

8034

**Sent:** 11 November 2013 10:01  
**To:** BDC strategic planning  
**Subject:** Bromsgrove District Plan 1/2  
**Attachments:** BDP Hagley 15 - para 8.30.docx; BDP Hagley 1 - para 1.12.docx; BDP Hagley 2 - para 2.8.docx; BDP Hagley 3 - para 2.13.docx; BDP Hagley 4 - para 2.14.docx; BDP Hagley 5 - para 2.20.docx; BDP Hagley 6 - para 2.30.docx; BDP Hagley 7 - ch 3.docx; BDP Hagley 8 - para 4.6-8.docx; BDP Hagley 9 - para 4.10.docx; BDP Hagley 10 - ch 5.docx; BDP Hagley 11 - ch 7.docx; BDP Hagley 12 - para 8.9.docx; BDP Hagley 13 - para 8.20 + Policy 3.3.docx; BDP Hagley 14 - Policy 4.docx

Dear All

These are the [first] batch of Hagley Parish Council's objections to Bromsgrove District Plan. At the time of writing they have not been formally approved by the Council, but it is expected that they will be ratified at a meeting tonight. If any are not ratified, I will advise you accordingly.

In that event, Dr Peter King has told you, they should go forward as personal objections by him. Certain objections cite two papers written by him, 'The Economic Structure of Bromsgrove District' and 'A history of Bromsgrove Housing Supply policy'. He has already sent you those to you.

Kind regards

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| Hagley Parish Council |
|-----------------------|

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 2       | Paragraph: 1.12 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|                               |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: NO |
|-------------------------------|--------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The "Consultation" exercise, carried out in 2011 on DCS2, was not a consultation according to the legal definition of that term, at least in the way in which BDC dealt with the many objections that it received to the release of the ADRs. The Council expected perhaps 300 objections, but received 2300 objections. However the Council's response to this was to brush them all off: they had as much effect on the way the Council proceeded as the proverbial water off a duck's back. Consultation involves listening to what those consulted said, which is just what the Council did not do.

Not only did the Council not listen, but it proceeded to give Planning Consent for almost all the ADRs. If democracy has any meaning in this context, the very level of objection should have led the Council to pause and consider whether the whole strategy of DSC2 was the right one. The result of its actions is that the development of the ADRs is virtually a *fait accompli*. The Council's actions have put it beyond the ability of the Examination to consider whether policy BDP5B is or is not a sound policy.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

Despite the defect, we would like the Examination to proceed, because the current Local Plan formally expired as long ago as 2001 (though only adopted in 2004). A replacement is thus desperately needed

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Since this objection concerns legal compliance the question of the soundness of the paragraph does not arise

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

2

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 7       | Paragraph: 2.8  | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant. However, the Plan does not comply with truth.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

See soundness section

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |    |
|--|--------------------------|----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |    |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The description of the District in paragraph 2.8 is grossly inadequate. It fails to recognise that most of the District is in a Commuter Zone, where the main economic activity consists of working beyond the district boundary, in the adjacent conurbations. This is a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of the District. Since this is a fundamental premise to the whole plan, this error has the potential to undermine large parts of the Plan and renders them fundamentally unsound. In fact, the actual proposals (apart from the Village ADRs most of now have Planning Consent for housing) focus development on the Bromsgrove Economic Zone (Bromsgrove, plus Catshill and Stoke Prior). Elsewhere, the Plan provides no policies for significant industrial or commercial development in the rest of the district, except:

- The retention of existing commerce
- On a small scale in existing village centres
- The designation of the Hagley ADR site as “mixed use”
- The retention of the Ravensbank ADR on the edge of Redditch.

Accordingly, as it happens, this defect does not in fact undermine the whole Plan and render its policies unsound, but this is merely by chance, the result of serendipity. The Plan should not be discouraging commuting out of the district, save to some extent in the Bromsgrove Economic Zone. This is why the change, substituting “Bromsgrove” for “the District”, is needed.

The detailed evidence, on which this objection is founded, is set out in Dr Peter King’s paper, “The Economic Structure of Bromsgrove District”. This is important because chapter two of the Plan is a fundamental premise to the whole plan. Furthermore, future plans (and the Green Belt Review) are likely to be built on these premises.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Split the present paragraph 2.8 into two, the gap being at the foot of the page, or after the first sentence in column two. Insert between them:*

2.8A Commuting out of the district to well-paid work in the conurbation or Redditch is the major economic activity in all the large settlements. It is less important in Catshill and parts of Bromsgrove. The town of Bromsgrove is the main focus of economic activity only for Bromsgrove, Catshill, and Stoke Prior.

2.8B [rest of present text], *but substituting “Bromsgrove” for “the District”.*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 8       | Paragraph: 2.13 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not |



6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The statement is factually correct, but inadequate, making the Plan unsound. The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) is to an extent a blunt weapon for identifying true deprivation. This is because one element of its housing barrier element is concerned with the distance to services. This is a significant factor for those without access to a car, but it has the bizarre result of attributing a comparatively "deprived" status to some areas that are in fact among the most prosperous areas of the district, those where house prices are the highest. This is the result of the normal market mechanism of supply and demand, due to them being highly sought after locations to live in, for people who commute into the conurbation to work.

The text should be amplified by the use of ACORN data identifying those LSOAs with the highest number of "hard pressed" people. Even if IMD is the only measure used, the paragraph should be expanded to name Charford and parts of Catshill as deprived. This should identify them as the targets for regeneration or other measures to counteract this status.

This issue is further explored in Dr Peter King's paper, "The Economic Structure of Bromsgrove District".

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*For Paragraph 2.13, substitute:*

2.13A On several measures, the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation, ACORN data, and 2013 Unemployment data, Charford, Sidemoor and Catshill Middle Super Output Areas (MSOAs) are significantly deprived. These pockets of deprivation need to be tackled. They include three Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in the 30% most deprived ones. The northern part of Sidemoor, the most deprived in the district is ranked 8168<sup>th</sup> out of the 32482 LSOAs nationally. Unemployment in them and West Bromsgrove was in the range 2.8% to 4.9% of the economically active population in August 2013.

2.13B In contrast most of the rest of the District is very prosperous. A major economic activity of its residents is working in the neighbouring conurbations. Such people commonly enjoy high salaries and can afford expensive houses. These areas register as prosperous on the ACORN index, in some cases having no people who are hard-pressed. They have low unemployment, usually below 1.5% of the economically active population. Nevertheless, certain of these areas show up on as slightly deprived the 2010 Index of Multiple Deprivation, but this is largely because residents are comparatively distant from services, as is inevitable in rural areas. However, with high car ownership in these areas, this is not a great problem.

*Consequential amendments are needed to the Strategic Objectives and the Policies.*

- The reference to commuting in 3.5 should be limited to Bromsgrove itself and should not apply to the while district.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? *Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

|   |
|---|
| Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues. |
|---|

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| Hagley Parish Council |
|-----------------------|

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 8       | Paragraph: 2.14 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

|   |
|---|
| The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant. |
|---|

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This paragraph is misguided in its conclusions. It assumes a social structure that has to a large extent long disappeared; at least so far as much of the middle class is concerned. This particularly applies to the large villages where the issue highlighted is most acute. In an environment when over 40% of young people (nationally) go to university after leaving school, it is likely that the proportion is higher in these least deprived settlements. Typically, most students do not go to their most local university. It is thus in the nature of middle class society that a large proportion of the young people disperse to the four winds on leaving school. They may subsequently settle in or near their university, but they may again disperse to the four winds on graduating. Due to this effect, the native population of the large villages is this inherently in decline, but there is no actual decline in the population, because it is continually replenished by prosperous young adults moving out of the cities. Their aspirations are the very cause of the high prices.

Young graduates will typically settle in cities. They will marry and probably buy their first home there, but with a growing family and sufficient income to support a large mortgage, their second (or perhaps third home) may be one of these large villages. They may return to their native village or a nearby one, unless they originally came from a completely different part of the country.

By way of example, research done in Hagley showed that the population cohort in their twenties was underrepresented in Hagley (see report by RCA Regeneration). Some years ago, the birth-rate in Hagley appeared to be so low that the County Council were afraid that the Primary School (then with a two-form entry) would have declining rolls. This was the reverse of the reality: it proved necessary to expand the school to a three-form entry, and the school is still full. Hagley Parish Council expressed concern over how the children from an extra 250 houses in Hagley could be accommodated, but the County Council were convinced that the situation could be managed by taking less out-of-area children. However, they are expanding Blakedown Primary School (within the same schools pyramid) from 15-pupil to 30-pupil entry.

The conclusions reached are thus misguided and unsound. This is important because it affects policies adopted later. It is pointless quoting two price datasets, both allegedly from 2012. There are two underlying datasets on house prices:

- Halifax Index is based on mortgage applications that it receives. This reflects sales recently agreed subject to contract, probably only trailing then

by a week or two.

- Land Registry data is based on land transfers received by it for registration. This is comprehensive (for England and Wales), but registration follows a week or two after house-sale completions, but due to the delays of the conveyancing process, completion trails sales agreed subject to contract by two to three months. This is accordingly a tailing indicator.

It is not useful to quote house prices without an income comparator. People will pay for houses what they can afford to pay. This is based on the mortgage repayment required. This has traditionally been judged by the multiplier between income and house price. With the worldwide reduction in interest rates generally since the 1990s, long-term comparisons based on this ratio are misleading. The better comparator would use the amount that would be interest on the whole value of the property at the interest rate applicable to low risk mortgages. Thus if an interest rate of 5% were applicable, the annual value of a house worth £200,000 would be £10000. This £10000 should then be compared with income. A person with an income of £25000 would thus have a house valued at 40% of income.

Data on income by residence is probably not readily available, due to the way the tax system works:

- Because HMRC collects PAYE income tax based on workplace, not residence; and
- Because of the separate taxation of couples living together.

SHMA has sought to deal with this by using the income of persons working in the district as a surrogate for the income of residents. This is probably not a problem in Bromsgrove where a large proportion of the population work locally, but there is a severe mismatch in those areas that rely heavily on commuting into the conurbations. Accordingly the conclusions of SHMA on this subject are severely flawed. People talk of a housing ladder. It is true that young people cannot afford to buy a home where they grew up, but there is no good reason why this should be a desirable objective. The mobility of educated middle-class young adults has been described above. The implication of the Plan (and of SHMA) is that if they cannot afford to buy, the State should provide them with housing. However, such young adults (like their parents) aspire to own their own homes, not usually to be permanent tenants. The plan is unsound so far as it follows this logic.

References to the mortgage market having dried up and unhelpful and merely explain the lack of activity in the housing market in recent years. This is (hopefully) a short term phenomenon, which will be rendered obsolete by the government's Help to Buy scheme. Historically, those seeking a mortgage above 75% paid a small premium to a guarantor (normally an insurance company), which undertook to indemnify the lender against the loss due to making a high loan-to-value advance. The Credit Crunch consisted of the bursting of a house price bubble. Previously, lending was made in the assumption that mortgage deals with an initial discounted interest rate would continue to be available indefinitely. This enabled borrowers to move from one low-rate deal to another, when they could only afford the payments on the discounted deals, not the full rate payable after the initial period. High loan-to-value mortgages were perceived as risky and disappeared from the market. As first time buyers typically need such a mortgage, only those with significant capital or parental help were able to enter the market. With no first-time buyers entering the bottom of the housing ladder, the whole market has dried up. Some of the cause of this relates to changes in banking policy as to the reserves needed by lenders, but part also relates to the disappearance of (or increase in premium for) the Mortgage Indemnity Guarantees formerly associated with high loan-to-value

mortgages. The government's Help to Buy scheme should make good the gap in that market.

There are certainly some people who will always need affordable housing. However by assuming that the unusual market conditions of the past five years will continue for the next fifteen or more, the Plan is unsound. The Council appears to have no robust data on what the true need for affordable housing is, and certainly no data on how that need is distributed across the district. Dr King has sought that data through Freedom of Information Requests, but these have been refused on the grounds that the addresses on the Council's Housing list are not kept in a form that enables details to be extracted. This data ought to have been collected as part of the evidence base for the Plan. Since it has not been, the Plan is not based on the relevant data and is accordingly unsound. If the Council had wanted this data, it could easily have extracted it from the housing list. It could, for example, have taken the postcodes and stripping them of the last two letters and then identified the settlements, to which that part of the postcode related. Alternatively, the name of the settlement could be manually copied from the middle to the address.

Even then data from the Housing List is a blunt tool, unless appropriately used:

- As long as social housing rents are typically set at 80% of open market rents, there will be a demand from private tenants for social housing. Any rational tenant would prefer to rent social housing at £400 per month, rather than privately at £500 per month.
- The Housing list measures gross demand, not net demand. Rehousing a social housing tenant in a larger house generates no net demand, because his previous house is then available for another tenant, perhaps one wanting a smaller house. Similarly, rehousing a private tenant will free up his previous house, which may be available to be re-let to another tenant, perhaps someone who was on the Housing List; if so, the action results in no change in net demand.
- Some people keep their names on the Housing List, because they have an insecure tenure, for example on a mobile home park. If that accommodation ceased to be available, they wish to avoid the wait required of those who newly join the housing list. BDC fell into this trap when they permitted a rural exception scheme at Hopwood a few years ago: it turned out that most of the potential tenants were happily living in a mobile home park, so that the alleged need proved illusory. BDC was censured for maladministration for permitting this development.

In the absence of data directly applicable to the issue of the distribution of affordable housing, other indicators ought to have been used. Since hard-pressed people are those most likely to require social housing, the ACORN data on this should be a good surrogate. This strongly points to the majority of the need for affordable housing being in Bromsgrove and Catshill, with minimal need in the prosperous commuter belt. NPPF advises that all developments should have an affordable element unless there is robust evidence to the contrary. Because BDC has not sought the requisite data, it does not know whether there is (or is not) robust data on this subject. The failure to seek such data means that the Plan is not based on evidence and is hence unsound.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*For Paragraph 2.13, substitute*

2.14 [quote one set of housing figures only, then:]. This represents a high ratio compared to the income of those working in the district, but the higher incomes enjoyed by those commuting into the conurbations mean that this statistic is misleading. [data on average income and the ratio of income to house price] As elsewhere, the housing market has stagnated since the Credit Crunch, but it is hoped that the government's Help to Buy scheme (for those needing mortgages of up to 95% of value) will free it up the market. BDC will monitor the situation over coming years. BDC has not collected data on where affordable housing is most needed, but ACORN data suggests that the need is likely to be concentrated in certain parts of Bromsgrove and in Catshill.

*Consequential amendments:*

- *Delete Objective 3.9.*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)****Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page:9        | Paragraph: 2.20 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)



The designation of the Clent Hills as a Landscape Protection Area (as in the old Local Plan) should be maintained. The Landscape Character Assessment contains nothing that requires this designation to be removed. Alternatively, the Plan should identify certain of the Character Types of the Assessment as ones to be protected, and by that means afford protection to the Clent Hills. This is particularly important in the context of a likely Green Belt Review.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

Landscape Protection Area of the old Local Plan should be carried forward into the new one.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 10      | Paragraph: 2.30 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This paragraph is not positively prepared. The object should be to say that the district does not need an airport. Airports were controversial a few years back, particularly in the west of the District when there were proposals greatly to expand the scope of Halfpenny Green Airfield (at Bobbington in South Staffordshire). It was re-titled Wolverhampton Business Airport.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*Amend to the following (changes in red type):*  
 2.30 Birmingham Airport is located within easy commuting distance of Bromsgrove. The Airport provides vital links with Europe and the rest of the world for local and regional business tourism, international conferences and sporting events. The M42 motorway provides good connectivity for the district with the Airport. The district therefore has no need of an airport. ~~and is also a major employment site. The Airport is therefore key to maintaining the region's competitiveness and in terms of Bromsgrove.~~ However, maintaining and improving connectivity to and from the Airport is fundamental to the District's competitiveness.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                              |
|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Page: 11      | Paragraph: 3    | Policy: Strategic Objectives |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                              |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The Strategic Objectives are essentially conclusions from the description in Chapter 2. This is why objection has been taken (at length) to some of the statements in it.

Since Hagley, Barnt Green, Alvechurch and Wythall are already prosperous and have very low levels of unemployment, they do not need investment in employment. Since they have no undeveloped land other than former ADRs that have planning consent for housing, inward investment would involve developing employment sites in the Green Belt. This would be wholly unacceptable and is contrary to the main thrust of the Plan.

3.9 is unachievable and hence unsound. It is an element of middle class life that young adults often settle away from where they grew up. Despite the tendency for the locally indigenous population to decline, the population is not, because it is continually replenished by prosperous people who commute to jobs in the conurbation. Fuller reasons for this are given in the objection to 2.13.

3.14 is laudable, but many parts of the Plan are so prescriptive as to render it community involvement impracticable. The Plan used to be called a "Core Strategy", but that is a misdescription, as it is much wider than that. Many districts have formulated a Core Strategy and then a Site Allocations Plan. Neighbourhood Plans need to comply with the Core Strategy, but they ought to be able to depart from the detailed provisions of a Site Allocations Plan, if they can provide a better alternative. With such a prescriptive Plan as currently drafted, this is not feasible. The Plan is unsound because it fails to comply with the provisions of Localism Act that are intended to encourage the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Furthermore since the rest of the Plan makes objective 3.14 unachievable, the Plan is itself unsound. Ideally, the Plan would be split into a Core District Plan and a Site Allocations Plan, where Neighbourhood Plans would have to comply with the former, but not the latter. At this late stage that is probably not practicable, but various specific policies must be amended, so that the requisite flexibility is built into the Plan, as to Site Allocation issues.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (**see Note 8 para 4.3**)

*Substitute for the present paragraphs:*

3.5 Attracting inward investment to Bromsgrove town and its immediate vicinity and stemming outward commuting from that area.

*Delete 3.9 (or limit it to Bromsgrove Town)*

*3.14 no change here, but changes are needed elsewhere.*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                   |         |
|---------------|-------------------|---------|
| Page: 12      | Paragraphs: 4.6-8 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document:   |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| *Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

4.6 This objective is unsound. The Plan seeks to make Bromsgrove into a self-sufficient island. This is completely unrealistic in an area sitting so heavily under the shadow of a major conurbation. See objection to paragraph 2.8.

4.7 This is again laudable, but the Plan fails to provide a mechanism to ensure that this can be achieved in the period after the present land allocations are exhausted about a decade hence; possibly sooner. No amendment is required in this respect here, but amendments will be needed to later parts of the Plan so that this is achievable. In particular, the Plan needs to provide targets as to the housing land to be found by each neighbourhood. See also under 4.10.

If these paragraphs are redrafted to apply only to Bromsgrove Town (perhaps with its immediate vicinity) the objection disappears, but a further paragraph will be needed referring to the rest of the District.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*In 4.6 Substitute Bromsgrove Town for the District.*

*Amend 4.7 as follows:*

New development will have been directed to sustainable locations around Bromsgrove town in the first instance, whilst encouraging appropriate levels of housing provision in other sustainable locations, such as the larger settlements. Sustainable and inclusive urban extensions will be established to the north and west of the town. The identification of the transport infrastructure, services and supporting Travel Plans needed to encourage walking, cycling, the use of public transport and high occupancy car modes will have been recognized at the beginning of the planning process. Developments will deliver affordable housing, employment, open space, and community facilities and will achieve a high standard of sustainable design and construction.

4.7A Elsewhere, housing development will proceed on those sites that already have planning consent. Little further housing development is expected to be authorised before the completion of the Green Belt Review. The Council will seek to make good those infrastructure deficits that have not been resolved during the application process.

4.8A New and existing communities will be supported by a network of local centres which will provide local residents with easy access to shopping, employment and services. Public transport, walking and cycling links will have been improved to better connect residents with local and regional destinations, providing health benefits and decreasing carbon emissions. Walking and cycling will be an easy first choice for shorter journeys. More balanced, mixed use communities with good



~~service centres, together with a greater proportion of people working from home will have further reduced the need to travel and levels of out commuting from the District.~~

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page:13       | Paragraph: 4.10 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This is only achievable if the Plan provides some room for flexibility in the detail of development proposals. By laying down precisely which pieces of land should be developed in the Plan, there is no opportunity for communities to develop their own proposals as to what land should be developed. Now that almost all the ADRs have planning permission, there is probably now little opportunity for change in them. They have had planning consent despite still being officially "as protected as if they were Green Belt", since the Local Plan procedure for releasing them has not been pursued.

Each community needs a target, in order that there can be some finality to what is to be developed. Otherwise, a community that develops a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) may find, after it has (with difficulty) found land for (say) 100 houses, that the district council will say, "Thank you very much. We will take your 100 and impose another 200 on you." That would be the very reverse of local decision making. It would also be undemocratic, since an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will have been subject to a local referendum. If the community had been told from the start that its target was 300, it could have consulted on how to accommodate them. The possibility of that happening would provide a grave disincentive to preparing a NP: if a community is going to have housing imposed on it, there is no incentive for its volunteers (in their own unpaid time) to put the considerable effort needed into preparing a NP. The effort required is considerable, as witnessed by the effort necessary to develop a Parish Plan, only to have the District Council refuse to adopt it, because it contained proposals that did not match the Local Plan.

This is not quite what happened under a previous plan process. An ADR (as safeguarded land was then known) was identified in Hagley in 1991. When the Bromsgrove Local Plan was rejected in about 1998, more ADRs had to be identified. Hagley Parish Council did not like the amount of extra ADR land being identified, but acquiesced in this, partly because a major local landowner was proposing ADRs all around the village and objecting to all those elsewhere proposed by the District Council. The Parish Council did not have the resources to investigate whether the provision was proportionate to the size of the village. Subsequent investigation indicates that it was disproportionately large, but with the undeveloped state of the Internet at that period, the Parish Council did not realise this and so did not object. This is no doubt why (uniquely among the village ADRs) the Hagley ADR was designated for mixed use. The ADR identified in 1991 may well have been sufficient for the village's needs, but more was imposed in about 2001. This was formally adopted in 2004, by which time the housing moratorium had been imposed.

The Plan needs to provide a housing target for each village (or at least the six large ones). It also needs a provision in the Plan that if the target is met, no further target will be required, save as part of a general increase in the targets for the whole District.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*No change is needed to 4.10, but substantial changes are needed elsewhere, so that objective 4.10 is achievable.*

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 14      | Paragraph: 5    | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The preservation of the Green Belt ought to be a strategic objective, save so far as land has to be released for future development needs. The Green Belt should not merely be treated as an element of the ill-defined Green Infrastructure.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Add:*

SO8A Preserve the Green Belt, save in so far as land has to be released from it under the Green Belt Review.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 15      | Paragraph: 7    | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|                            |                          |  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Proper drafting requires that the detailed Proposals Map should be incorporated into the Plan at this point. Unless this is done the Proposals Map will not have the status that it ought.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

Change title to "Key Diagram and Proposals Map".

Add at end:

The proposals of this Plan appear in greater detail on the Proposals Map.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:



**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                             |         |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Page: 18 & 20 | Paragraph: 8.9              | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: and Table 2 |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The paragraph fails to highlight the complete irrelevance of Bromsgrove Town as a commercial centre to some of the large villages. The residents of Hagley are far more likely to seek those services provided by a Market Town in towns beyond the boundary of the District, particularly Stourbridge and to shop there or at Merry Hill, with Kidderminster as their next choice.

The present retail provision in Hagley, Rubery, Barmt Green and Hollywood is not limited to Convenience, but to so-called Comparison retailing, though "comparison" is a misnomer, since there is normally no second shop, with which to compare. These centres (at least) have the leisure/culture items listed from Bromsgrove and should continue to do so. Indeed many small villages have a church and a public hall. I have not noticed significant shopping centres in Wythall (proper), Catshill, or Alvechurch, so that they are not mentioned in the suggested amendment. It does not appear to be one of the strategic objectives to strangle existing Local Centres. Indeed a welcome policy on the subject of Local Centres has been included in the Plan. The object of the following amendments is merely to preserve the *status quo*.

Previous policy has allowed infill within Village Envelopes. The section on Small Villages (as drafted) would appear to restrict this, so that a Housing Needs Survey would be needed to establish whether it was needed before a single market house could be built. This is presumably not intended, in view of the lack of a 15-year housing land supply. For the Small Village classification, the main criterion for inclusion in the list seems to be that it has a village envelope in the old Local Plan. The purpose of footnote 10 is thus not clear, partly because Bromsgrove is a "blue" settlement: it would be better to state in the text that they have a Village Envelope, perhaps marking any that do not with an asterisk (explained by a new footnote). Local Services is listed twice against small settlements.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*Amend the penultimate sentence of 8.9:*

Over time a settlement hierarchy has been established in the District. ~~with~~ Bromsgrove Town is able to provide ~~providing~~ most of the services, but outlying villages often look beyond the District boundary for services. Hagley, Rubery, Barnt Green and Hollywood have good local shopping centres with some other services available.

*Table 2*

- *Refer to Large Villages, rather than Large Settlements and similarly to Small Villages.*
- *Leisure/Culture item should have e.g. not i.e.*
- *Leisure/Culture items should apply to Large Villages, not just to Bromsgrove.*
- *It may be desirable to list Hollywood and Majors Green as distinct large villages, rather than making them all as part of Wythall, since there are strategic gaps between them.*
- *For small settlements substitute for the first paragraph:*
  - *Limited infill within any village envelope, normally fronting to existing roads.*
  - *Rural exception housing within or adjacent to the village envelope, or adjacent to the settlement where there is none. If beyond a village envelope, this is subject to a local need (as opposed to demand) being established through a Housing Needs Survey.*

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

***After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.***

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? ***Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.***

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |             |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Page: 21-22   | Paragraph: 8.20 | Policy: 3.3 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |             |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This is not positively prepared in that it does not directly address the issue at stake. In both this might be qualified that if future monitoring revealed a future failure to deliver, this would be increased to 20%. If the Inspector at the Examination disagrees, the reverse amendment can be made then.

BDP3.3 Since the conclusion of the papers cited in paragraphs 8.20 and 8.21 is that over the longer term, BDC has a good record of delivering its housing target, Policy BDP3.3 should adopt a 5% buffer as policy. By the time the Plan is subject to Examination, it is likely that the District will have a 5-year housing supply, if it does not already. The final sentence of Policy BDP3.3 thus appears to be out of date. Again in the Inspector disagrees, he can ask for an amendment.

Our other objections are suggesting that the Council should be designating certain sites as Safeguarded Land. Accordingly a procedure of the release of these is needed. There are few potential sites for this at the moment, but it is likely that the Green Belt Review will identify a significant quantity. It is desirable to have something on this subject in the Plan, so that there can be a phased release of land, as needed, every few years. It is not clear why the procedure laid down in the old Local Plan on this was not invoked in 2009 (when the Housing Moratorium ended). Possibly the procedure was too cumbersome. We are therefore suggesting a procedure with one consultation followed by an examination and adoption, which it should be possible to complete within a year.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*Amend to:*

8.20 It is fundamental to the success of the strategy for growth that the Council is able to achieve, and maintain, a 5 year supply of housing land. ~~Following the publication of the NPPF, requires local authorities have to provide this with a buffer. of either 5% or 20% depending on whether they have a history of persistent under delivery.~~ Based on the evidence analysed within the paper "Housing Delivery Performance", showing good delivery of targets over the longer term, the Council will initially seek to maintain only a buffer of 5% in addition to the 5 year land supply.

BDP3.3 The Council will seek to maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable sites plus an additional buffer of 5% ~~moved forward from later in the plan period (or 20% where there has been persistent under delivery of housing).~~

BDP3.4 Annual monitoring will be used to identify the required rate of housing delivery for the following five year period, based on the remaining dwellings to meet overall requirements. Whenever a five year supply has been achieved the Council will ~~consider whether granting~~ refuse permission, if granting it would provide a substantially higher supply and thus undermine the objectives of this strategy. If annual monitoring identifies a deficit in supply and there is then Safeguarded Land, the Council will immediately initiate a review, to lead to a Supplementary Plan (releasing some sites or parts of them) being consulted upon examined and adopted to make good the deficit.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

|   |
|---|
| Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues. |
|---|

|                  |             |
|------------------|-------------|
| Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
|------------------|-------------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |          |
|---------------|-----------------|----------|
| Page:25       | Paragraph:      | Policy:4 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |          |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

BDP4.1 is not positively prepared. The clause is extremely uncertain in its implications. The use of the "General extent" actually suggests that nibbling at the edges will be allowed. That is completely unacceptable. The de facto release of safeguarded ADRs in the last few years, in advance of the adoption of a Local Plan Review or a new Plan creates a worrying precedent, as does the practice of assuming that "emerging plans" carry significant weight in decision making. It is important that the Plan makes clear that until the adoption of the Green Belt Review, the Green Belt will be absolutely protected

In view of the extreme development pressure that is inevitable on the fringes of a conurbation, it is important that the Green Belt is maintained. That is what it is there for. Furthermore, that pressure is likely to lead to premature development of land, sooner than it is needed. The policy of the former WMRSS was to encourage the regeneration of brownfield sites in urban areas. While WMRSS is now abolished, that policy was and still is sound. An excessive release of land is likely to prejudice that regeneration.

Since land for the 15-year housing land supply can properly be Safeguarded Land, until it is needed, BDP4.2 should explicitly provide for some of that land to be Safeguarded Land. The present land supply will probably only last until about 2023. This probably means that the Review needs to be completed by about 2019, so that the District does not fall below its 5-year target, but the Review will provide at least a 10-year supply. Proper management requires that BDC must prevent the profligate use of that land supply in the early years of that period. This is essentially the problem that arose in 2002-3 and led to the Moratorium. The recent *de facto* release of all ADRs has the risk of leading to a similar boom and bust. That must not be repeated; instead the release of land must be gradual. The full Local Plan preparation process is very long-winded, but it should be possible to devise a system whereby there can be a brief consultation, perhaps every three years on what Safeguarded Land should be released, followed by a quick Examination of a Supplementary Plan and its adoption. The object should be to maintain a 5-8 year land supply at all times. The implication of this is that some of the land released from the Green Belt by the Green Belt Review should become Safeguarded Land.

It should be beyond the power of the Planning Committee to grant planning consent for Safeguarded Land; it might be reserved to the full Council to do so, exceptionally. However, there should be a clear mechanism so that regular releases can take place. It is suggested that with each Annual Monitoring Report, the Strategic Planning Staff should report whether a release procedure needed to be initiated that year. The Strategic Planning Staff would assess the sites and put forward a Preferred Option. With a single consultation, it should be possible to summarise the arguments for and against each site in a few weeks, and submit a final version for Examination. It ought to be possible to get this done within the year. This is of course on a larger scale than a normal Planning Application, but writing a report of the consultation results should not be more difficult. The objective should be to have a rapid procedure (with as few bureaucratic stages as reasonable) to produce a short Supplementary Plan releasing the land needed soon, but not more than that.

The problem with the settlement hierarchy of BDP2 is that it imposes not express view on where development should go. This is because it is designed to use up existing capacity. If the Plan is to require a Green Belt Review (as it must), it is also necessary that it should indicate how it is to be done. The normal sequential approach (for example in the former WMRSS) focused on Market and Larger Towns. That is a sound policy, and implies that most development should be in Bromsgrove Town. It is suggested that it should appear in this policy, so that it cannot be used by developers as a pretext for off-plan development. This is also indicated by the location of the deprived MSOAs, which are presumably the places that will benefit most from development. This issue is discussed more fully in the objection to Paragraph 8.30.

BDP4.4c does not belong in this policy, though it is an appropriate policy. It should be part



of BDP15, as it relates to extensions, not new buildings.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*Substitute*

BDP4.1 The **general** extent of the Green Belt as indicated on the Policies Map will **only** be maintained **as per BDP-4.2**, except so far as land may be removed from it upon the adoption of a Supplementary Plan under 4.2-4.3. Development (other than in accordance with BDP4.4) will not be permitted until a Supplementary Plan has been adopted.

*Insert between the two sentences of BDP4.3A: Most development will be focused on Bromsgrove Town with some contribution from each of the Large Villages and a small one from Small Villages. Better still, the policy would provide a target for each settlement, even if this is a provisional one, to be reviewed as part of the Review process.*

*Add BDP4.3B: All land released from the Green Belt will become Safeguarded Land, except in so far as it may immediately be needed to provide a five-year supply (with a buffer) under policy BDP3.3.*

*Remove BDP4.4c to Policy 15.*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 24      | Paragraph: 8.30 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

We strongly object to the following text:

At this stage it is not considered appropriate to apportion a particular number or percentage of dwellings to tiers within the settlement hierarchy or individual settlements. This is considered to be inflexible and it is more important to focus on identifying the most suitable and sustainable sites for growth.

Several villages in the District are either in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan or thinking about it. If they are given a target, a consultation could be undertaken as to how that target would be met. Hagley has a strong NIMBY tendency. The in advance of Hagley Parish Plan consultation was conducted in the parish, with the high number of about 28% of households responding. This had a question asking respondents to choose two types of housing out of four that were most needed. Though not invited to, a large proportion of respondents wrote in something to the effect, "No more development" and did not answer the question asked. This consultation was undertaken shortly after the Housing Moratorium was imposed. Hagley suffered from particularly high proportionate growth in that period, so that the reaction is understandable. However it has persisted: it was reflected in the large number of objections from Hagley people to the appearance of the Hagley ADR as a development site in the consultation on DCS2 and again in opposition to two planning applications covering the majority of it. In one case there was a march against it.

Without some target laid down, or at least a mechanism by which some target can be deduced, the Plan is unsound. Without one, it will be impossible for any village to produce a robust Neighbourhood Plan, without running the risk that the Green Belt Review will impose a higher target on the village, thus negating the Neighbourhood Plan process for that village. If there is no target, it will be impossible to know if a Neighbourhood Plan does or does not conform to the Plan. If laying down a figure is left until the Green Belt Review is completed and land is allocated by it, there will again be no scope for villages to develop their own plan.

It will no doubt be said that the proportions are themselves a matter on which BDC must consult, and that it has not done so. It has been apparent at least since the Examination of WMRSS Phase 2 Revision that BDC would have to find land for housing for Birmingham for the 2020s. The need for more land has been apparent since the publication of a new SHMA a couple of years ago. BDC managed to undertake an urgent consultation to find more land for Redditch. It should at the same time consulted on the distribution of the housing overhang for the 2020s, so that some target could be adopted. The target then thought to be 3000, but is now only 2400. As the consultation has not been undertaken, it is presumably not appropriate to adopt any figures by way of policy, but it is desirable that the Plan should provide some provisional target, perhaps in the narrative, even if this is explicitly subject to review as part of the Green Belt Review process. It is suggested that a table light be put in the text with provisional targets. The figures in this table are by way of example. We are open to persuasion on what the target should be, but distributing 120 between the small villages and 600 between six large ones seems appropriate as a starting point.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or

text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Accordingly the text objected to should be amended:*

At this stage it is not considered finally appropriate to apportion a particular number or percentage of dwellings to tiers within the settlement hierarchy or individual settlements. ~~This is considered to be inflexible and it is more important to focus on identifying the most suitable and sustainable sites for growth.~~ Until a stage is reached in the Green Belt Review where a definite number can be assigned to each settlement, the following table should apply, with the target for large villages being split equally between them:

|                 |     | At least |
|-----------------|-----|----------|
| Bromsgrove Town | 70% | 1680     |
| Large Villages  | 25% | 600      |
| Small Villages  | 5%  | 120      |
|                 |     | 2400     |

*Alternatively, it should be replaced by:*

At this stage it is not considered finally appropriate to apportion a particular number or percentage of dwellings to tiers within the settlement hierarchy or individual settlements. ~~This is considered to be inflexible and it is more important to focus on identifying the most suitable and sustainable sites for growth.~~ However, the Council intends to consult on how the target should be split and to adopt a Supplementary Plan, setting out a target for each settlement as soon as possible, and in advance the completion of the Green Belt Review.

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page:26ff     | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP5 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |              |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Possibly not | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is certainly contrary to the spirit of the Localism Act on Neighbourhood Planning. The Plan is so prescriptive that the scope for planning by Neighbourhoods is largely ruled out: see further under soundness

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

See under soundness

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

BDP at various points pays lip service to Neighbourhoods Plans at various points, but it is so prescriptive that there is in fact little room for Neighbourhoods to develop meaningful plans. This is contrary to NPPF paragraph 69. Many LPAs have produced a Core Strategy and then a separate Land Allocations Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan has to comply with the

former, but ought to be able to depart from the latter, as long as it does not tend to less housing being built. This should mean that a Neighbourhood Plan should be able to identify a different site for development to one allocated by the Allocations Plan and return an allocated site either to being Safeguarded Land or even to Green Belt.

DCS2 contained a policy CP5 on Neighbourhood Planning. This was not well thought out and the relationship of Neighbourhood Planning to the Core Strategy was again not well explained. This followed the predecessor of BDP5, but instead of this, we have the Redditch Expansion policy. Precisely where a policy should appear may be a matter for debate. For the moment it is suggested that it should precede BDP5, so that it is preliminary to BDP5A, BDP5B (which would be better numbered as separate policies) and RCBD1 (which should also be numbered in the main sequence). Better still, they would appear in a completely separate part of the plan as LA [Land Allocation] 1-3. The Town Centre sites TC1-10 (in BDP17.8-18) would similarly be numbered in this sequence. This would mean that BDP would be split into Core Policies and Land Allocation Policies. Neighbourhood Plans would be required to comply with the former, though not necessarily with the latter.

By dealing with everything in a single Plan, BDP is giving insufficient scope to the neighbourhood planning that is encouraged by Localism Act 2011. To a considerable extent, This is currently only an academic question. This is because the actions of the Planning Committee, in granting planning consent for the Safeguarded ADRs without first completing the Review required by the old Local Plan, have prevented the question being asked. The vast majority of the objections to DCS2 were to the development of one or other of the ADRs, but BDC has rejected every one of them. The whole process was like water off a duck's back. That consultation was undertaken in the context of WMRSS Phase 2 Revision, where BDC argued for a housing target of 4200, rather than the much lower target of the Preferred Option. That figure appears not to have been derived from an objective assessment of need, but subjectively by a desire to use up the identified capacity. Subsequently a new SHMA has imposed a much higher target. This means that the main thrust of BDP5 is perhaps largely inevitable. Nevertheless, there should be an option open to neighbourhoods to depart from the Land Allocations, by identifying different sites. However, the terms of Localism Act mean that this cannot provide for less development.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*There should be a new policy, perhaps preceding both parts of Policy BDP5, explaining the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and BDP5 (also sites identified by the Green Belt Review under BDP4).*

#### **BDP5.0 Neighbourhood Plans**

In accordance with the Localism Act, BDC encourages neighbourhoods to develop Neighbourhood Plans. Such plans are required to comply with the Core Policies of BDP, but are not required to comply with the precise Land Allocation Policies, BDP5A, BDP5B, RCBD1 and BDP17.8-18. However, no Neighbourhood Plan may provide for the development of less housing- than is required of its area by the Land Allocation Policies without very good reasons, judged on a strategic (as opposed to a local) basis.

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                    |              |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Page:46-78    | Paragraph: 8.78-84 | Policy: BDP6 |
| Policies Map: | Other document:    |              |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

We have no objection to the policy, but are concerned that this should be about more than transport (which is all that has so far emerged). Any problems are likely to arise in the implementation of the policy, not with the



policy itself.

The Council should be in a position to use CIL to make good deficits in community infrastructure. It is clear (from the difficulties in this that arose in relation to large planning applications in Hagley) that the Council has collected on information on the condition and adequacy of Community Centres, Village Halls and the like. In the prosperous areas of the district, such as Hagley, lottery (and much other) funding is difficult to obtain, because this is tied to deprivation. This means that the only source of funding is public philanthropy. However this is a deficit that CIL levies ought to be able to make good.

The proposal in paragraph 8.80 for a mere 4-week consultation is grossly inadequate. 12 weeks would be much more appropriate to give time for third parties to collect evidence to highlight any gaps in the CIL document. Section 106 contributions can only deal with increases in the burden on community infrastructure and not underlying deficits.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (**see Note 8 para 4.3**)

The period in paragraph 8.80 should be amended to 12 weeks.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make.**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page: 48-49   | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP7 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |              |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | is  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is fine as far as it goes, but there is no mechanism to ensure that the policy can be delivered. In the commuter belt (including Hagley, Barnt Green, Alvechurch, and Wythall), the pressure from developers is to build the more profitable 4 and 5 bedroom houses, sought by affluent people moving out of the conurbations.

Furthermore, there is a need to provide bungalows (not being "dormer bungalows") for the affluent active elderly, so that they can move on and free up larger family homes, when (with an empty nest) they no longer need such a large house. On past performance, we have grave concerns as to whether the Council will succeed in delivering this policy without something more to give it teeth. This will probably be best done by the Council adopting an SPD on the subject. This should be more flexible than amending the plan.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*In BDP7.1:*

*After 2 and 3 bedroom properties insert including bungalows.*

*At end insert: The Council will adopt a SPD with targets for each house-size, including for single-storey bungalows.*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page:         | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP? |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |              |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

We are not in a position to question the accuracy of the statistics used in the SHMA and other surveys cited, but would suggest that they are misleading due to the high level of commuting from the district into the neighbouring conurbations.

- Incomes of those working in the district are being compared with the housing costs of those living in it. The prevalence of commuting means that there is a severe mismatch between these datasets.
- One of the housing surveys cited (at least) was prepared jointly with BDHT. Since BDHT's agenda is inevitably to promote an expansion of social housing, it must be questioned whether this has not led to a bias having crept in to the conclusions reached. It has been known for national politicians to refer an issue to a Royal Commission, but effectively to determine the result by their choice of the commissioners, selecting only those towards that has not been allowed to be drawn in.
- Another related to the Southern Housing Market Area, but the HMA boundaries were drawn excluding the northern part of the district, due to its affinity with the conurbation to the north. The southern HMA study is thus not relevant to housing needs in places such as Hagley, Wythall, Alvechurch and Barnt Green.
- One SHMA contained a table of demand for social housing, but the total number of applications was approximately seven times the number of applicants. Such exaggeration indicates a callous disregard for the kind of objective assessment required in formulating a District Plan.

A further problem with judging housing need by the length of the housing list is that it provides data on gross housing need rather than net housing need. There are at least two difficulties with this:

- As long as social housing is rented at a discount to the equivalent market housing, there will be a demand. Those renting a similar house from a private landlord at £500 per month will have a natural preference to rent a similar one from a social landlord at £400 per month. There are those who cannot afford either rent; and need a subsidy, but that ought to be provided as a social security benefit, not by offering below market rents. However this issue cannot easily be solved by any change locally in planning policy. The only possibility would be to change the definition of "affordable housing" to include housing that a private provider is willing to undertake to make available for renting out in the long term. However, that would require a change in NPPF, which BDP cannot make.
- Housing list data relates to gross demand. There is data on those in severe housing need and certain lower categories, but the vast majority of applicants are not in any class of great housing need. This indicates that they are in satisfactory accommodation, but that it is for one reason or another not satisfactory to them. They may well need rehousing; but when re-housed, their existing housing will become vacant and be available to rent to another person. This action will reduce the gross need by one, but will not affect the net need at all.

Over this summer, Dr King has repeatedly tried to obtain a breakdown of the distribution of where housing list applicants are living. Despite two Freedom of Information requests, this data has been refused me on the grounds that the data is not kept in a form that allows data on the settlement in which they respectively live to be extracted. The failure to be able to provide the data sought indicates that BDC have no data whatsoever on which to base a policy on the distribution of future affordable housing. This lack of data renders the policy

unsound.

NPPF advises that all development should have an element of affordable housing, unless there is *robust data* indicating the contrary (emphasis added). The refusal of my requests for data suggests to me that not only has BDC not collected such data, but it is wilfully refusing to do so. Unless the data is collected, it cannot be known whether there is robust data on the subject or not. BDC's Strategic Planning Manager has been heard to say that he know of no such data at a Planning Committee meeting, even though Dr King had placed his research into the ACORN data before the Committee.

There is certainly a need for affordable housing in the district, and it may be on the scale indicated in the policy, but that is not evidence that it is needed on-site in every case.

- Dr Peter King's paper, "The Economic Structure of Bromsgrove District", points to the areas where deprivation is concentrated being Charford, Sidemoor, and Catshill. That data does not directly address the issue, but must be a strong indicator of the areas where the Housing list applicants will be concentrated; there should be a strong correlation between his indicators and affordable housing need. Since data on their distribution is wilfully refused in circumstances that indicate that BDC has no idea what their distribution is, the data cited in relation to his paper must be taken to be the best evidence available of where the need exists.
- It is noteworthy that BDHT (which now owns what used to be BDC's council housing) has sold houses and potential house plots in Hagley and Clent in recent years. The justification is said to be that it can build 2-3 houses in Bromsgrove for each one it sells in Hagley. This was the explanation given to the planning committee, when BDHT sold four house plots in Hagley, without asking for any affordable houses to be provided from the development. However, it seems likely that BDHT also knows that there is only limited local need in Hagley for social housing.

Until data from the housing list can be provided as to the distribution of applicants, it must be suspected that the policies as to the distribution of affordable housing (as opposed to the quantity overall) is based on *no evidence at all*. BDC does not know how affordable housing ought to be distributed, because it has performed an ostrich act, in not seeking it. Any policy that is not based on evidence is automatically unsound. BDC should have undertaken an assessment of where the applicants are and have tailored its policies to where the need is. It is not suggested that need arising in Charford must be met precisely in Charford. However, it should be met within (or adjoining) Bromsgrove, the settlement of which Charford is part. It would be wholly inappropriate that it should be met in a relatively distant location such as Hagley or Wythall. If the person was working in Bromsgrove, he should be expected to commute from Hagley or Wythall. With the poor level of bus services from them and no direct railway line, such commuting would necessarily be by car, which would be contrary to other BDP Policies. The same should apply where a person has strong local connections with Bromsgrove, for example keeping an eye on elderly parents. Though not strictly applicable, such connections are recognised in BDC's Rural Housing Criteria.

Policy BDP8.3 contains no mechanism for determining what the mix of tenures should be. There should be a requirement that a housing needs survey should be carried out, including in large villages, unless there is a recent one or a Neighbourhood Plan provides an appropriate policy on the subject. The procedure laid down in BDP9.2 should be adapted for the purpose.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or

text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Policy BDP8.2 should be amended to provide:*

A lower number will be agreed where:

- The local need for affordable housing justifies a lower limit, based either on a Housing Needs Survey or a Neighbourhood Plan that has robustly considered such needs. If so, the Council may require a payment for off-site provision of the difference in a settlement where there is a higher need.
- Site preparation or infrastructure provision costs mean that the viability of the site requires a lower target.

*Policy BDP8.3 should be amended by inserting after the first sentence:*

The tenure mix should reflect the needs of the settlement where the development is to take place. This will be in accordance with any policy on the subject in a Neighbourhood Plan and will reflect the findings of any Housing Needs Survey. In appropriate cases, the Council may require a housing-needs survey to be conducted, applying such of the principles of Policy BDP9.2 b-c.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |               |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Page:56       | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP10 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |               |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |



6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Policy BDP10 is inadequate. Wealthier “empty nest” couples will commonly seek to acquire a home in their 60s or 70s, while that they are still fit and active. For those who can afford it this will be a bungalow. (I exclude so-called dormer bungalows – a design of two-storey house – from the bungalows referred to in this objection). Because bungalows are relatively extravagant in their use of land, it is unattractive for developers to build them. The policy should be encouraging developers to build them for older people, rather than just the typical sheltered flat developments.

This policy (or some other) should provide for the retention of the existing stock of bungalows. There is a profit to be made by replacing a bungalow with a two-storey house. This means that it is necessary for there to be a policy to protect the existing stock of bungalows against being replaced by multi-storey dwellings (unless there is compensating provision of new bungalows).

It would be better if 10.3 used the normal terminology, rather than a manufactured jargon for the different classes of residential care for the elderly – sheltered accommodation (with a warden resident or on call); care homes (institutions providing residential care); and nursing homes (care homes with a qualified nurse on the premises at all times). These classification terms may be useful to those planning or monitoring the availability of such accommodation, but the breakdown does not need to be in the policy.

There is also potentially a need for small residential institutions providing supporting living to those with learning difficulties. This requires a slightly different approach from housing the elderly.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Amendments:*

Policy BDP10.2 should list fewer types of accommodation using a few generic terms.

Policy BDP10.4 The Council will encourage developers to provide bungalows (as suitable for the elderly) particularly as part of larger developments. It will only permit the conversion of a single-storey bungalow into a multi-storey dwelling as part of a larger scheme which provides a greater number of single-storey bungalows than are being replaced.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination | YES |
|--|-----|

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

|   |
|---|
| Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues. |
|---|

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Page: 59      | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP12.1 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                 |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The last sentence seems rather too sweeping. It should be limited to housing and employment developments and such like. A development is being undertaken to meet one infrastructure deficit (for example the lack of a village hall) ought not, in one fell swoop, to be expected to solve all the other infrastructure deficits, of the same village. Community infrastructure developments (such as village halls) should only be expected to provide such infrastructure as is necessary for their own development, for example access roads and drains. Such gold-plating would be liable to render the scheme impossible to fund, and hence unviable. This would mean that the infrastructure deficit would remain. Accordingly, the requirement is liable to be counter-productive. Village halls, scout huts, and the like often have to be funded from grants or charitable donations. Even where developer's contributions are available, they are unlikely to meet more than a proportion of the cost.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

*Add to BDP12.1:*

Developments of new or replacement community infrastructure (such as village halls) will only be expected to provide such infrastructure (such as roads and drains) as is a necessary consequence of their development.

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                  |         |
|---------------|------------------|---------|
| Page: 70      | Paragraph: 8.182 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document:  |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

8.182 is welcome as far as it goes, but it fails to provide for the possibility of new Park and Ride car parks at or near stations, something that is liable to be necessary if people are only to make part of their journey by car. A reason for not including a policy on such is explained in paragraph 8.196. However, there is a failure in logic here. The latter says that station car park provision will be dealt with by working with other bodies. The Plan fails to say that plans promoted by Network Rail and WCC will be considered on their merits. Nevertheless, this is covered by Policy BDP16.5.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

The wording of section 8.185 needs to be amended so that it supports Policy BDP16.5.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)****Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                                 |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Page:81-87    | Paragraph:      | Policy:17 – Structure of policy |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                                 |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Policy BDP17 seeks to incorporate all the town centre proposals (formerly in the Town Centre draft AAP) into a single policy. The result is overly long and convoluted. BDP17 should be broken up into a series of at least three separate policies as follows:

- Sections 1, and 3-6 cover a general overall policy.
- Section 2 deals specifically with Shopping Frontage issues.
- Sections 7 onwards deal with opportunity sites. These would be better numbered as BDP17C.TC1 etc. or better still (say) BDP19.TC1 etc.

The related narrative should be distributed so that each of the new policies is supported by the text related to it. This comment does hardly goes to soundness, save that the presentation is not the most effective. Nevertheless, it does tend to make the plan illegible.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (**see Note 8 para 4.3**)

Split into (at least) three separate policies, as indicated above.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:



**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page: 81      | Paragraph:      | Policy: 17.2 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |              |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

(Empty response box for question 4)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

|                                      |                          |  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Policy BDP17.2.2 a-c seem primarily to refer to the frontage at street level. A wider range of uses ought to be acceptable on other floors. The upper parts of shops have been traditionally used for such purposes in most town centres. This is probably implicit in the policy, but should be more clearly expressed.

Acceptable uses should not only include B1, but small scale medical facilities, such as dentists, chiropodists and physiotherapists. Such uses have commonly been carried on in office-type premises. Encouraging them to cluster with other service uses in the Secondary Shopping area of the town centre (and the upper floors in the Primary Shopping area) tends to enhance the viability of the town centre, as people visiting their dentist may chose also to visit shops as part of the same trip.

Encouragement for the Evening Economy will best be limited to Secondary Shopping frontage, so that it does not further degrade the core Primary Frontage, which already has quite a low concentration of A1 uses.

I do not know Bromsgrove well, but my impression was that the extent of the Primary Shopping Frontage (as shown on the Proposals Map) is rather greater than is in fact in Primary shopping usage at present. It would be better to limit the extent of the Primary Frontage and increase that of the Secondary. This will serve to concentrate the main retail area and encourage the other Secondary uses in an area at the Southwest end of the centre. This is where a cinema is proposed and other Evening Economy uses should be appropriate there.

Councils have a tendency to try to buck the market, but retail space needs to be commercially viable. Any attempt artificially to expand (or even retain the extent of) the existing retail area is doomed to failure, if it is not profitable to retailers. The effect of this is to leave a host of empty shops or to cause the core to contract or to shift its centre. This has happened in Stourbridge over the past 40 years and is happening in Kidderminster following the development of Weavers Wharf there. This is ultimately a consequence of the rise of Internet-shopping, which has caused a general decline in high street shopping.

An analogy may be drawn from the experience in the way Stourbridge has developed over the past 50 years. Large new retail developments have twice been built next to the High Street. In the short term, these may have increased the retail space in use, but in the longer term, the effect has been to shift the Primary Shopping Area, so that areas that were once largely retail are now largely devoid of retail, the shops having been replaced by estate agents, financial services outlets, and uses related to the evening economy, including pizza and kebab shops.

Similarly in Kidderminster the development of Weavers Wharf has led to there being a considerable number of empty shops on the other side of the town centre.

The Council needs to manage decline by having a small primary core and encouraging new uses for space vacated by retailers beyond it.

The Plan speaks (though not in BDP17.2) of an uncompleted Retail Capacity Assessment (RCA) and anticipates that it will suggest additional retail space, as opposed to recycling the existing space.

On completion of RCA, a short Supplementary Plan dealing with its findings will be required, perhaps a SPD. This should be subject to Public Examination. BDP needs to provide a mechanism for such a Plan to be adopted, including the possibility that it may not precisely conform to the detailed provisions of BDP concerning the Town Centre. This

applies principally to sites TC1 and TC6.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (**see Note 8 para 4.3**)

*Remove the application of word "extended" to "Primary" from the first line:*

... District with Primary and extended Secondary Shopping Zones

*Limit the Primary frontage to a much smaller area, the balance becoming secondary frontage.*

*BDP17.2.2h should be limited to the (enlarged) secondary frontage and not apply to primary frontage.*

*Add a further section BDP17.2.2B:*

Upon completion of the Retail Capacity Assessment, the Council will adopt a SPD to give effect to its findings. This may involve altering the respective extents of the Primary and Secondary Shopping Zones.

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                     |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Page:84       | Paragraph:      | Policy:BDP 17.8 TC1 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                     |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

One reason for the failure of the old covered market was that it was in the wrong place. With the shrinkage of the functioning Primary Retail Area, it ceased to be part of it. This meant that shoppers had to walk a significant distance from the functioning Primary Area to visit it. Whether more retail space is needed remains an open question, pending the completion of the Retail Capacity Assessment. Accordingly, the determination of whether the redevelopment of the site should be retail-led – rather than (say) leisure-led for the evening economy – needs to await the completion of that Assessment. This should be followed by a short Supplementary Plan to settle the uses of sites TC1 and TC6.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

This will be resolved if the suggested additional paragraph for BDP17.2.2 requiring a SPD following the completion of the Retail Capacity Assessment is adopted (see separate objection).

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? *Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                             |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Page:         | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP17.10 TC3 item B |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                             |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

BDP17.10 TC3B, as currently worded, would permit the construction of a theatre building. This is no doubt not what is intended, only an open air performance space. Any loss of Open Space should be unacceptable. Accordingly, the Plan as currently worded is unsound. The defect can probably be cured either by describing it as an "open air" performance space or by a more precise statement of what is intended.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Insert open-air before public event*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:



**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                                   |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Page:86       | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP17.12 TC5 School Drive |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                                   |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This site currently contains a number of important public facilities, which are intended to be redeveloped. The bare statement that housing will be acceptable leaves open the possibility that the other public facilities will fail to be replaced. The existence of that possibility makes the Plan unsound.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

Paragraph B should be replaced with "Residential development could be acceptable as part of a comprehensive scheme". However, it would probably be better to combine this statement into the present paragraph D.

*Alternatively, Add*

G. Existing uses will continue until replacements for existing facilities on the site have been replaced with new ones elsewhere.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? *Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |                      |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Page:86       | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP17.13 TC6 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |                      |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

If further retail development is needed, this is certainly a good place for it, but in advance of the Retail Capacity Assessment being completed that remains an open question.

Example: it is useful to compare what happened in Stourbridge. In the 1980s, Dudley MBC promoted the development of the Crown Centre. An officer in the Council's Treasurer's department determined that Stourbridge had a dearth of larger shops. His comparator was Basingstoke, which was allegedly a similar size, but in fact has a very different hinterland. The development included a Safeway supermarket and a retail market, together with 3-4 large retail units and several smaller ones. The Safeway operated for a considerable period, but was closed after Morrisons took over that company. One of the larger retail units was let to a clothing retailer. Another was for a time used by a motor accessories shop until that retail chain became insolvent. A third one never was let; instead after some years it was used to expand the retail market. The development was thus largely failure. The site and an adjacent multi-storey car park have just been redeveloped as a Tesco superstore.

It is important that BDC should not attempt to buck the market by promoting new retail space, when the more appropriate course may be to manage decline, for example by encouraging Evening Economy uses beyond a reduced Primary Retail area.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (**see Note 8 para 4.3**)

This will be resolved if the suggested additional paragraph for BDP17.2.2 requiring a SPD following the completion of the Retail Capacity Assessment is adopted (see separate objection).

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? *Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date:

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |               |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Page: 89      | Paragraph:      | Policy: BDP18 |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |               |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

As currently drafted, this policy is too restrictive. We presume this is the result of an oversight, not of a policy decision. It and Table 2 (which classifies settlements) fails to reflect the nature of some of the existing Local Centres, suggesting that the Council has failed to collect adequate evidence of what they already have.

The objective should be to maintain and enhance the existing centres. They should provide a multi-purpose service centre serving the local community.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) **(see Note 8 para 4.3)**

- The cross-reference to BDP2 is appropriate, but that policy is even more restrictive and does not even reflect the present character of the Local Centres.
- The inclusion of doctors' surgeries, dentists' surgeries, chiropodists, physiotherapists and the like in a Local Centre, rather than scattered in residential areas, would tend to enhance the vitality of the Local Centre.
- Development of further retail premises adjacent to an existing centre should not be ruled out, provided they are appropriate in scale. A maximum of 280 m<sup>2</sup> is suggested.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page:33       | Paragraph: 8.70 | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> Probably, but we do not admit this | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

The policy is probably generally legally compliant, save that the consultation on Draft Core Strategy 2 was defective. We nevertheless reserve the right to argue at Examination that issues that we have raised on Soundness also go further, so that the Plan is not legally compliant.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                                 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> NO |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |



6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This paragraph is misleading in that it wholly fails to make clear the enormous level of hostility of to the proposals. Paragraphs 8.71-8.74 record a few small changes made due to the consultation, but they wholly ignore the wider question of whether the sites were appropriate and whether they should have been released at this stage, when they were according to the old Local Plan as protected as Green Belt until released under a Review. No such Review has taken place, so that they ought still to be as protected as Green Belt. When challenged on this, Council officers said that the resolution of the Council to consult on DCS2 had that effect, but the resolution was to proceed with a consultation, not a resolution to adopt and implement any plan or review.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

The paragraph needs to be amended to include a table giving the number of objections to each of the sites.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? *Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

|            |       |
|------------|-------|
| Signature: | Date: |
|------------|-------|

**Part B (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)**

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation (see Note 8 para 4.1)

Hagley Parish Council

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

|               |                 |         |
|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| Page: 138     | Appendix IV     | Policy: |
| Policies Map: | Other document: |         |

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant? (see Note 2)

|                               |                              |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

This appendix is compliant, but nevertheless unsatisfactory.

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound? (see Note 3)

|                               |                              |    |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|
| Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> | No: <input type="checkbox"/> | NO |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----|

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

|  |                          |     |
|--|--------------------------|-----|
| (1) Justified (see Note 4)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (2) Effective (see Note 5)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (3) Consistent with national policy (see Note 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> |     |
| (4) Positively prepared (see Note 7)             | <input type="checkbox"/> | not |

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

BDP replaces the vast majority of the Local Plan. Some of its policies were not "saved" in 2007. However, it appears to be intended that a few policies will remain in force, or to some extent in force until replaced through new SPDs. This applies to all items listed as "partly replaced", which raises the question, "What part?" Some parts of the appendix use "superseded" and others "replaced". Unless there is a substantive difference, these should be made consistent.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

*Appendix IV should be divided into three sections:*

- Policies wholly superseded by BDP.
- Any policies that remain fully in force
- Policies only partly replaced or superseded.

*The latter should be preceded by the following:*

Save where specific expressly explained, the following policies will remain in force so far as they are not inconsistent with BDP. They are expected in due course to be superseded by a new SPD or otherwise.

*In any cases where continuation (subject to the BDP policies) will not provide an adequate explanation, a further explanation of the extent to which it remains in force should be provided against the entry for that policy.*

*Preferably, either in the Plan or a separate document, the Council should publish a consolidated list of policies from the old Local Plan that remain in force, with notes on the extent to which those partly replaced continue to operate.*

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? **Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination |     |
| Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination       | YES |

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Hagley Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the Plan, but believes that many of the defects are remediable. Furthermore, it is desirable that a new Plan should be in place soon, because the old Local Plan is so out of date. On most issues, the Parish Council is likely to be represented by Dr Peter King, one of its

councillors. He will also represent CPRE in dealing with other issues.

Signature:

Date: