

Appendix – Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlined for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission local plan, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|-----|------|-----------------|--|
| MM1 | 5 | Para 4 | In addition, Redditch has worked with other Local Authorities, which although are not directly adjacent to Redditch may have strategic matters that have implications for the preparation of the Local Plan. In particular, Redditch Borough Council and Birmingham City Council have jointly acknowledged there is strategic planning matter with regard to Birmingham being unable to accommodate all of its own housing needs. <u>As required by the Duty to Co-operate, due consideration will be given, including through a review of the BORLP4, to the housing needs of another Local Planning Authority in circumstances when it has been clearly established through collaborative working that those needs must be met through provision in Redditch.</u> This issue will need to be dealt with during the preparation stage of the next Redditch Local Plan (i.e. the next plan period), or when a review of the development plan may be needed to consider these cross boundary matters. This will be dependent on the outcome of recently commissioned work to understand the issues, and further work on allocations for Birmingham's growth. With regard to Birmingham City Council, the mechanism for resolving this potential strategic matter of with Birmingham's unmet housing needs this would be through the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and Redditch's subsequent review of the BORLP4. |
| MM2 | 10 | Para 3 | Redditch Borough has similar crime levels in comparison to the national average of England and Wales, but the number of offences per 1000 population is increasing in Redditch. It has increased from 20.3 offences per 1000 population in Redditch, compared to the England and Wales average of 24.9 in 2006 to 44 offences per 1000 population in Redditch, compared to the England and Wales average of 45 in 2009/10. 95% of people feel safe walking around Redditch Town Centre and the street where they live during the day; at night, this falls to 61% for the Town Centre and 73% for the home street (CHYM Redditch). Recorded crime rates for Redditch have fallen substantially since 2005/06 (92.2 offences per 1000 population in 2005/06 to 57.7 offences per 1000 population in 2012/13), although they remain above the average for Worcestershire. Perceptions of anti-social behaviour in Redditch have also remained consistently above the average for Worcestershire and the latest data for 2013 shows that nearly twice as many Redditch residents feel unsafe when out after dark in their local area when compared with residents in the rest of the County. |
| MM3 | 12 | Para 1 | Redditch Borough has good transport links, with the M42 (<u>Junctions 2 and 3</u>) |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|--|---|
| | | | located under 5 miles away and the M5 around 6 miles from Redditch Town Centre. |
| MM4 | 12 | New para after para 2 | <u>There are a range of issues that need to be tackled to achieve modal shift including perceptions of safety and security. Research indicates that a significant number of people feel unsafe walking to bus stops, waiting for buses and travelling on buses. Close to 4% of people cite “feeling unsafe walking” as being a main reason stopping them from walking more often. A similar percentage stated that “feeling unsafe cycling” was a main reason stopping them from doing so more often.</u> |
| MM5 | 13 | Para 1 | A number of District Centres (Church Hill, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow) suffer from a poor image as their inappropriate design means that they are inward-looking and prone to <u>having</u> crime and anti-social behaviour problems. <u>Lessons have been learnt from Council and Partnership projects that can be implemented when re-development occurs.</u> Work has commenced <u>been completed</u> on the re-development of Church Hill District Centre. |
| MM6 | 20 | Objective 7 | Reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design <u>and infrastructure</u> , with regeneration achieved at Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow District Centres. |
| MM7 | 23 | Policy 2, 3 rd bullet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feckenham is a small, rural settlement predominantly set within the Green Belt, which offers limited local facilities but has important conservation and historic merit. In order to conserve and enhance these characteristics, development within or adjacent to the settlement boundary, as defined on the Policies Map, will provide for locally identified affordable housing and other <u>locally identified</u> development needs only, in accordance with the most up-to-date guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and Parish Housing Needs Survey. |
| MM8 | 26 | Policy 4, para 2 | <p>Around 3,000 dwellings can be accommodated within Redditch Borough. There is limited capacity within Stratford-on-Avon District in the vicinity of the former A435 ADR to contribute towards Redditch’s housing target should comprehensive delivery of this site be achievable. A minimum of <u>Approximately 3,400 dwellings are</u> to be accommodated in Bromsgrove District (see Appendix 1, Redditch Cross Boundary Development). Details of the sites expected to contribute to meeting the Borough’s housing needs can be found in Appendix 2 and are shown on the Policies Map and Key Diagram.</p> |
| MM9 | 26 | Policy 4, para 3 New 2 nd sentence | <u>The Council will encourage the provision of housing for elderly people.</u> |
| MM10 | 26 | Policy 4, para 4 | In order to achieve a supply of flexible and inclusive housing in the Borough that caters for life-long occupancy, all new affordable housing for rent will be expected to comply with the Lifetime Homes Standard <u>new technical standards, excluding the additional optional standards.</u> The private sector development industry will be encouraged to implement these concept of lifetime homes <u>new technical standards</u> within their development schemes. |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|--|--|
| MM11 | 26 | Policy 4, Reasoned Justification para 1 | Land identified which could contribute towards housing provision indicates that around 3,000 dwellings could be accommodated within the Borough boundary. However, evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates that this will not meet the Borough's housing needs up to 2030. It has therefore been necessary to collaborate with Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council to identify land in these <u>Bromsgrove Districts</u> , in the vicinity of Redditch, which is capable of accommodating Redditch's land supply shortfall. |
| MM12 | 27 | Policy 5, criterion i | i. the reuse and regeneration of Previously Developed Land (PDL) will be actively encouraged. Where the economic viability of a scheme on PDL is questionable, and can be fully demonstrated by the applicant, the Borough Council may negotiate a more appropriate level of infrastructure provision, or deferred payment scheme with the applicant, in order to secure beneficial reuse of a site. Development proposals on contaminated land should demonstrate that the site is capable of appropriate remediation without compromising development viability or the delivery of sustainable development; |
| MM13 | 28 | Policy 5 New para at end of (and within) policy. | <u>Development proposals on land likely to be affected by contamination should demonstrate that the site is capable of appropriate remediation without compromising development viability or the delivery of sustainable development.</u> |
| MM14 | 28 | Policy 5, Reasoned Justification para 2 | Proposals also need to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or is put at unacceptable risk from ground contaminants. The SHLAA and Employment Land Review (ELR) identify PDL potential within the Borough. |
| MM15 | 29 | Policy 5, Reasoned Justification New para after para 2. | <u>Proposals also need to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or is put at unacceptable risk from ground contaminants. Where sites are suspected of contamination, the Council will require the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and, if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme.</u> |
| MM16 | 31 | Policy 6, paras 2 and 5 | <u>Contributions towards affordable housing will not be sought from developments of 10 units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm (gross internal area). On sites of 11-40 or more dwellings (net), a 30% contribution towards the provision of affordable housing will be expected. On-site provision should be made and must incorporate a mix of dwelling types and sizes, which reflect the site's characteristics, the development as a whole, and meets the needs identified in the Borough Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or other up to date local housing need surveys, and in consultation with the Council's Housing Strategy Team.</u> On all sites of 5-9 dwellings (net), a 30% financial contribution towards affordable housing provision will be sought on completion of the development. |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|-------|--|---|
| MM17 | 32 | Policy 7, Paras 1, 2 and 3 | <p>Provision will be made for new Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches, in line with an up-to-date assessment of permanent and transit accommodation needs in line with Government guidance. Requirements for Redditch Borough are currently contained in the Worcestershire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2012) and the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (2008). These assessments identify a minimum of 14 'yards' to be provided to meet the needs of travelling showpeople and 18 pitches for temporary stopping places to meet Redditch's need.</p> <p>The Borough Council will allocate site(s) to meet identified need through an <u>Site Allocations DPD Plan</u>. Proposals for new sites will be required to demonstrate that they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. are located within a reasonable distance of existing facilities and transport networks with satisfactory access and highway arrangements; ii. where appropriate, are located on Previously Developed Land; iii. are well screened and landscaped and will not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area; iv. will not result in unacceptable disturbance or loss of amenity to any neighbouring development, <u>specifically in relation to the transport movements associated with Travelling Showpeople yards</u>; and v. have, or are capable of having, a satisfactory water supply, sewerage and refuse disposal facilities. <p>Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are considered inappropriate development.</p> |
| MM18 | 32-33 | Policy 7, Reasoned Justification | <p>There are currently 31 Travelling Showpeople plots in the Borough. The Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) for The South Housing Market Area of the West Midlands Area (2008) was commissioned by the South Housing Market Area Partnership. The purpose of the assessment is to provide information on the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers for sub-regional and District/Borough level planning policy to set the appropriate number, type and distribution of additional pitches to be provided. The GTAA is supplemented by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Worcestershire (2012). The Assessment recommends that an additional Showpeople site should be provided for which is a minimum of 14 'yards'. 'Yards' can be anything from 100ft x 100ft up to 150ft by 200ft (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for The South Housing Market Area, March 2008). The Assessment also recommends that a temporary stopping place of</p> |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|--|---|
| | | | <p>not less than 18 pitches should be provided. <u>'Planning policy for traveller sites'</u> (CLG, March 2012August 2015) is the current national planning guidance regarding the provision of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This guidance requires Local Planning Authorities to make an assessment of need for traveller sites for the purposes of planning.</p> <p>A review of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Worcestershire is being completed in 2014 2013 and will inform a future Site Allocations DPD. This will provide the Borough Council with an up to date assessment of the need for sites and identify whether sites should be provided in cooperation with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>'Planning policy for traveller sites' (CLG, March 2012) is the current national planning guidance regarding the provision of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Sites will be allocated in accordance with national planning guidance <u>and based on need identified in an up to date Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. Allocated sites will be identified in an Allocations Plan.</u> The criterion contained within this policy will be applied to site allocations as well as proposals for sites through planning applications.</p> |
| MM19 | 34 | Policy 8, para 2 | <p>There will be a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) except in very special circumstances. Some forms of development are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Applications for development in the Green Belt will be determined in line with national planning guidance on Green Belts and other relevant policies within the development plan.</p> |
| MM20 | 36 | Policy 10, para 1 | <p>New dwellings in the Green Belt and Open Countryside outside the settlements of Astwood Bank and Feckenham will only be permitted where there is an essential need for a rural worker to live at or near their place of work. <u>Applications for rural workers' dwellings in the Green Belt will be determined in accordance with national planning policy on Green Belts.</u></p> |
| MM21 | 40 | Policy 12, para 3 | <p>Local Green Spaces will be designated <u>by the Council through the Allocations Plan</u>, where appropriate, in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Once designated, Local Green Space will be managed in line with planning policy for Green Belts.</p> |
| MM22 | 40 | Policy 12, Reasoned Justification para 5 | <p>The NPPF makes provision for local communities to designate Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans. Local Green Space will only be designated where it does not conflict with the Objectives of the Local Plan and in accordance with the NPPF. Once designated, Local Green Space will be subject to the same planning policy safeguards as land designated as Green Belt. <u>The Allocations Plan will designate specific sites for Local Green Space where there is a justification for that allocation.</u></p> |
| MM23 | 45 | Policy 15, | <p>To be sustainable, new developments must have regard for the need to be</p> |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|-------|---|---|
| | | para 1 | climate-resilient. <u>For residential development this policy applies to planning applications of more than 10 units.</u> In order to ensure appropriate consideration of adaptation and mitigation to climate change has been made, applications will be judged against the following criteria |
| MM24 | 45 | Policy 15, criterion iii | iii. proposals must seek to be zero carbon in line with Government targets; <u>meet the new national technical standards, excluding the additional optional standards;</u> |
| MM25 | 45 | Policy 15, criterion iv | iv. all new residential development must meet the nationally required standard of the Code for Sustainable Homes (or any other national scheme which supersedes it); |
| MM26 | 45 | Policy 15 Insert as new para after last para but within policy | <u>This policy relates to all forms of renewable energy development other than wind energy developments. Wind energy development will be considered against national policy and guidance.</u> |
| MM27 | 46 | Policy 15, Reasoned Justification para 3 | The Government's target is that buildings should meet zero-carbon standards by 2016. The Code for Sustainable Homes is intended to improve the overall sustainability of new homes and measures the sustainability of a home against design categories. BREEAM (BRE Environmental Assessment Method) is a widely used environmental assessment method for non-domestic buildings. It sets the standard for best practice in sustainable design and is used as a measure to describe a buildings environmental performance http://www.breeam.org/index.jsp). All <u>non-domestic developers</u> will be encouraged to meet the highest level of Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM rating (or any other national scheme which supersedes them <u>it</u>) as where it is economically viable but are not required to meet standards above those set nationally. |
| MM28 | 47-48 | Policy 16, Part B, para 1 | The location of sites of national (Sites of Special Scientific Interest), regional (Local Wildlife Sites) and local (Local Nature Reserves) wildlife importance are shown on the Policies Map. <u>Applications for development should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the principles of the NPPF. In determining applications affecting sites of wildlife importance, the Council will apply the hierarchy of designated sites and appropriate weight will be given to their importance and contribution to wider ecological networks.</u> <u>Due to the national importance of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) proposals likely to have an adverse impact within or outside of a SSSI, either individually or in combination with other developments, will not normally be permitted. An exception will only be made when it can be demonstrated that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the impact on the site or network of sites.</u> |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|-------|--|---|
| | | | New development or land use changes likely to have an adverse effect on such sites <u>Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves</u> , directly or indirectly, will not be allowed unless there are no reasonable alternative means of meeting that development need and the reasons for development clearly outweigh the intrinsic nature conservation and/or geological value of the site or network of sites. |
| MM29 | 48-49 | Policy 16, Reasoned Justification para 6 | Within the Borough there are currently six sites of national wildlife importance designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which cover a range of different habitats. SSSIs are important for their wildlife, geological or physiological features and are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000 and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Regional sites of wildlife importance in the Borough include Local Wildlife Sites (LWS – formerly known as Special Wildlife Sites) which have been identified by the Worcestershire Local Sites Partnership as being of substantive nature conservation value. Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are declared by Local Authorities under Section 21 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, and amended by Schedule 11 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Any additional wildlife sites identified during this Plan period will also be protected by this policy. <u>The principles of the NPPF to be applied in determining planning applications affecting sites of wildlife and geological importance can be found in paragraphs 109, 113, 117 and 118 of the NPPF.</u> |
| MM30 | 49 | Policy 17, para 2 | Any development sites that are located in areas that are subject to flood risk will need to demonstrate that there are no other reasonable locations for development in accordance with the ‘ <u>Sequential Approach Test</u> ’ and ‘ <u>Exception Test</u> ’ (where appropriate) as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework <u>National Planning Practice Guidance</u> and have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Redditch. <u>A sequential approach should also be taken in site design.</u> Development will be designed to be safe taking into account the lifetime of the development, and the need to <u>consider and adapt to climate change.</u> |
| MM31 | 49 | Policy 17, para 3 | In addition, any development in areas that are subject to flood risk will need to demonstrate that adequate flood protection has been incorporated on site and that the effects elsewhere have been fully assessed and mitigated against. Opportunities should be sought <u>to demonstrate flood risk improvements</u> , wherever possible to provide multiple benefits when managing flood risks, for example to provide amenity benefit or ecological improvements. It is expected that any on-site flood defences required will be provided and financed by the developer of the site. |
| MM32 | 50 | Policy 17, Reasoned Justification para 1 | If, once the Sequential Test has been applied, insufficient sites are identified the ‘ <u>Exception Test</u> ’ (as defined in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework <u>and National Planning Practice Guidance</u>) can be applied <u>where necessary</u> . This may, in certain circumstances, justify |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|-------|------|--|---|
| | | | development taking place in Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3. |
| MM33 | 50 | Policy 17, Reasoned Justification para 2, 2 nd bullet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the risk of flooding arising from the development in addition to the risk of flooding <u>from all sources</u> to the development; |
| MM34 | 50 | Policy 17, Reasoned Justification para 2, 6 th bullet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the vulnerability of those that could occupy and use the development, taking account of the Sequential and Exception Tests and the vulnerability classification as per the Technical Guidance to the NPPF <u>the National Planning Practice Guidance (table 2 and 3 flood risk vulnerability), including arrangements for 'safe development' having regard to the FRA requirements within the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Redditch (2012) including setting of appropriate Finished Floor Levels, with flood proofing techniques considered (where appropriate), and safe access;</u> |
| MM35 | 50 | Policy 17, Reasoned Justification para 2, new bullet at end | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>applicants should refer to Table 1 and 2 of the Government's Climate Change Allowances guidance and seek contact with the Environment Agency for any detailed river catchment climate change data.</u> |
| MM35a | 52 | Policy 18 | <p><i>Add the following to the end of policy 18:</i></p> <p><u>Any major residential development (as defined in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 or any subsequent replacement) within the Bow Brook and Batchley Brook catchments should meet a water efficiency target of 110 litres per person per day.</u></p> |
| MM36 | 53 | Policy 18, Reasoned Justification para 4 | Through the use of SuDS techniques and the requirement for new developments to be assessed against either the Code for Sustainable Homes the new national technical standards or BREEAM (<i>for non-domestic developments</i>), water demand will be significantly lowered. The Level 2 SFRA contains more guidance on the appropriate application of SuDS. |
| MM37 | 55 | Policy 19, Reasoned Justification para 8 | The transport network must be maintained and managed in a way that preserves strategic routes, and supports business efficiency which is critical to Redditch's competitiveness. <u>The Strategic Road Network (SRN) and Primary Route Network (PRN) are central to this by providing routes between major settlements and important destinations. Motorways and trunk roads make up the SRN including the M42 and M5 which lie outside the Borough; and other primary routes represent the PRN. The Primary Route Network (PRN) is central to this and designates routes between major settlements and important destinations. Routes consist of motorways, trunk roads and other primary routes, however in In Redditch the PRN is formed only of 'A' roads and is taken from the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan No.3 Network Management Plan – Figure 2.1) and consists of the A441, A4023 and the A448, and can also be identified on the Transport Map. New accesses onto the PRN and SRN will not be encouraged and should not inhibit the strategic function of these routes. Where development proposals</u> |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|---|--|
| | | | impact upon the PRN <u>or the SRN</u> , a transport assessment and environmental impact assessment must be undertaken and, where necessary, planning conditions and planning obligations, including financial contributions to securing highways improvements may be sought, to ensure that the function of the network is maintained and appropriate financial contributions to improvements are made. |
| MM38 | 58 | Policy 20, criterion i. | A Transport Assessment will be required where it is considered that development will have significant transport implications. <u>The assessment of traffic impact should be undertaken in line with the policies in the Plan and other relevant transport policy and guidance.</u> |
| MM39 | 58 | Policy 20, criterion ii. | A Travel Plan will be required alongside <u>all certain developments which generate significant amounts of movement</u> |
| MM40 | 58 | Policy 20, criterion v. | v. all proposals will be expected to be located <u>accessible to within 250m of</u> local services (in accordance with the retail hierarchy this should either be a parade of local shops or a District Centre) and a public transport link (i.e. bus stop or train station); |
| MM41 | 58 | Policy 20, criterion vii. | The cumulative effects of development on transport infrastructure must be assessed and solutions sought in line with the policies in this Plan <u>and other relevant transport policy and guidance</u> , with particular regard to the cumulative effects of the delivery of the Strategic Sites |
| MM42 | 58 | Policy 20 New criterion to be inserted at end of (and within) policy. | <u>The Council will use mechanisms such as planning conditions and planning obligations, including financial contributions where necessary to secure the timely delivery of any necessary transport mitigation measures.</u> |
| MM43 | 58 | Policy 20 New criterion to be inserted at end of (and within) Policy. | <u>Development of transport infrastructure provision will be co-ordinated in line with the up to date Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will be subject to regular review.</u> |
| MM44 | 59 | Policy 20, Reasoned Justification para 2 | A Travel Plan will be expected where proposals <u>generate significant amounts of movement, including development which exceeds</u> for development exceed the following thresholds |
| MM45 | 64 | Policy 23, para 1 | Provision is made for the identification of around 55 hectares of land which are available for employment uses for the period up to 2030. Around 27.5 hectares will be accommodated within Redditch Borough and around 5.5 hectares will be accommodated within Bromsgrove District at <u>the north western section of the existing Ravensbank business park</u> . Within this provision, an allowance has been made to accommodate waste management |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|---|---|
| | | | facilities, within Redditch Borough, as identified in the Waste Core Strategy for Worcestershire (November 2012), see Policy 24 Development within Primarily Employment Areas. |
| MM46 | 64 | Policy 23, para 2 | The Redditch Eastern Gateway has been identified as a key initiative for employment provision to meet Redditch related employment needs. Around 10 hectares will be accommodated in Bromsgrove District at the former Ravensbank ADR, <u>adjacent to the south eastern boundary of the existing Ravensbank business park</u> and <u>a minimum of 12 hectares further employment provision</u> will be accommodated within Stratford-upon-Avon District at Gorcott (<u>around 7 hectares</u>) and Winyates Green Triangle (<u>around 12 hectares</u>). |
| MM47 | 64 | Policy 23, para 3 | The Redditch Eastern Gateway aims to provide a significant enhancement to the employment land supply through the creation of a high-profile and accessible employment scheme to take advantage of the demand of the M40/M42 corridor. The site should develop as a high quality business park to support both existing businesses and to provide the opportunity to diversify the employment base of Redditch and the surrounding areas through attracting businesses that are not currently provided for within the existing supply of sites. Comprehensive development of the three areas that comprise this initiative should: |
| MM48 | 72 | Policy 25, para 1 | Sites <u>within the urban area</u> other than those within designated Primarily Employment Areas may be suitable for economic development, redevelopment or change of use. Within the Redditch urban area the economic development proposals should: |
| MM49 | 74 | Policy 29, para 1 | In order to support the expansion of electronic communications networks, (including telecommunications and high speed broadband) all developments should make provision for the service infrastructure required at the design stage of any proposal <u>suitable for occupiers of all development. For the provision of broadband, developers should work with a recognised network carrier to design a bespoke duct network, wherever practicable, for the development. Developers should also consider the inclusion of other forms of infrastructure, such as facilities necessary to support mobile broadband where possible and where it is viable to do so.</u> All <u>service</u> infrastructure should be designed to ensure minimal disruption, should the need for maintenance, adaption or upgrades arise. |
| MM50 | 78 | Policy 30, Reasoned Justification para 3 | The Council has identified specific roles for each of the centres and will use planning policies to maintain and, where necessary and appropriate having regard to national guidance, improve the shopping function and environment of these centres. Whilst in many instances this will serve to maintain their position within the retail hierarchy, it is recognised that the role, function and relative importance of centres may change over time in pursuit of this Objective-. <u>District Centres are the equivalent to the definition of 'Local Centres' in the NPPF by virtue of the types of facilities they provide.</u> |
| MM51 | 86 | Policy 34, | The Council will look favourably on development proposals that will help |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|--|---|
| | | Reasoned Justification para 1 | revitalise and improve the shopping and community facilities of District Centres providing they are in keeping with their primarily retailing role and actively support the redevelopment of, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow District Centres and their status as Strategic Sites. In relation to the types of shopping facilities they provide, District Centres are the equivalent to the definition of 'Local Centres' in the NPPF. |
| MM52 | 90 | Policy 36, para 1 | Designated heritage assets including listed buildings, structures and their settings; conservation areas; and scheduled ancient monuments, will be given the highest level of protection and should be conserved and enhanced. Non-designated <u>heritage assets</u> , nationally important archaeological remains and locally listed heritage assets, and their settings will also need to be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance and contribution to the historic environment. |
| MM53 | 101 | Policy 40, criterion iv | iv. include where appropriate, public art that is well designed, <u>takes into account the risk of crime</u> , is integrated within the overall design and layout of the development, located where it can be easily observed, improves public outdoor space and legibility and creates landmarks; |
| MM54 | 101 | Policy 40, criterion vi | vi. encourage community safety and 'design out' vulnerability to crime by incorporating the principles, concepts and physical security standards of the 'Secured by Design' award scheme; <u>providing infrastructure for policing and emergency services</u> ; and <u>considering the incorporation of fire safety measures</u> ; |
| MM55 | 102 | Policy 40, Reasoned Justification para 5 | The 'Secured by Design' award scheme focuses on crime prevention at the design, layout and construction stages of homes and commercial premises and promotes the use of security standards (www.securedbydesign.com). Redditch Borough Council and North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership will publicise and promote developments that achieve Secured by Design Standards. <u>These principles of this scheme or any relevant scheme at the time are supported should be adhered to</u> in order to encourage community safety and 'design out' vulnerability to crime. <u>New development can put additional pressure on the infrastructure of West Mercia Police and Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service. Proposals should make provision for this infrastructure as identified in the IDP to ensure that Redditch Borough is a safe and attractive place to live and work.</u> |
| MM56 | 104 | Policy 42, criterion iv | iv. they would not <u>impede natural surveillance</u> , be an obstruction <u>security to surveillance cameras</u> ; and |
| MM57 | 113 | Policy 46, Para 1 | A Strategic Site at Brockhill East is appropriate for a high quality mixed use development comprising around <u>4,0001,025</u> dwellings, employment (8.45ha) and relevant community facilities and services including, a District Centre (including convenience retail store), a first school and a sustainable public transport network. |
| MM58 | 114 | Policy 46, 'Infrastructure' | <u>xv. proposals should demonstrate that there is no adverse risk of pollution to controlled waters through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme;</u> |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|--|---|
| | | Insert new criterion | |
| MM59 | 114 | Policy 46, 'Infrastructure' Insert new criterion | <u>xxii drainage proposals for the site should include appropriate pollution prevention measures to avoid risks to controlled waters.</u> |
| MM60 | 115 | Policy 46, Reasoned Justification para 2 | An appropriate location should be determined in Brockhill East for a District Centre which is needed in north Redditch, in the Brockhill area. This District Centre should satisfy any convenience needs of the <u>local</u> community. Where <u>If proposals for convenience retail is to be provided in the Brockhill area exceed the level of retail provision normally associated with a District Centre location (see Policy 30), this will be subject to an impact assessment on surrounding District Centres to ensure there are no negative impacts.</u> |
| MM61 | 116 | Policy 46, Reasoned Justification Insert new para. | <u>The site is underlain by the Mercia Mudstone Group, which is classified as a secondary aquifer. Development proposals must demonstrate that there is no adverse pollution risk to the aquifer through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme.</u> |
| MM62 | 120 | Policy 47 Insert new criterion | <u>ix proposals should demonstrate that there is no adverse risk of pollution to controlled waters through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme;</u> |
| MM63 | 120 | Policy 47 | and <u>xiv incorporate any necessary infrastructure identified for the effective delivery of the site; and</u> <u>xv drainage proposals for the site should include appropriate pollution prevention measures to avoid risks to controlled waters.</u> |
| MM64 | 120 | Policy 47, first paragraph after final criterion | Land immediately south of the Alexandra Hospital is not included within the Strategic Site boundary and will be safeguarded for health related purposes; this should be considered when formulating proposals for the Strategic Site. |
| MM65 | 120 | Policy 47, second paragraph after final criterion | This Strategic Site is expected to be delivered 6-10 <u>within 5</u> years following Local Plan adoption. The Borough Council will issue further strategic planning guidance in order to guide and accelerate the sustainable delivery of this Strategic Site. |
| MM66 | 120 | Policy 47, Reasoned Justification para 1 | The NHS Trust has indicated that the land immediately south of the hospital (which is not within the Strategic Site boundary) must be safeguarded for future health related development associated with the hospital. This also aligns with Policy 44 Health Facilities which seeks to ensure this land is protected for health purposes. |
| MM67 | 122 | Policy 47, | <u>The site is underlain by the Mercia Mudstone Group, which is classified as a</u> |

| Ref | Page | Policy/ para | Main Modification |
|------|------|---|---|
| | | Reasoned Justification Insert new para | <u>secondary aquifer. Development proposals must demonstrate that there is no adverse pollution risk to the aquifer through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme.</u> |
| MM68 | 125 | Policy 48 Insert new criterion | <u>xi development proposals should address contamination associated with any previous uses on the site, including the disused sewage works, through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme;</u> |
| MM69 | 126 | Policy 48, Reasoned Justification Insert new para | <u>Development of this site provides an opportunity to address the remediation of any potential contamination as a result of the former sewage works located within the site boundary.</u> |
| MM70 | - | Appendix 2 | <i>Delete Appendix 2 and replace with revised version attached at the end of this Appendix.</i> |
| MM71 | - | Appendix 3 | <i>Delete Appendix 3 and replace with revised version attached at the end of this Appendix.</i> |
| MM72 | - | Appendix 6 | The following list details which of the Borough Councils Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) are to be retained: Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital SPD Church Hill District Centre SPD Edward Street SPD Church Road SPD Education SPD Open Space Provision SPD Auxerre Avenue SPD Designing for Community Safety SPD Prospect Hill SPD Local List SPD Encouraging Good Design SPD Employment Monitoring SPG |
| MM73 | - | Appendix 7 Glossary: Code for Sustainable Homes | Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH / GFSH) The Government's standard designed to improve the overall sustainability of new homes by setting a single framework. |
| MM74 | - | Appendix 7 Glossary: Gypsies and Travellers | Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, <u>including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.</u> |

Main Modification MM70

Appendix 2: Schedule of Housing Sites

Policy 4 Housing Provision explains how Redditch Borough Council will meet its housing needs of around 6400 dwellings between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2030.

This appendix provides more detailed information on the component parts of the housing target. Additional monitoring information is available from the Development Plans Team. Monitoring information and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) are updated annually on 1 April.

i. Sites allocated for housing development in the Borough of Redditch in order to meet the Strategic Housing Target for the period 2011-2030

| No. | Site Name | Capacity for completions on or after 1.4.2011 | Completions 1.4.2011–31.3.2013 | Brownfield/ Greenfield | Area (Ha) |
|-----|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 124 | Brush Factory, Evesham Road | 6 | 0 | B | 0.09 |
| 135 | RO 144 – 162 Easemore Road | 19 | 0 | B | 0.42 |
| 143 | Adj. Castleditch Lane/ Pheasant Lane | 16 | 0 | G | 0.52 |
| 147 | Windsor Road Gas Works | 37 | 37 | B | 5.68 |
| 153 | Prospect Hill | 71 | 0 | B | 1.43 <u>1.40</u> |
| 155 | Former Claybrook First School | 35 <u>36</u> | 0 | B | 0.74 <u>1.31</u> |
| 156 | Land at Millfields and the Fire Station | 35 <u>30</u> | 0 | B+G | 1.36 <u>1.02</u> |
| 157 | Former Ipsley School playing field | 41 | 0 | G | 0.93 |
| 158 | South of scout hut, Oakenshaw Road | 41 <u>46</u> | 0 | G | 1.02 |
| 200 | Land at Wirehill Drive | 12 | 0 | G | 0.47 <u>0.71</u> |
| 201 | The Hills, Tanhouse Lane | 14 | 14 | B | 0.57 |
| 202 | Dorothy Terry House | 42 | 0 | B | 0.41 |
| 203 | Former Dingleside Middle School | 180 | 0 | B/G | 3.95 <u>7.27</u> |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|
| 204 | Former Marlfield Farm First School | 79 | 44 | B/G | 1.41 |
| 205 | Mayfields Works, The Mayfields | 23 | 0 | B | 0.19 |
| 206 | Church Hill District Centre | 51 | 0 | B | 2.25 <u>1.23</u> |
| 207 | Matchborough District Centre | 47 <u>70</u> | 0 | B | 0.92 |
| 208 | Widney House, Bromsgrove Road | 40 | 0 | B+G | 2.24 <u>1.56</u> |
| 209 | Loxley Close | 10 | 0 | B | 0.31 |
| 210 | RO Alexandra Hospital | 145 | 0 | G | 7.74 |
| 211 | A435 (former ADR) | 255 <u>205</u> | 0 | G | 10.25 <u>7.36</u> |
| 212 | Brockhill East | 1025 | 38 | G | 23.40 <u>60.13</u> |
| 213 | Webheath | 600 | 0 | G | 47.71 |
| 215 | Birchfield Road | 28 <u>29</u> | 0 | G | 0.86 |
| 216 | Former Hewell Road swimming baths | 44 <u>30</u> | 0 | B | 0.56 |
| 217 | Sandycroft, West Avenue | 9 | 0 | B | 0.35 <u>0.07</u> |
| 218 | RO Windsor Road Gas Works | 42 <u>44</u> | 0 | B | 0.19 <u>0.91</u> |
| 219 | Studley Road/ Green Lane | 42 <u>10</u> | 0 | G | 0.39 |
| 220 | Park House, Town Centre | 14 | 0 | B | 0.10 |
| | | | | | |
| | Total | 2913 <u>2873</u> dwellings | 130 dwellings | | |

~~Small Site Completions 1.4.2011 – 31.3.2013~~

~~Completions between 1.4.2011 and 31.3.2013 on sites where capacity at 1.4.2011 was less than 10 dwellings.~~

~~Small Site Completions 1.4.2011 – 31.3.2013 = 63 dwellings~~

~~Small Site Commitments at 1.4.2013~~

These are small sites (less than 10 dwellings) with planning permission outstanding at 1.4.2013 and SHLAA sites (less than 10 dwellings)

Small Site Commitments at 1.4.2013 = 69 dwellings

Borough of Redditch Commitments to Meet the Strategic Housing Requirement At 1.4.2013

Large Site Completions = 130

Large Site Commitments = 2783

Small Site Completions = 63

Small Site Commitments = 69

TOTAL = 3045 dwellings

Outstanding Strategic Housing Target at 1.4.2013

6400 dwelling target minus 3045 commitments = 3355 below strategic target

(i) **Additional land beyond the Borough of Redditch in order to meet the Strategic Housing Target for the period 2011-2030. (Land within Bromsgrove District)**

| Site No. | Site Name/ Address | B/G* | Capacity on or after 1.4.2011 | Completions up to 31.3.2013 (Ha) |
|----------|------------------------|------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Land at Foxlydiate | G | 2800 | 0 |
| 2 | Land at Brockhill East | G | 600 | 0 |
| | Sub Total | | 3400 | 0 |

* Brownfield/Greenfield

Main Modification MM71

Appendix 3: Schedule of Employment Sites

Policy 23 Employment Land Provision explains how Redditch Borough Council will meet its employment needs of around 55 hectares between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2030.

This appendix provides more detailed information on the component parts of the employment target. Additional monitoring information is available from the Development Plans Team. Monitoring information and the Employment Land Review (ELR) are updated annually on 1 April.

i. Sites allocated for employment development in the Borough of Redditch in order to meet the Strategic Employment Target for the period 2011-2030

| Site No. | Site Name/ Address | B/G* | Site Area (Ha)Capacity on or after 1.4.2011 | Completions up to 31.3.2013 (Ha) |
|----------|--|------|---|----------------------------------|
| IN15 | Woolaston Road, Park Farm | G | 0.40 | 0 |
| IN19 | Studley Road (Aeroquip) | B | 1.44 | 0 |
| IN20 | Old Forge Drive (BACO) | G | 1.32 <u>1.21</u> | 0 |
| IN34 | Merse Road, North Moons Moat | G | 0.65 | 0 |
| IN37 | Bartleet Road, Washford | G | 0.62 | 0 |
| IN38 | Adj. 47/52 Heming Road, Washford | G | 0.22 | 0 |
| IN52 | Shawbank Road, Lakeside | G | 1.03 | 0 |
| IN54 | Palmers Road, Moons Moat (E) | G | 0.29 | 0 |
| IN58 | Crossgate Road, Park Farm (N) | G | 1.40 <u>1.04</u> | 0 |
| IN59 | Adj. Greenlands Business Centre, Park Farm (N) | G | 0.38 | 0 |
| IN67 | Brockhill East (west of railway) | G | 6.60 | 0 |
| IN69 | Land rear of Alexandra Hospital | G | 2.00 | 0 |
| IN80 | Land at Winyates Way/ Moons Moat Drive | G | 0.64 | 0 |
| IN81 | Brockhill East (Weights Lane, east of railway) | G | 1.85 | 0 |
| IN82 | A435 ADR (area 3) | G | 7.78 | 0 |
| IN83 | Land at Kingham Close/ Far Moor Lane | G | 0.19 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|------|----------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|
| IN84 | Land off Pipers Road | G | 0.190.22 | 0 |
| | Sub Total | | 26.7018.78 Ha | 0 Ha |

ii. Additional vacant land which counts towards the Borough's employment land allocation in order to meet the Strategic Employment Target for the period 2011-2030. (Land within Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon Districts)

| Site No. | Site Name/ Address | B/G* | Site Area (Ha) Capacity on or after 1.4.2011 | Completions up to 31.3.2013 (Ha) |
|----------|--|------|--|----------------------------------|
| | Land at Ravensbank (BDC) | G | 5.32 | 0 |
| | Ravensbank ADR (BDC) | G | 10.00 | 0 |
| | Land at Gorcott (SoADC) | G | 7.47 | 0 |
| | Winyates Green Triangle (SoADC) (<u>gross</u>) | G | 4.5012.00 | 0 |
| | Sub Total (<u>gross</u>) | | 27.2934.79 Ha | 0 Ha |
| | <u>TOTAL</u> | | <u>53.57 Ha</u> | <u>0.615 Ha</u> |

iii. ~~Windfall sites for inclusion as a result of windfall contribution criteria~~

| Site No. | Site Name/ Address | B/G* | Site Area (Ha) Capacity on or after 1.4.2011 | Completions up to 31.3.2013 (Ha) |
|----------|---|------|--|----------------------------------|
| 08/392 | 7 Howard Road, Park Farm North | B | 0.06 | 0 |
| 10/267 | 9 Brook Street | B | 0.009 | 0 |
| 11/024 | 49 Arthur Street | B | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| 11/061 | Hill Top, Webheath | B | 0.005 | 0 |
| 11/241 | 7 Dunlop Road, Hunt End | B | 0.024 | 0 |
| 12/005 | Hewell Road COU from A1 to B8 | B | 0.022 | 0 |
| 12/020 | 18 Broadground Road, Lakeside | B | 0.016 | 0 |
| 12/032 | Former Hepworth site, Brook Street | B | 0.37 | 0 |
| 12/117 | Former Arrow Valley Social Club, Washford | B | 0.5 | 0 |
| 12/151 | Autobody, Hewell Road | B | 0.1 | 0 |
| 12/169 | Thorlux Lighting, Merse Road | B | 0.24 | 0.24 |

| | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|
| 12/220 | 1B Washford Trade Park | B | 0.028 | 0.028 |
| 12/222 | Unit 2A Millsborough House | B | 0.027 | 0.027 |
| 12/288 | Former coach depot, Oxleasow Road | B | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| | Sub Total | | 1.721 Ha | 0.615 Ha |
| | TOTAL | | 55.711 Ha | 0.615 Ha |

* Brownfield/Greenfield