. However, the policy performs less favourably against some of the environmental objectives due to the loss of greenfield land and the potential loss of Green Belt towards the end of the plan period.</p>						
22	BDP3	<b>BDP3 Policy Future Housing and Employment Growth</b>						Correction
22	BDP3 (table)	BDP43 Development Targets						Correction
		<b>BDP 3 Development Targets</b>						
		<b>BROMSGROVE</b>			<b>REDDITCH <i>within Bromsgrove District</i></b>			
		<b>Type of development</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	<b>Type of development</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Timescale</b>	
		Dwellings outside Green Belt	4,700	2011-2030	Dwelling units	3400	2011-2030	
					<i>Employment land</i>	<i>10 ha</i>	<i>2011-2030</i>	
					<i>in hectares (ha)</i>			
		Green Belt Review	2,300	2023-2030				
		Employment	28ha	2011-2030				

		land in hectares (ha)				
23	8.29		... the total amount of land required will be approximately <del>330</del> 320 ha, including: <del>128</del> 118 ha to deliver 2,300 dwellings until 2030...			
24	BDP4 8.37-8.39		<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b>  <del>8.37 Most of the comments on Green Belt came from other policies, such as the development sites and employment policies. Comments on Green Belt were contradictory, a considerable amount of comments considered that the Council should do the Green Belt review now to ensure sufficient land is available for development, which should also include leisure development and allow businesses in the Green Belt to expand. At the same time, many considered that Green Belt should be protected from development and some suggested that several designations of Areas of Development Restraint (identified in the existing local plan adopted in 2004) should be changed to Green Belt.</del></p> <p><del>8.38 There were also some suggestions to provide further protection for the Green Belt, for example, to remove the right to retrospective planning and give higher priority to the openness of Green Belt. There were also comments on the policy repeating national guidance contained in PPG2 Green Belts.</del></p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>  <del>8.39 The policy performs strongly in relation to environmental and social objectives in terms of identifying land for future housing in sustainable locations which could additionally contribute to maintaining the viability of the Town centre and local centres.</del></p>			Text not required in final version of the Plan
25	BDP4 and BDP4.1		<p><b>BDP4 Policy Green Belt</b></p> <p><del>The general extent of the Green Belt as indicated on the Policies Map will only be maintained as per BDP 4.2</del></p>			Correction and Clarification
28	BDP5A 8.55-8.59		<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b>  <del>8.55 A wide range of consultation responses were received in relation to the policy</del></p>			Text not required in

		<p>and in particular the choice of site allocations. Across all the sites a range of issues were raised including traffic congestion; lack of infrastructure; loss of greenfield land; impact on biodiversity and pollution. However, it is considered that many of the matters can be addressed through the implementation of this policy, for example, the policy seeks to retain important biodiversity features and implement a strategy to manage traffic. Planning contributions will be sought where appropriate to deliver new and improved infrastructure. It is acknowledged that development will result in the loss of greenfield land, however, there is a lack of suitable brownfield alternatives and there is a high level of housing need in the District. It is also important to note that the sites were identified as Areas of Development Restraint (ADR) in the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (Adopted 2004) which means that they were identified for future development and are not in the designated Green Belt.</p> <p>8.56 Wording changes were also sought by some respondents to CP4A (now BDP5A). Some felt that criteria i to viii contained elements of repetition of either other Bromsgrove District Plan policies or national policy and were also too generic. Detailed local assessments have identified issues that are particularly relevant to the urban extensions and Officers therefore consider that it is important that these issues are addressed and dealt with strategically in the development of BROM 1, BROM 2 and BROM 3.</p> <p>8.57 Other respondents considered that the criteria could delve into greater detail on issues such as highway improvements, ecological connectivity, SuDS and heritage assets. It was also suggested that the policy should seek to maintain 40% open space, set a maximum limit for retail floor space and remove the terminology 'landscape geodiversity features'. The Council made some of the proposed changes in relation to highway improvements and SuDS however some of the proposals were considered to create unnecessary duplication with other policies in the plan. The Council considered the imposition of a 40% open space target and a retail target was too prescriptive and could unduly constrain development.</p> <p>8.58 The Council have continued to gather evidence in relation to the sites and</p>	<p>final version of the Plan</p>
--	--	--	----------------------------------

		<p>engaged with relevant stakeholders which have resulted in minor changes to the capacities of each of the sites.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>  <del>8.59 The policy performs well against a number of SA objectives for several reasons including the delivery of affordable housing, job creation and access to facilities and services. The policy performs less favourably against some of the environmental objectives due to the loss of greenfield land and the loss of high quality agricultural land. However, given the lack of brownfield alternatives available and the presence of much high quality of agricultural land around the town this is inevitable. The recommendation for mitigation is the creation of a detailed Masterplan that addresses a full range of issues including biodiversity and green infrastructure.</del></p>	
29	BDP5A	<b>BDP5A Policy Bromsgrove Town Expansion Sites Policy</b>	Correction
32	BDP5B 8.62	Two small development sites are located on the northern edge of the existing residential area of Alvechurch. The first site, which has an area of approximately 1.06 hectares, is located on the corner of Birmingham Road and Old Rectory Lane and is predominantly in agricultural use or is grassland. The second site has an area of around 0.6 hectares and is located to the rear of houses fronting Birmingham Road, with a branch of the Worcester and Birmingham canal located to the western boundary, as shown on map 2. At the time of writing outline planning permission for 25 dwellings has been received for the Birmingham Road/ Rectory Lane site (13/0026). Land adjoining Crown Meadow, Birmingham Road, Alvechurch has full permission for 27 dwellings (11/0672) <i>and the development has now been completed.</i>	Factual update
32	BDP5B 8.63	Also included in the list of other development sites is land at Barnt Green, identified as an 'unzoned area' in the Bromsgrove District Local Plan (BDLP). The site has a developable area of approximately 5 hectares (this excludes Cherry Hill Coppice, the Barnt Green Inn and the cricket pitch) and is identified on map 3. At the Public Inquiry held into the Proposed Modifications of the BDLP the Inspector identified that the site at Barnt Green was a suitable location for some ADR provision. Following a	Factual update

		High Court challenge whereby the views of the Inspector were upheld and after due consideration, BDC now concur with this view. The boundary of the site has been redrawn to show the developable area and the remaining 'unzoned land' has been placed into the Green Belt as it should have been shown previously on the Proposals Map. At the time of writing the site has outline (11/0741) and reserved matters (13/0522) planning permission for 88 dwellings and construction is underway(11/0741).	
32	BDP5B 8.64	This site is located to the north western edge of the residential area of Catshill, to the rear of houses fronting Stourbridge Road and bounded in part to the north by the M5. It totals some 6.04 hectares in area, is vacant and has a watercourse running through it, together with associated flood plain and is shown in map 4. This site now has reserved matters planning permission for 80 dwellings (12/0586) and is now complete.	Factual update
33	BDP5B 8.68	This development site is located south of existing residential development at Scaife Road, south/west of St Godwalds Road and in relative close proximity to Bromsgrove railway station, as shown on map 6. This site comprises almost 8 hectares of land and has planning permission for 181 dwellings following a reserved matters application (12/0708) and is now under construction.	Factual update
33	BDP5B 8.69	Comprises two development sites located to the north (Bleakhouse Farm) and east (Selsdon Close) respectively of the existing residential area at Wythall, as shown on map 7. The first site is approximately 6.3 hectares in area and the second smaller site has an area of approximately 3.1 hectares. At the time of writing the land at Bleakhouse Farm has outline planning permission for 178 dwellings (12/0912). Selsdon Close has planning permission and all 76 homes are now under construction.have now been completed.	Factual update
33	BDP5B 8.70-8.77	<b>Consultation Feedback</b> <del>8.70 A wide range of consultation responses were received in relation to this policy and in particular the choice of site allocations. Across all the sites a range of issues were raised including traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure, loss of greenfield land, impact on biodiversity and air quality. It is considered that many of the matters can be addressed through the implementation</del>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>of the District Plan as a whole which, for example, seeks to address noise and pollution issues, retain important biodiversity (as part of Green Infrastructure) and implement a strategy to manage traffic. Planning contributions will be sought where appropriate to deliver new and improved infrastructure. It is acknowledged that development will result in the loss of greenfield land, however, there is a lack of suitable brownfield alternatives and there is a high level of housing need in the District.</p> <p>8.71 Wording changes were also sought by some respondents to ensure development sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow flexibility as to how the 40% affordable housing is allocated.</li> <li>• Reflect and incorporate flood management measures to protect and enhance the District's watercourses</li> <li>• Retain and enhance Green Infrastructure and incorporate SuDS</li> </ul> <p>8.72 Many of the proposed changes were appropriate however these amendments were considered to create unnecessary duplication with other policies in the plan.</p> <p>8.73 Concern was raised regarding the loss of certain assets, such as the cricket pitch and Barnt Green Inn on Barnt Green development site, which was never the intention but was not clear in the Plan. Therefore the Barnt Green development site map has been amended to clarify the specific developable area.</p> <p>8.74 The Catshill development site boundary map has been amended to reflect what is considered to be the developable area.</p> <p>8.75 The Council recognise the importance of continuing to liaise with relevant stakeholders to discuss any further site issues.</p> <p>8.76 Submissions for alternative sites were received, predominately for Green Belt sites which would be considered in the event of a Green Belt review. The Council will</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>continue to gather information from developers regarding realistic capacities and delivery time scales for sites and update the SHLAA and subsequent versions of the Plan accordingly.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>  <del>8.77</del> The policy performs well against a number of SA objectives for several reasons including the delivery of affordable housing, job creation and access to facilities and services. The policy performs less favourably against some of the environmental objectives due to the loss of greenfield land. However, the proposals do not result in the loss of Green belt land. Given the lack of brownfield alternatives available within the District the loss of some greenfield land is inevitable. The recommendation for mitigation is the creation of a detailed masterplan that addresses a full range of issues including biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p>	
34	BDP5B	<b>BDP5B Policy Other Development Sites Policy</b>	Correction
43	RCBD1.2	<p>Two sustainable mixed use urban extensions (<del>Foxlydiate</del> <i>Foxlydiate</i> and Brockhill) are proposed adjacent to the west and north of Redditch Town which will deliver two new sustainable communities. The two development sites, as shown on Page 44, will provide a minimum of 3400 dwellings and comprehensive provision of associated new infrastructure to meet some of Redditch's housing requirements up to 2030. These sites are currently designated as Green Belt; however exceptional circumstances exist to allocate these sites to meet development needs. These developments will create balanced communities that fully integrate into the existing residential areas of Redditch, addressing the social, economic and environmental elements of sustainable development, whilst being sympathetic to the surrounding rural areas of Bromsgrove.</p>	Correction
43	RCBD1.5.1-RCBD1.5.2	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b>  RCBD1.5.1 A wide range of consultation responses were received in relation to the policy and in particular the choice of site allocations. Across all of the sites a range of issues were raised including traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure, loss of greenfield/Green Belt land, impact on biodiversity and pollution. However, it is considered that many of the matters can be addressed through the implementation of this policy, for example the policy seeks to retain important biodiversity features</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan



		<p>and implement a strategy to manage traffic. Some infrastructure requirements will be provided as part of any new development and where appropriate planning contributions will be sought to deliver new and improved infrastructure. It is acknowledged that development will result in the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land, however there is a lack of suitable brownfield alternatives and there is a high level of unmet housing need in the Borough.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>RCBD1.5.2 The policy performs well against a number of SA objectives for several reasons including the delivery of affordable housing, job creation and access to facilities and services. The policy performs less favourably against some of the environmental objectives due to the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land. However, given the lack of brownfield alternatives available this is inevitable. The recommendation for mitigation is the creation of a detailed Masterplan that addresses a full range of issues including biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p>	
45	RCBD1.1	<b>RCBD1.1 Policy Redditch Cross Boundary Development</b>	Correction
47	BDP6 8.81- 8.85	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.81 From previous consultations there was support for the development of a CIL in the District, although it was highlighted that economic viability was fundamental. With Consultants being employed to address viability it is considered that this concern has been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>8.82 Concerns were raised about the second paragraph of the DCS2 policy where it stated that all forms of development should aim to benefit the local community taking account of its needs and aspirations. It was considered that this goes beyond the realm of what is permitted by relevant legislation; however the Council considers that most developments provide direct benefits through the creation of new homes or jobs and therefore the policy does not place an unreasonable burden on applicants. Whilst the wording has now been removed from the policy the reference to an improved quality of life for residents still maintains the stance of delivering a net benefit.</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>8.83 Some felt the policy could be written in a more flexible way highlighting that contributions could go directly to local communities or Parishes as deemed appropriate. It was also considered necessary by some to highlight that any money should be spent within 5 years and if not returned to the developer. The Council recognises the validity of the points raised but considers these matters should be addressed within the CIL as the document progresses and will in any case be governed by the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>8.84 There were requests for additional information to be included in the policy. Several respondents felt that Green Infrastructure should be highlighted as a possible area for contributions. Whilst the Council agree that Green Infrastructure could be a possible area for contributions a definitive list of possible areas for contribution is no longer included in the policy. This is considered to be more flexible and will not impede the process of developing a charging schedule within the CIL. It was also felt by some that the New Homes Bonus (NHB) and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) could also be mentioned. The Council considers that NHB and TIF are not planning obligations and therefore have not included references to these in this policy.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.85 In terms of the sustainability appraisal the policy performed strongly against social, environmental and economic objectives due to the overarching nature of the benefits of contributions. No mitigation was identified for this policy.</p>	
49	BDP7 8.95-8.97	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.95 There was support for the policy although some thought it was inflexible and too prescriptive. It was felt that the Council should be trying to deliver a wider mix of homes reflecting need, demand and the existing mix of dwellings. The evidence supporting a focus on smaller dwellings was questioned as developers argued that people tend to buy the largest property that they can afford rather than buying to meet actual needs. It was considered that trying to micromanage supply in such a</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>way could compound affordability problems.</p> <p>The Council considers that there are already a high proportion of larger dwellings in the District and therefore it is essential to build smaller dwellings to meet the needs of first time buyers and people of retirement age. It is considered that the policy is sufficiently flexible to deliver a wide range of dwellings across the plan period.</p> <p>8.96 Some respondents felt that a density target was unnecessary as they felt that planning should be design-led instead. It was considered that applying a density target could constrain the quality of a development. In a District that is approximately 90% Green Belt it is essential to make prudent use of land to minimise Green Belt release in the future. However, the Council recognises the importance of having a design-led approach and therefore density targets have been removed. The emphasis is now on making efficient use of land whilst achieving a high quality design outcomes without imposing prescriptive density targets.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.97 The Policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and performs well against a number of social and environmental objectives due to its emphasis on meeting housing needs, creating mixed and balanced communities and minimising the use of greenfield land. No weaknesses were identified.</p>	
49	BDP7	<b>BDP7 Policy Housing Mix and Density</b>	Correction
51	BDP8 8.107-8.111	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.107 Consultation feedback highlighted that there was widespread support for the policy on affordable housing although some concerns were raised. It was identified by some respondents that the policy should be supported by up-to-date evidence. Following the completion of the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and the Worcestershire SHMA this matter has been addressed and the policy has been amended to reflect this robust and up to date evidence.</p> <p>8.108 Some felt that the policy was too prescriptive and should be more flexible in terms of the percentage target and the mix and tenure of affordable units to be</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>provided. The Council acknowledges that it is important to be flexible with the tenure mix to ensure that the types of homes needed most in a community are delivered. Therefore the tenure mix and dwelling sizes is now proposed to be negotiated on a site by site basis.</p> <p>8.109 Some respondents felt that the policy should mention affordable rent as a type of affordable housing. The Council agreed with this comment and a reference to affordable rent is now included.</p> <p>8.110 Some felt that clarity was needed as to whether the policy only applied to the net gain in dwellings whilst others felt an SPD was needed to provide further clarity and detail generally. The Council considered that the policy already provided clarity on the issue of net gain and generally the policy provided sufficient detail so that an SPD may not be required in the future.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.111 The assessment of the policy within the Sustainability Appraisal has identified that the policy performs well against some of the social objectives due to the delivery of affordable housing and the creation of mixed and balanced communities. Due to the nature of the District, some the affordable housing will be on greenfield land meaning the policy performs poorly against some of the environmental objectives.</p>	
52	BDP8	<b>BDP8 Policy Affordable Housing</b>	Correction
53-54	BDP9 8.117-8.118	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.117 The issue of rural exception housing was previously addressed within the affordable housing policy but has now been given greater prominence in a policy of its own so greater detail can be provided. This reflects the importance of this method as a way of delivering affordable housing and also the fact that the Council no longer intends to develop an Affordable Housing SPD following the adoption of this Plan.</p> <p>Consultation feedback from both the Draft Core Strategy 2 and the Draft Affordable Housing SPD (November 2009) highlight the support for a policy on this issue. In</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>particular, respondents to the draft SPD felt that the matter was of such importance it should be addressed within a DPD rather than an SPD so greater weight could be attached to it. Some respondents highlighted that some market housing could be acceptable as cross-subsidy to enable the delivery of rural affordable housing. Wording changes have been made to address this issue and ensure that the policy accords with the NPPF.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.118 The assessment of the policy within the Sustainability Appraisal has identified that the policy performs well against some of the social objectives due to the delivery of affordable housing, the creation of mixed and balanced communities and housing, the creation of mixed and balanced communities and the potential to improve the vitality and viability of some community facilities in some small settlements. The potential loss of Green Belt land means that the policy has a negative impact when assessed against EV2.</p>	
54	BDP9	<b>BDP9 Policy Rural Exception Sites</b>	Correction
56	8.127-8.128	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.127 There was considerable support for this policy during the consultation as it demonstrated that the Council recognised the need to understand and plan for an ageing population. There were some concerns about the introduction of ‘Lifetime Homes’ standards from developers; however, these measures are seen as essential to meet the needs of the elderly and assisting independent living at home. ‘Lifetime Homes’ standards were taken into account as part of the Affordable Housing Viability Study (2012). There was also a desire from developers to provide elderly accommodation outside defined settlements; however, this would contradict policy BDP 4 Green Belt.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.128 The policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal, which identifies the need for appropriate provision for all sectors of the community including the needs of elderly people. The policy performed highly against social objectives,</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		although mitigation may be required when considering development outside defined settlements.	
56	BDP10	<b>BDP10 Policy Homes for the Elderly</b>	Correction
57	BDP11 8.132-8.133	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.132 Very few comments were received in relation to this policy although those who did felt that a sequential approach was inconsistent with national policy. Respondents felt that a clear set of criteria were required to guide applicants to appropriate sites in the District. The Council agreed that the sequential approach is not appropriate and the policy was amended accordingly.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.133 The policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and it performs well against social objectives due to the creation of mixed and balanced communities and also promoting sites in highly accessible locations. The policy does not perform so well against environmental objectives as any new site is likely to be on Green Belt land due to a lack of alternatives.</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan
57	BDP11	<b>BDP11 Policy Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</b>	Correction
59	BDP12 8.138-8.139	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.138 There were only a few comments received in relation to this policy, and those that did respond were generally in support, especially regarding the improvement of existing facilities and resisting their loss. The small number of concerns related to wording changes, which have been amended where appropriate. There was a suggestion that Green Infrastructure should be included as part of sustainable communities; however, this topic is covered in sufficient depth within BDP24 and the Plan should be read as a whole.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.139 This policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and focuses on protecting essential local facilities and ensuring that new developments contribute to creating a better balance of facilities, services and infrastructure within settlements. There are no clear negative impacts of this policy; however, the linkages to BDP6</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		requiring developer contributions for the provision of facilities, infrastructure and services and other forms of environmental and social requirements may limit the viability of a scheme.	
59	BDP12	<b>BDP12 Policy Sustainable Communities</b>	Correction
62	BDP13 8.149-8.153	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p><del>8.149 Consultation responses identified that there was support for the policy although some felt that the policy was too focussed on traditional types of employment (B class uses) when other employers such as hotels and care homes should be mentioned. The Council notes that the policy already refers broadly to economic development and therefore considers it is not overly focussed on B class uses. On this basis no changes are proposed to policy in relation to this issue.</del></p> <p><del>8.150 It was highlighted that the policy should mention the employment target as well as explicitly highlighting the sites where employment development is permitted. In response the Council has included the employment target in the supporting text. It should be noted that the Policies Map highlights main employment areas but it is considered unrealistic to highlight every possible location where some employment might be acceptable.</del></p> <p><del>8.151 Some respondents felt that the role of previously developed land in the Green Belt should also be recognised. The Council notes that the NPPF supports redevelopment of brownfield land within the Green Belt where no additional harm is caused and therefore this matter is addressed within BDP4 Green Belt.</del></p> <p><del>8.152 One respondent felt that the policy should include reference to the protection of biodiversity and the natural environment however the Council notes that these matters are addressed in BDP21 Natural Environment. The Plan should be considered holistically and therefore no changes are proposed in relation to this issue.</del></p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p><del>8.153 The policy performs well in the Sustainability Appraisal against the social and</del></p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		economic objectives due to the creation of jobs, the diversification of the local economy and the opportunity for people to live and work locally rather than commuting elsewhere. However, the policy may lead to some development on greenfield sites which conflicts with some of the environmental objectives.	
62	BDP13	<b>BDP13 Policy New Employment Development</b>	Correction
63	BDP14 8.158-8.159	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.158 There was a general positive consensus to this policy and support for the maintenance and promotion of existing employment provision across the District. There were some concerns regarding the latter part of the policy concerning the loss of employment sites. A number of responses felt the requirements for non-employment developments were too rigid. In light of this and in order to conform to the NPPF, an extra paragraph has been added to provide more flexibility. Each proposal will be based on its own merits and where it can be justified that the criteria in the policy cannot realistically be applied, alternative uses of land and buildings will be considered.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.159 The policy performs well within the Sustainability Appraisal against the social and economic objectives due to the creation of jobs, the diversification of the local economy and the opportunity for people to live and work locally rather than commuting elsewhere. However, although development will be on existing sites, the policy may lead to some development on greenfield sites which conflicts with some environmental objectives.</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan
64	BDP14	<b>BDP14 Policy Designated Employment</b>	Correction
66	BDP15 8.165-8.168	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.165 There was a positive consensus to the policy for the support of rural regeneration and the social and economic needs of rural communities. The numerous negative responses were in regard to the lack of support for commercial expansion and development in the Green Belt. The Council cannot write policy contrary to Green Belt policy and it is for an applicant to suggest any very special circumstances as part of a planning application. There was also a response suggesting a particular premises should be considered a Major Developed Site,</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan



		<p>however, the Council do not deem this a similar scale of development. Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt are not specifically referenced in the NPPF.</p> <p>8.166 There was a response that greater attention should be given to the character, condition and role of farmsteads, which has been applied to the new policy. There was a concern on the definition of small scale renewable energy developments, which has been added to the glossary.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.167 The policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and it indicates there are a number of positive social and economic attributes. Allowing employment development in rural areas will help to support the rural economy, especially in the field of diversification and growth of new businesses which support existing leisure and tourism. Diversification can improve accessibility to services and the well-being of the local population. The provision of affordable housing to meet local needs can allow a greater proportion of the rural population to stay and work more locally, with positive benefits for traffic generation and climate change.</p> <p>8.168 However, beyond a certain point, it is likely that such environmental spin-offs will be outweighed by increased commuting into rural areas, as well as traffic impacts from delivery vehicles and customers. There is likely to be some landscape, biodiversity, noise, air quality, water quality impacts from a wider spread of economic development in the open countryside. Although this policy could encourage applications for development in the Green Belt (negative impact against EV2), special circumstances would need to be justified, as inappropriate development would not be permitted.</p>	
67	BDP15	<b>BDP15 Policy Rural Renaissance</b>	Correction
70	8.182	Where a need is demonstrated Bromsgrove District Council will continue to work with Worcestershire County Council and rail industry partners to improve facilities at railway stations across the District. This includes proposals to provide a new railway station and interchange facilities in Bromsgrove by relocating and improving the	Update for consistency

		existing station ( <i>now completed</i> ). Sustainable transport measures (buses, walking and cycling) to connect Bromsgrove Railway Station with the Town Centre and wider residential areas will make rail travel more viable.	
70	BDP16 8.183	In addition, the Cross City services to Bromsgrove will be extended by 2016, the electrification of the line will result in an increased frequency of services at the new Bromsgrove Station. <i>This will improve connectivity with the West Midlands Metropolitan area in accordance with the West Midlands Local Transport Plan or successor document.</i>	Highlight link to wider strategies ie the West Midlands Local Transport Plan or successor document
70	BDP16 8.184	8.184 Encouraging walking and cycling is the most effective way to reduce short distance car journeys. Aside from the well-publicised health and environmental benefits of walking and cycling, these modes also offer an extensive, adaptable and permeable network of routes available for use. This network is not limited to footways alongside roads and cycle paths; it includes for example the extensive Public Rights of Way network covering urban and rural areas; <i>and the National Cycle Network (NCN). And Although technically not Public Rights of Way, canal towpaths also provide an important means of access to the countryside. where publically accessible.</i>	Clarification
71	BDP16 8.187	<del>Transport user needs (including freight) will continue to be met by a combination of road, rail, bus, community transport and taxi services (or similar initiatives) or any appropriate combination of these modes.</del> The LTP3 Worcestershire Multimodal Freight Policy has been developed to provide a comprehensive policy base to enable the delivery of schemes to enhance the efficient movement and operation of freight by all modes around the County.	Sentence not appropriate under the heading of freight.
71	BDP16 8.190	Birmingham Airport is the region's principal airport and is important in terms of the air links it provides and the role it can play to; connect Bromsgrove internationally, serve local businesses, enhance leisure and training opportunities and increase access to emergency services.	correction

72	BDP16 8.195-8.197	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.195 There was widespread support for the policy although concerns were raised over the deliverability of the policy with the District Council being reliant on other bodies such as the County Council who have been making cuts to bus services. Discussions are ongoing with the County Council regarding public transport services and where necessary financial contributions will be sought from developers improvements.</p> <p>8.196 Some felt that the policy could be expanded to mention proposed changes to the rail network including the new Bromsgrove Station, improvements to the cross-city line and better links between the train station and Bromsgrove Town Centre. It was considered that the existing reference to relocate the new Bromsgrove Station was appropriate and additional improvements to the network have been included. Other respondents were keen for a reference to be included that supported new and expanded rail station car parks. It is not considered appropriate to actively encourage new or extended rail station car parks as Worcestershire County Council will work with Network Rail and Train Operating Companies to identify optimum levels of car parking at rail stations, supported with Station Travel Plans (as identified in the LTP3 Smarter Choices Policy) to encourage greater use of sustainable modes of travel to access rail services.” The Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3) states that “The County Council recognises that, whilst rail is a sustainable means of travel, the provision of parking at stations is not sustainable, as this encourages rail users to drive to access rail services (particularly for short trips).”</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.197 This policy has overall positive benefits for all objectives. The emphasis on sustainable transport will have a positive impact environmentally and may in turn improve the health of the population in Bromsgrove District.</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan
73	BDP 16	<b>BDP16 Policy Sustainable Transport</b>	Correction
73	BDP 16	BDP16 Sustainable Transport BDP16.1 Development should comply with the Worcestershire <i>County Council's</i>	Clarification and update

		<del>Transport Local Transport Plan 3 policies, design guide and car parking standards , incorporate safe and convenient access and be well related to the wider transport network</del>	
73	Footnote	Worcestershire County Council Parking Standards 2016 or successor guidance	Update
78	BDP17 8.229	8.229 <del>Planning permission (13/0464) has been granted Current proposals to refurbish and extend the former Parkside Middle School premises to create office accommodation for staff of Worcestershire County Council and a Civic Centre for Bromsgrove District Centre Council and associated staff. The scheme also incorporates the relocation of Bromsgrove Hub, Bromsgrove Library and the job centre. This scheme is now complete.</del>	Updated information available
80	BDP17 8.239-8.246	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p><del>8.239 There was widespread support for the regeneration of the Town Centre with very few changes actually sought to the policy.</del></p> <p><del>8.240 Overall support for the naturalisation of the Spadesbourne Brook was noted with some respondents concerned it would impact the trading access to businesses in the Town Centre. The policy seeks to encourage the naturalisation of specific parts of the Spadesbourne Brook especially in areas that will allow for greater use by local residents whilst not to the detriment of local businesses.</del></p> <p><del>8.241 Some respondents felt the policy should provide greater detail on the evening economy with others suggesting that a specific housing target for the Town Centre would be beneficial. A number of references are made to the evening economy and it is considered this policy provides adequate support to allowing such development to take place within the Town Centre. In addition an Evening Economy Group was established so that local businesses and interested parties could directly influence the economic potential of Bromsgrove Town Centre in the evening.</del></p> <p><del>8.242 In terms of housing numbers it is difficult at this stage to anticipate numbers that could be achieved, partly due to the mixed use opportunities at certain sites and</del></p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>the uncertainties linked to viability and it is considered that any Town Centre housing would provide a windfall gain. The rationale for not incorporating a specific number of residential units in the Town Centre is that it is very difficult to estimate what capacity each site could contain. At this stage specific targets are almost impossible to determine, however, once developers seek to progress with the sites, only then will a realistic target be known and worth referencing.</p> <p>8.243 Some respondents wanted to encourage independent retailers whilst others recognised the potential to attract a large retailer to the Town Centre. The revised policy recognises the importance of small and independent businesses to Bromsgrove and they have a role to play in Bromsgrove in offering alternative shopping choices to the large retailers. In addition the policy seeks a balanced approach in terms of providing the physical space for nationally established retailers whilst also safeguarding the smaller boutique style independent retailers. It is important for Bromsgrove Town Centre to adapt to the modern requirements of retail so that it is a positive environment for retailers.</p> <p>8.244 Several respondents referred to specific development sites with some seeking improvements to the existing sports hall and support for the Sainsbury's development. In terms of specific sites the revised policy incorporates the 10 development sites within the Town Centre to emphasize the Councils support of Town Centre regeneration. This includes School Drive site which encourages a new leisure centre and the proposal for a Sainsbury's supermarket on the Birmingham Road Retail Park which received planning permission on 28 June 2010.</p> <p>8.245 Some public support for the Drill Hall as a historic, architectural and local asset (by local residents) was raised. It was also noted that there is some public support to regenerate the whole site and create a modern building. There is also no reason why in regenerating the Drill Hall that some reference is given to the historical background to the site. A number of factors need to be considered when regenerating a site. Local support for keeping certain buildings in Bromsgrove is</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>noted and the Council can seek to encourage the retention of them, but there are other factors that would be considered when regenerating the identified sites. These include whether the buildings are on the local list, whether the building is statutory listed, the level of quality design or architectural quality of a proposed building, and also the level of economic activity that the regeneration of a site could together with viability issues to enable development to proceed. When considering these factors regeneration of a site could be very difficult to refuse.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.246 This policy performs well overall as the regeneration of the town centre is likely to have far reaching social, economic and environmental benefits for the District.</p>	
81	BDP17	<b>BDP17 Policy Town Centre Regeneration</b>	Correction
88	8.248	...(as indicated <i>in blue</i> on the Policies Map).	Clarification
89	BDP18 8.249-8.251	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.249 Although this is a new policy, there were a number of comments from the DCS2 and the Draft Town Centre AAP that have influenced this policy. There were concerns from numerous residents as to whether current centres can cope with the increased populations and the affect it will have on infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.250 This policy aids numerous social objectives in terms of sustainability. The provision of mixed used in Local centres, with particular regard for retail facilities, mean these areas become more sustainable. People would be less likely to travel further afield for certain facilities and services, allowing more sustainable travel choices. This in turn can have effect on the health and well-being of local communities as they are more likely to walk or cycle to the centres. As cars could potentially be used less, there are also environmental advantages to this policy as there are possible improvements to air quality and the effects of climate change.</p> <p>8.251 Creating active frontages and complimenting uses above retail units can reduce crime and anti-social behaviour by providing natural surveillance there is also</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		the potential for vacant buildings to be used for local retail facilities, which is an effective use of land and would help to retain the retail character of the centres. The Sustainability Appraisal showed there were no known weaknesses to the policy.	
89	BDP18	<b>BDP18 Policy Local Centres</b>	Correction
89	BDP 18	<b>BDP18 Local Centres</b> <b>18.1 Within the areas defined on the Policies Map the District Council will allow proposals for retail development (Class A Uses) at ground floor level and retail, office, residential use or any other appropriate Town Centre use at upper floor level. These areas are defined as Local Centres for shopping purposes in accordance with the provisions of 'large settlements' identified in Policy BDP2.</b>	Clarification due to Main Modification in BDP2
90	BDP 19 8.257	Many poor connected developments with road-dominated layout encourage people to use car, which has led to fewer opportunities for people to meet and socialise. This can contribute to social exclusion, and a loss of local identity in neighbourhoods. To achieve well-design homes and neighbourhoods, the Council will expect all housing developments to follow the design principles in the external environment section of the Standards and Quality in Development.: A good practice guide and use Building for Life 12 as a tool to facilitate design conversation at all stages of the development process. The Council will expect development to achieve the highest standard of Building for Life 12.	Building for life deleted by Inspector in Main Modifications
93	BDP19 8.266-8.269	<b>Consultation feedback</b> <del>8.266 There was some support for the policy, in particular the reference to design out crime, soft landscaping, trees retention and the user hierarchy. There were some misunderstandings that the policy tries to keep all trees rather than those considered appropriate.</del>  <del>8.267 Some questioned the legitimacy of imposing the HCA space standards beyond affordable housing. As one of the aims of planning is to plan for houses that meet people's needs and expectations, it is considered that developers should take into account other published evidence and meet the requirements where viable.</del>  <del>8.268 Some raised concerns that references to the Building for Life and West</del>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>Midlands Sustainability Checklist in the policy would elevate the status of the two tools which would create an extra burden for developers. Also, funding for the West Midlands Sustainability Checklist has stopped and some suggested developing a local checklist. Comments in relation to the Sustainability Checklist are noted and this has now been removed, however as Building for Life is only an assessment tool guiding developments to achieve good design, it is not considered that policy reference is conflicting with the national policy which also seeks high quality design. There is also no evidence to suggest that high quality design is more costly.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b> 8.269 The Policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and has many positive features with respect to environmental, social and economic sustainability with no clear weaknesses.</p>	
94	BDP19	<b>BDP19 Policy High Quality Design</b>	Correction
95	BDP 19 s.	s. In relation to air quality all new developments with a floor space greater than 1000sqm or 0.5 hectare or residential developments of 10 or more units <del>should</del> <b>must</b> not increase nitrogen dioxide (NO2), particulate matter (PM10) and carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from transport and should be accompanied by an assessment of the likely impact of the development on local air quality and comply with current best practice guidance:	
97	BDP20 8.272	Within the District examples would include, nailers cottages, assets associated with the scythe industry and assets associated with the use of the <del>Birmingham Worcester</del> <i>Birmingham</i> canal which runs the length of the District, to name but a few.	Correction
97	BDP20 8.273-8.274	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b> 8.273 There was support for the policy however some respondents felt that the policy could be improved. It was argued that the approach to design was too prescriptive and a contemporary approach is not always the right approach.</p> <p>The reference to contemporary design has now been removed with the focus now on achieving development that is sympathetic to historic assets. Some respondents</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan



considered that the policy should make greater reference to the Historic Environment Assessment, Historic Landscape Characterisation, Conservation Area Appraisals and the West Midlands Farmsteads and Landscape Project. The inclusion of a reference to each of these documents was considered unnecessary as many form part of the evidence base for the policy.

A reference to the production of appraisals and management plans for each conservation area has been retained. There was support for the inclusion of a local list and the Council agree with this view. The policy now supports the updating and adoption of a local list. Some felt that there should be a greater emphasis on the re-use of buildings and appropriate climate change measures. Greater reference to these issues are now included within the policy.

#### **Sustainability Appraisal**

8.274 This policy performs most strongly predominantly in environmental terms as it is very specific in the protection and enhancement of heritage in the District, however the policy does have some social and economic benefits. In social terms the protection and enhancement of such assets can add to the vibrancy and local distinctiveness of the District and also act as cultural, recreational and educational resources. The historic environment contributes to a sense of pride and quality of life and may enrich people's understanding of the diversity and changing nature of their community. In economic terms the preservation of the historic environment can contribute to the area's local distinctiveness. This may have economic benefits, for example, a refurbished historic character property in an area of attractive and well maintained properties may attain a higher price on the open market than an equivalent more modern and larger property due to special, perceived and actual, qualities for example, of uniqueness. Although in some cases the layout and efficiency of historic buildings may be considered unsuitable and inefficient by modern day standards and may in some cases be more costly to restore in terms of required materials and techniques, development that enhances the character and appearance of historic environment may also have the potential to contribute towards tourism and economic growth. Furthermore, the Council recognises that redundant historic buildings offer a range of opportunities for conversion to new uses which can

		<del>act as a catalyst for regeneration and economic vitality.</del>	
98	BDP20	<b>BDP20 Policy Managing the Historic Environment</b>	Correction
99	BDP20.17	Applications likely to affect the significance of known or potential <del>h</del> <i>Heritage Assets</i> or their setting should demonstrate an understanding of their significance in sufficient detail to assess the potential impacts. This should be informed by available evidence and, where appropriate, further information to establish significance of known or potential heritage assets.	Correction
102	BDP21 8.282	Landscape, which results from the interaction between the nature and culture of a place, directly affects our quality of life. In the past, landscapes of local importance were protected through rigid local designations, whilst the impact of developments outside of these areas was not normally considered. However, it is now recognised that all landscapes matter. <i>Following the principles established at The European Landscape Convention, which became binding to the UK from March 2007, the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment was produced. The Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment identifies the distinct, recognisable and consistent pattern of landscape elements in Bromsgrove. To ensure the landscape character of the District is enhanced, the Council will expect the design of all developments to take the Landscape Character Assessment into account and result in landscape gain. Details can be found in the Landscape Character Supplementary Guidance.</i>	Add reference to European Landscape Convention
103	BDP21 8.283-8.284	<b>Consultation Feedback</b> <del>8.283 There was support for the policy and some would like to see greater protection for several habitats such as ancient woodlands and trees and stronger policy wordings such as replacing ‘protecting’ by ‘safeguarding’. Some also referred to functional and ecological connectivity, landscape-scale thinking and suggested to include a direct reference to the Green Infrastructure policy, the Habitat Inventory and the ‘Living Landscape’ projects. Most comments are incorporated into this revised policy. There was also criticism that the policy repeats the national policy and other legislative requirements.</del>  <del>It was suggested that illustrative maps should be included. It was considered that</del>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>the policy build on national guidance and in many cases are locally distinctive. Also, to ensure that the most up-to-date information is used, it is not considered illustrative maps should be included.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>  <del>8.284 The Policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and performs well in environmental terms and has some social benefits but these will need to be carefully balanced against economic objectives on a site by site basis.</del></p>	
103	BDP21	<b>BDP21 Policy Natural Environment</b>	Correction
104	8.289	<p><b>Reducing Energy Use</b>  <b>Existing buildings</b>  8.289 A large proportion of Bromsgrove district’s existing older housing stock is in need of improvement in terms of adequate insulation. The average energy performance of buildings in Bromsgrove is D, with 8.8% of homes rated E or below<sup>39</sup>. From 2013, the <del>Green Deal</del><sup>40</sup> and Energy Company Obligation<sup>41</sup> will be in place to help householders and the non-residential sector<sup>42</sup> fund energy efficiency measures installations. The Council therefore encourages developments in existing building (such as extensions, change of use) to achieve consequential energy efficiency improvements.</p>	Green Deal no longer exists
104	Footnote 36	Worcestershire County Council (2013) <del>2014</del> “Draft Worcestershire Climate Change Strategy 2012-2020”. Projections <del>are</del> is based on medium emissions scenario for 2020s using 90% probability level.	Update
104	8.289	<p><b>Reducing Energy Use</b>  <b>Existing buildings</b>  A large proportion of Bromsgrove district’s existing older housing stock is in need of improvement in terms of adequate insulation. The average energy performance of buildings in Bromsgrove is D, with 8.8% of homes rated E or below<sup>39</sup>. From 2013, the <del>Green Deal</del><sup>40</sup> and Energy Company Obligation<sup>41</sup> will be in place to help householders and the non-residential sector<sup>42</sup> fund energy efficiency measures installations. The Council therefore encourages developments in existing building (such as extensions, change of use) to achieve consequential energy efficiency improvements.</p>	Green Deal no longer exists

104	Footnote 40	<del>40.</del> The Green Deal will provide finance for investment in energy efficiency measures at no up-front cost to the householder. Finance will be secured as a charge on the property to be repaid through the electricity bill over a period of up to 25 years.	Green Deal no longer exists
106	Renewable Energy, paragraph 8.294	The Renewable Energy Directive 2009 sets a target for the UK to achieve 15% of its energy consumption from renewable sources by 2020. The resource assessment in the Renewable Energy Capacity Study for the West Midlands (2011) reveals considerable potential for renewable energy generation from wind and microgeneration in Bromsgrove. The Worcestershire County Council Renewable Energy Study and the Planning for Renewable Energy in Worcestershire report have identified areas where renewable resources are available/ technically feasible. Compared to big cities, Bromsgrove is identified as having good solar irradiance, showing good opportunities for solar thermal/power generation. The Department of Energy and Climate Change has published a new National Heat Map, identifying locations where heat distribution is most likely to be beneficial and economical. To encourage the deployment of low-carbon electricity and heat generation to households and industrial, business and public sectors, the Government has introduced various schemes, including the Feed-in-Tariffs, Renewable Heat Premium Payments and Renewable Heat Incentive schemes by which householders and businesses will get paid for both the generated energy used on site and any surplus exported energy generated. <i>For residential development this policy applies to planning applications of more than 10 units.</i>	Changes in response to July Post Hearing Note suggestion by the Inspector to check compliance with Written Ministerial statement (18th June 2015)
106	BDP22 8.296	The Climate Change Act has created a framework for climate change adaptation, including the UK Climate Change Risk Assessment (2012) and the National Adaptation Programme: <i>Making the country resilient to a changing climate (underway July 2013)</i> . The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment identifies the key climate change risks and opportunities across all sectors and the results are presented in five themes: agriculture and forestry, business, health and well-being, buildings and infrastructure, and the natural environment.	
107	BDP22 8.300-8.302	<b>Consultation Feedback</b> <del>8.300 There were criticisms on demanding market housing to achieve the same level of Code for Sustainable Homes as affordable housing and requiring developments to provide infrastructure to connect to nearby zero/low energy scheme with firm delivery</del>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>plan. Some also considered the policy repeating the national policy as there was no evidence to demonstrate local circumstances. The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment was published since DCS2 which provide evidence for requiring market housing to achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes. As developments have to provide general services, there is no reason why connecting to zero/ low carbon scheme will affect the viability of the development.</p> <p>8.301 There were suggestions to reference the impact of transport emissions in affecting carbon emissions, the potential impact of renewable energy schemes on aerodromes and link the policy with Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>It was also raised that the data shown in the Warmer Worcestershire flyover may not be 100% reliable down to individual building. Where relevant, amendments were made.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.302 Apart from addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change, the policy has many positive inferences upon the SA objectives, such as promoting the health and well-being of the population. However, the policy may lead to an increase in construction cost and affect the viability of development.</p>	
107	BDP22	<b>BDP22 Policy Climate Change</b>	Correction
107	BDP 22 Climate Change	<p>The Council will deliver viable low carbon climate resilient developments through:</p> <p>a. Encouraging development in existing buildings to achieve consequential energy efficiency improvements</p> <p>b. Requiring allowable solutions to be linked with projects within the District in the first instance, followed by the County and then Region</p> <p>b e. Ensuring developments and infrastructure are planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts and take advantage of the opportunities arising from climate change, having regard to the intended lifetime of the development. Where developments and infrastructure are brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures,</p>	Changes in response to July Post Hearing Note suggestion by the Inspector to check compliance with Written

		<p>c d. Ensuring developments are in locations well-served by public/ sustainable transport, existing local facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>d e. Ensuring the construction and design of developments as well as future occupants of the developments will follow the energy, waste management hierarchies and other relevant guidance. Where relevant, developments must comply with the Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>e f. Supporting developments to incorporate zero or low carbon energy generation technologies, especially installations that improve the energy security of developments in the rural areas. Where there is a firm delivery plan of a <i>district heating zero or low carbon energy generation</i> scheme, developments nearby are expected to provide infrastructure/ to connect to the zero/ low carbon energy <i>that</i> scheme.</p> <p>f g. Supporting zero or low carbon energy generation schemes when adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily.</p>	<p>Ministerial Statement (25th March 2015)</p>
110	BDP23 8.317-8.321	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p><del>8.317 There was support for the policy as well as some suggestions for stronger policy wordings and to include more details in the justifications and policy such as identifying areas by types of flooding, referring woodlands as a water risk management tool, easements adjacent to watercourses, referring to the foul drainage hierarchy and cross-referencing to issues that were addressed in other policies. Suggestions are accommodated where appropriate, except cross-referencing and issues that are dealt with in other policies. As flood maps for watercourse flooding, surface water run-off and sewer flooding are included in the evidence document, it is not considered necessary to refer to the areas in the justifications.</del></p> <p><del>8.318 Some considered water efficiency is already addressed in Building Regulations and questioned the viability of achieving the water standard in the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM. The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment was published since the last consultation which provides evidence for the required standard in the Code for Sustainable Homes.</del></p>	<p>Text not required in final version of the Plan</p>

		<p><del>8.319 Concerns were raised on the sewage treatment capacity. Severn Trent Water has a legal obligation to initiate funding when new development is certain. The policy now states that on all major developments engagement with Severn Trent Water should take place at the earliest opportunity to agree on their foul drainage plans.</del></p> <p><del>8.320 There were also a few comments that listed out the flooding issues in local areas, comments were forwarded to North Worcestershire Water Management team accordingly.</del></p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p><del>8.321 The policy seeks to reduce the impacts of new development on the environment, the running costs of buildings, the causes of climate change and the potential loss and disruptions to occupants and owners. However, the policy may lead to increase in construction costs and affect the viability of development.</del></p>	
111	BDP23	<p><b>BDP23 Policy Water Management</b>  <b>BDPC23.1 The Council will deliver safe developments with low environmental impact through:</b></p>	Correction
112	BDP 24 8.323	<p>Green Infrastructure is therefore a holistic approach to viewing and managing the natural environment, acknowledging the multiple benefits and vital services it provides and making tangible links to economic, health and social welfare agendas and aspirations. For this reason, the Council will expect development to consider policies BDP16 Sustainable Transport, BDP20 Managing the Historic Environment, BDP47 21 Natural Environment, BDP 49 22 Climate Change, BDP23 Water Management, BDP25 Health and Well Being together to ensure developments deliver multiple benefits in accordance to priorities determined by local circumstances, improve connectivity, enhance the quality of and provide for the appropriate long term management of Green Infrastructure. The District's Green Infrastructure assets are outlined in the Green Infrastructure Baseline Report.</p>	Correction of policy references
112	BDP24 8.324	<p>The Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Framework documents form the basis for the development of the <del>emerging</del> Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy which <del>will</del> creates a comprehensive policy framework for the protection, creation,</p>	Update following the finalisation

		enhancement and accessibility of Green Infrastructure in the County. At the local level, Concept Plans which set out and prioritise the respective Green Infrastructure requirements for an individual site.	of the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy
112	BDP24 8.325	To ensure developments can enjoy the benefits of the local, sub-regional and wider Green Infrastructure network, the Council will expect development to have regard to and contribute towards the emerging Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy and any local GI Strategy which may be prepared. All major development should explain how the design of development achieves the multiple benefits of Green Infrastructure and contribute towards the wider network.	Update following the finalisation of the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy
113	BDP24 8.326-8.328	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p><del>8.326 There was support for the policy although there were doubts in singling out forestry/woodland from other Green Infrastructure assets in the policy. It was unclear then whether the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Framework will take into account the Delivery Plan of the West Midlands Forestry Framework and given the multiple benefits of trees, it was considered appropriate to include tree planting in the policy. However, it is now confirmed that the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Framework will also incorporate the Delivery Plan of the West Midlands Forestry Framework as well as the Woodland Access Standard, so the details about tree planting in the previous version is now taken out.</del></p> <p><del>8.327 It was suggested that supporting maps illustrating the locations of different Green Infrastructure assets should be incorporated. Given that the maps are already included in the evidence base documents and referred to in the policy, it is considered sufficient.</del></p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p><del>8.328 The Policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal and performs strongly against many of the environmental and social objectives and in some cases,</del></p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan



		brings in economic benefits (e.g. eco-tourism). But safeguarding all Green Infrastructure assets maybe costly and even unviable in some cases.	
113	BDP24	<b>BDP24 Policy Green Infrastructure</b>	Correction
115	BDP25 8.339-8.343	<p><b>Consultation Feedback</b></p> <p>8.339 There was support for healthier lifestyles, but there were numerous responses requiring more to be done on improving health and well-being, in particular the overconcentration of A5 uses and the use of allotments. The policy has been updated accordingly to include these topics, with more emphasis applied to the restriction of A5 uses.</p> <p>A considerable amount of support was given to the references regarding walking and cycling.</p> <p>8.340 Sport England was concerned at the lack of reference to sport, with word changes made accordingly. Two responses felt the policy should have a more emphasis on green infrastructure, however, the Council believe this topic is addressed adequately in BDP24 Green Infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>8.341 The policy was assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal, with high scores in both the social and environmental attributes, and there are no known weaknesses. The retention and enhancement of open space for recreation and amenity and the resulting improved living environment helps improve the health and well-being of the population. The environmental benefits of maintaining or enhancing open space are wide reaching. Whilst some recreational areas, such as sports pitches, have little biodiversity value, well designed parks and gardens can contribute greatly to conserving and enhancing ecological diversity through habitat provision and maintenance or creation of wildlife corridors.</p> <p>8.342 Open space can also be beneficial in terms of preserving landscape and townscape, which is particularly important in terms of preserving the historic setting of heritage features or conservation areas. The policy also has potential to minimise flood risk through maintaining areas of undeveloped green space that will enable</p>	Text not required in final version of the Plan

		<p>precipitation to infiltrate the soil and reduce run-off.</p> <p><del>8.343 The provision of high-quality walking and cycling routes will also contribute to the health and well-being of the population. The policy also goes further by promoting partnership working to explore new ways to improve opportunities for healthy and active lifestyles. Reducing the over-concentration of hot food takeaways actively assist in the health and well-being of communities. The promotion and support of local food growing initiatives is not only sustainable, but encourages healthy food options.</del></p>	
116	BDP25	<b>BDP25 Policy Health and Well Being</b>	Correction
117	BDP 25 .6 a)	a) The proposed use will not result in the proportion of units within the designated centre or <i>retail</i> frontage <i>outside of a Local centre</i> being hot food takeaways exceeding 5% (updated figures for each local centre will be published annually within the Council's AMR)	Clarification
119	Appendix I (BDP3)	<p><b>Evidence Base</b></p> <p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Bromsgrove District Council</p> <p>Worcestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012, GVA</p> <p>Employment Land Review 2012, Drivers Jonas Deloitte</p> <p>Housing Land <del>Availability</del> <i>Availability</i> Report, Bromsgrove District Council</p> <p>Five Year Land Supply, Bromsgrove District Council</p>	Correction

		Duty to Co-operate <i>Review Statement of Compliance, Bromsgrove District Council</i>	
120	Appendix I (BDP4)	<p>Worcestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012, GVA</p> <p>Employment Land Review 2012, Drivers Jonas Deloitte</p> <p>Housing Growth Development Study, Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council Sustainability Appraisal of Housing Growth Development Study, Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council</p> <p><i>Duty to Co-operate Statement of Compliance, Bromsgrove District Council</i></p>	Correction
123	Appendix I (RCBD1)	<p>Housing Growth Development Study, Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council Sustainability Appraisal of Housing Growth Development Study, Redditch Borough Council and Bromsgrove District Council</p> <p>Worcestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012, GVA</p> <p>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Redditch Borough Council</p>	Correction

		<p>Affordable Housing Viability Study, Level</p> <p>Hewell Grange Estate-Setting of Heritage Assets Assessment 2013 (BDC)</p> <p>Duty to Co-operate <i>Statement of Compliance Review</i> (BDC)</p> <p>An Analysis of Green Belt Land and Areas of Development Restraint within Redditch Borough (RBC)</p> <p>Redditch Green Belt Release to meet Growth needs (RBC)</p>	
134	Appendix II	<p><b>Authority Monitoring Report (AMR)</b> - The report prepared by Councils to assess the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which the policies of the <del>Local Development Framework</del> <i>Local plan and adopted SPDs</i> are being achieved.</p>	Correction
134	Appendix II	<p><i>Building Research Establishments Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) is the world's most widely used environmental assessment method for buildings. BREEAM assesses buildings against a set criteria and provides an overall score which will fall within a band providing either a; PASS, GOOD, VERY GOOD, EXCELLENT or OUTSTANDING rating.</i></p>	Additions to glossary
134	Appendix II	<p><b>Close Care Housing</b> - Close Care schemes consist of independent flats or bungalows built on the same site as a care home. Residents often have some services (such as cleaning) included in their service charge and other services can be purchased from the care home. Close care schemes can either be rented or purchased. Purchasers may receive a guarantee that the management will buy back the property if they enter the care home.</p> <p><b>Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</b> - <i>The Community Infrastructure Levy (the levy) came into force in April 2010. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a new charge which local authorities in England and Wales can levy on new development in their area. CIL is the Government's preferred method for development to pay</i></p>	Additions to glossary

		<p>towards the infrastructure and is charged on the net additional floorspace created by development of buildings that people normally use. It allows local authorities in England and Wales to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects in their area. The money can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. This includes transport schemes, flood defences, schools, hospitals and other health and social care facilities, parks, green spaces and leisure centres.</p> <p><b>Conservation Area</b> - Conservation Areas are designated by the District Council as areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which the Council considers desirable to preserve or enhance.</p> <p><b>Continuing care retirement communities</b> - A continuing care community, also known as a life-care community, is a type of retirement community where a number of aging care needs, from assisted living, independent living and nursing home care, may all be met in a single residence, whether apartment or enclosed unit. Typically, elderly candidates move into a continuing-care retirement community (CCRC) while still living independently, with few health risks or healthcare needs, and will remain reside there until end of life. As patrons progress in age, and medical needs change, the level of nursing care and service increases proportionally in response. Continuing-care communities are ideal for seniors that may be living in isolation, and would like to be immersed in a hospitable environment with other people of the same age. Typically, a range of activities and amenities are provided for both recreation and resource. However, CCRCs are costly, and vary widely in entrance and recurring fees. Often, a life-care contract is required, and the stipulations within such contracts can also vary in terms of service.</p>	
135	Appendix II Glossary	<p><del><b>Major Urban Area (MUA)</b> – The main urban area of the West Midlands Region, as identified on the RSS Spatial Strategy Diagram (see the inside back cover of West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy).</del></p> <p><b>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b> - The NPPF was published in March</p>	Clarification and additions to glossary

		<p><i>2012, replacing past Planning Policy Statements/Guidance (PPSs/PPGs), and sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It sets out the Government's requirements for the planning system only to the extent that it is relevant, proportionate and necessary to do so. It provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities.</i></p> <p><b>Planning Obligations</b> - <i>Legal agreements between a planning authority and a developer that ensure that certain extra works related to a development are undertaken. For example, the provision of highway works. More commonly known as 'Section 106 agreements'.</i></p> <p><b>Planning Policy Statements/Guidance (PPGs/PPSs)</b> - National planning policy published by the Department for Community and Local Government, all regional and local planning policy must be in general conformity with this guidance. <i>These were replaced by the NPPF in March 2012.</i></p> <p><b>Previously Developed Land (PDL)</b> - Land that contains permanent buildings (excluding agriculture or forestry buildings) and associated fixed-surface infrastructure. The definition covers the curtilage of the development.</p> <p><b>Priority Habitats and Species</b> - <i>Priorities compiled by regional bio-diversity partnerships, reflecting those in the national bio-diversity action plan and those agreed by local biodiversity partnerships at the sub-regional level.</i></p>	
135	Appendix II	<p><b>Small Scale Renewable Energy (Microgeneration)</b> - Small-scale renewable energy schemes include the installation of solar panels and wind turbines at domestic and nondomestic premises, as well as other renewable and low carbon energy installations at these premises such as ground or air source heat pumps,</p>	Addition to glossary

		<p>biomass systems and combined heat and power (CHP) systems.</p> <p><b>Special Wildlife Site (SWS)</b> – Defined areas of ecological or geological importance identified to protect habitat and species diversity.</p> <p><b>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)</b> - A document that examines the potential for flooding from all sources in the area, this includes the potential impacts from climate change. It examines the impact of new development both within and beyond the District.</p>	
135-136	Appendix II	<p><del><b>Special Wildlife Site (SWS)</b> – These places are considered to be the best places for wildlife outside of legally protected areas such as SSSIs, National Nature Reserves and Local Nature Reserves.</del></p> <p><b>Use Class</b> - The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 puts uses of land and buildings into various categories. Planning permission is not needed for changes of use within the same use class.</p> <p><b>Viability</b> - To be capable of existing or surviving in a successful manner. The term is often used in the context of whether town centres are able to exist as viable retail centres. Financial viability is about being able to generate sufficient income to meet overheads and allow growth whilst still being able to maintain service levels.</p> <p><b>Vitality</b> - Used to describe the liveliness of an area, which may be measured by particular local features, the general environment or the quality of life for local residents. In the context of town centres, this term can be used to describe the capacity of a centre to grow or develop.</p> <p><b>Windfalls or Windfall Sites</b> – Sites that come forward for development that have not been specifically identified as available for development within the Local Plan.</p>	Alterations to glossary

Delete Appendix IV Superseded BDLP Policies and Proposals as now replaced by new Plan				
Appendix IV Monitoring indicators				
B098	146	BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Number of trips made by public transport</del></li> <li>• <del>Decrease in CO2 emissions</del></li> <li>• <del>No of parks and areas of recreation space</del></li> <li>• <del>No of listed buildings at risk</del></li> <li>• <i>New dwellings on previously developed land</i></li> <li>• <i>Total amount of employment land on previously developed land</i></li> <li>• Number of bus and rail travellers</li> <li>• % of peoples usual method of travel</li> <li>• Number of new AQMA's declared</li> <li>• <del>Total n</del> Number of listed buildings (<i>all grades</i>)</li> <li>• Number of listed buildings demolished</li> <li>• <i>Number of listed buildings and archaeological sites on English Heritage's register of buildings/sites at risk</i></li> <li>• % of unemployment</li> <li>• <i>Emissions within the scope of influence of Local Authority</i></li> </ul>	Corrections to ensure that all indicators are relevant and can be monitored with ease.
B099	146	BDP2 Settlement Hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>New dwellings on previously developed land</i></li> <li>• <del>% of development</del> <i>Total amount of employment land on previously developed land</i></li> <li>• % of development in each settlement type</li> </ul>	Correction
B100	146	BDP3 Future Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net additional dwellings <i>completed</i></li> <li>• Number of hectares of employment completed</li> <li>• Number of years of housing supply</li> <li>• <i>Managed delivery target (Housing trajectory)</i></li> <li>• <i>Employment land available</i></li> <li>• <i>Plan period and housing targets</i></li> <li>• <i>Plan period and employment targets</i></li> <li>• <i>Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Traveller)</i></li> </ul>	Correction



B101	146	BDP5A Bromsgrove Town Expansion Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings (<i>including affordable</i>) completed on expansion sites</li> <li>• <del>No. of affordable dwellings on expansion sites</del></li> <li>• <del>No. of hectares of employment completed on expansion sites</del></li> <li>• <i>Total amount of additional employment land – by type on expansion sites, development sites and cross boundary sites</i></li> <li>• <del>Amount of retail floorspace completed on expansion sites and cross boundary sites</del></li> <li>• <del>Amount of open space on expansion/development sites</del></li> </ul>	Correction
B102	147	BDP5B Other Development Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings (<i>including affordable</i>) completed on development sites</li> <li>• <del>No. of hectares of employment completed on development sites</del></li> <li>• <i>Total amount of additional employment land – by type on expansion sites, development sites and cross boundary sites</i></li> <li>• <del>Amount of open space on expansion/development sites</del></li> </ul>	Correction
B103	147	RCBD1 Redditch Cross Boundary Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of dwellings (<i>including affordable</i>) completed on cross boundary sites</li> <li>• <del>No. of affordable dwellings on cross boundary sites</del></li> <li>• <del>Amount of retail floorspace completed on expansion sites and cross boundary sites</del></li> <li>• <del>Amount of open space on cross boundary sites</del></li> </ul>	Correction
B104	147	BDP7 Housing Mix and Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average density of development achieved across the District</li> <li>• Number of dwellings built at less than 30 dwellings per hectare</li> <li>• Number of dwellings built between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare</li> <li>• Number of dwellings built at greater than 50 dwellings per</li> </ul>	Correction

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>hectare</li> <li><del>No. and % percentage of dwellings completed in each size category (e.g. 1 bed, 2 bed, 3 bed, 4 bed and 5 bed dwellings)</del></li> <li><i>Number of bedrooms for completed dwellings</i></li> </ul>	
B105	147	BDP10 Homes for the Elderly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number and types units completed for the elderly</li> <li><del>Number of dwellings completed to Lifetime Home Standards</del></li> </ul>	Correction
B106	147	BDP11 Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers & Showpeople	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Occupancy rates</del></li> <li><del>No of pitches provided in District</del></li> <li><i>Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Traveller)</i></li> </ul>	Correction
B107	147	BDP12 Sustainable Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Increase or decrease in the number of local facilities in the district</del></li> <li><i>Diversity of Town Centre Uses (Street level property)</i></li> <li><i>Diversity of local centres (Street level property)</i></li> <li><i>% of open space, allotments , sports and recreational facilities lost to development</i></li> </ul>	Correction
B108	148	BDP13 New Employment Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Total amount of additional employment over plan period</i></li> <li><i>Total amount of additional employment – by type</i></li> <li><del>Total amount of Employment Completions (B1, B2, B8)</del></li> <li>Employment completions by Parish</li> <li>Amount of available employment land</li> <li>% of unemployment</li> <li><del>No. of VAT Registered businesses – registrations/deregistrations</del></li> <li><i>Business births</i></li> <li><i>Business deaths</i></li> <li><i>Number of extensions granted to existing employment premises</i></li> </ul>	Correction
B109	148	BDP14 Designated Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amount of employment land lost to other uses</li> <li>Number of extensions granted to existing employment</li> </ul>	Correction

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>premises</li> <li><i>Total amount of employment on previously developed land</i></li> </ul>	
B110	148	BDP15 Rural Renaissance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of agricultural dwellings completed</li> <li>Number of affordable houses completed through <i>rural exception schemes sites</i></li> </ul>	Correction
B111	148	BDP16 Sustainable Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of bus and rail travellers</li> <li>% of peoples usual method of travel</li> <li><del>Number of trips made by public transport</del></li> <li><del>Proportion of new housing within 30 minutes by public transport</del></li> <li><del>from key facilities</del></li> <li><del>Proportion of development within 800 metres/13 minutes walk</del></li> <li><del>from hourly bus service</del></li> <li>% access to GP</li> </ul>	Correction
B112	148	BDP17 Town Centre Regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>No. of Town Centre Delivery Sites completed</del></li> <li>Diversity of main Town Centre Uses (<i>Street level property</i>)</li> <li><del>Proportion of vacant street level property</del></li> <li><i>Vacancy rates in town centre</i></li> <li>Pedestrian flows</li> <li><i>Progress of Town Centre development sites</i></li> <li><i>Total amount of retail (larger than 500m<sup>2</sup>)</i></li> </ul>	Correction
B113	148	BDP18 Local Centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Diversity of local centre uses (<i>Street level property</i>)</li> <li><del>Proportion of vacant street level property</del></li> <li><i>Vacancy rates in local centres</i></li> </ul>	Correction
B114	149	BDP19 High Quality Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Proportion of relevant schemes incorporating “secured by design” principles</del></li> <li>% of people to which fear of crime is an issue</li> <li>Number of recorded crimes</li> <li>Number of <i>recorded</i> ASBO’s</li> </ul>	Correction

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>% Number of non-domestic residential developments buildings to meet meeting of BREEAM 'very good ' standard</del></li> <li>• <del>Number of dwellings completed to Lifetime Homes standard</del></li> <li>• <del>% of affordable housing to meet the Code for Sustainable Home Level 6</del></li> <li>• <del>The level of the Code for Sustainable Homes achieved by market (% achieved for each code level)</del></li> <li>• No. of schemes achieving <i>meeting Building for Life 12diamond status standards or its successor guidance</i></li> <li>• <i>Number of new developments incorporating SuDs</i></li> <li>• <i>Emissions within the scope of influence of Local Authority</i></li> <li>• Number of new AQMA's declared</li> </ul>	
B115	149	BDP20 Managing the Historic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Total</del> Number of listed buildings (<i>all grades</i>)</li> <li>• Number of Listed Buildings demolished</li> <li>• <del>Number of listed buildings at risk</del></li> <li>• <i>Number of listed buildings and archaeological sites on English Heritage's register of buildings/sites 'at risk'</i></li> <li>• <del>Total</del> Number of Registered Parks, Gardens and Scheduled Monuments</li> <li>• Number of Conservation Areas</li> <li>• <del>Proportion of</del> <i>Number of Conservation Areas with an up to date Character Appraisal Assessments completed and Management Plan</i></li> <li>• Number of buildings on the Local List of architectural merit</li> </ul>	Correction
B116	149	BDP21 Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>% of total land use under landscape designation</del></li> <li>• % of planning permissions granted in the <i>applications on Green Belt land approved</i></li> <li>• <del>% of planning permissions affecting areas of recognised landscape value</del></li> <li>• <del>No. of SWS</del></li> <li>• <del>No. of SSSI</del></li> </ul>	Correction

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>No. of BAP habitats</del></li> <li>• <i>Number of Local Sites (wildlife and geological) and proportion of Local Sites in positive management</i></li> <li>• <i>Number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and condition</i></li> </ul>	
B117	150	BDP22 Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Decrease in CO2 emissions</del></li> <li>• <del>Climate Change Decrease in average electricity consumption per household/ year in line with Government targets</del></li> <li>• <del>% of new developments with energy efficient design</del></li> <li>• Number of new AQMAs declared</li> <li>• <i>Emissions within the scope of influence of Local Authority</i></li> <li>• Number of new developments with on-site renewable energy</li> <li>• <i>Number of renewable energy applications granted permission and their capacity</i></li> <li>• <i>Amount of waste collected per annum</i></li> <li>• <i>% of waste disposal to landfill per annum</i></li> <li>• <i>% of waste recycled per year-annum</i></li> <li>• Number of bus and rail travellers</li> <li>• % of peoples usual method of travel</li> <li>• <del>Number of trips made by public transport</del></li> <li>• <del>Proportion of new housing within 30 minutes by public transport from key facilities</del></li> <li>• <del>Proportion of development within 800 metres/13 minutes walk from hourly bus service</del></li> <li>• <del>Number of noise related complaints</del></li> <li>• <del>Vehicle flows through urban areas</del></li> <li>• <i>Percentage of watercourses within the District that meet the targets set out in the Water Framework Directive</i></li> <li>• <del>% of rivers with fairly good or better biological and chemical</del></li> </ul>	Correction

			<p>water quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of new developments incorporating SuDs</li> <li>• Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority or Internal Drainage Board</li> <li>• <del>Number of new developments on flood plains</del></li> <li>• <del>Number of schemes incorporating water harvesting</del></li> <li>• <del>Number of new industries/companies developing new technology addressing climate change</del></li> <li>• Number of new developments incorporating opportunities for recycling</li> </ul>	
B118	150	BDP23 Water Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice of Environment Agency, the Lead Local Flood Authority or Internal Drainage Board</li> <li>• <del>No of incidences of flooding</del></li> <li>• <del>No of new properties built in the flood plain</del></li> <li>• % of watercourses within the District that meet the targets set out in the Water Framework Directive</li> <li>• Number of new developments incorporating SuDs</li> </ul>	Correction
B119	151	BDP24 Green Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of open space on expansion/development sites</li> <li>• Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag award standard</li> <li>• % of open space, allotments, sports and recreational facilities lost to development</li> <li>• The number of applications that contribute towards the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• <del>No of parks and areas of recreation space</del></li> <li>• <del>Green Infrastructure Proportion of eligible open space maintained to "green flag" standard</del></li> <li>• <del>% of allotments lost to development</del></li> <li>• <del>% loss of recreational land and/or buildings lost to</del></li> </ul>	Correction

			development	
B120	151	BDP25 Health and Well Being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Number units and percentage of units with A5 use within the Town and Local Centres</del></li> <li>• % of obese children in Year 6 of Primary School</li> <li>• % of adults who are obese</li> <li>• % of adults who eat a healthy diet</li> <li>• % of adults who participate in recommended levels of physical activity</li> <li>• Average life expectancy</li> <li>• Mortality Rates from circulatory diseases under the age of 75</li> <li>• Mortality rates from cancers under the age of 75</li> <li>• Average yearly excess winter deaths</li> <li>• Total amount of leisure</li> <li>• <del>No. of new cycle routes</del></li> <li>• <del>No. of applications with cycling facilities</del></li> <li>• % of obese children in Year 6 of Primary School</li> </ul>	Correction
<b>Appendix VI Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance now renumbered Appendix V</b>				