

**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)

ADVANCE Land &amp; Planning Ltd on behalf of Heyford Developments Ltd

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

Page: 43-46	Paragraph: RCBD1 (including RCBD1.3 Site 1 – Foxlydiate)	Policy: RCBD1.1 (including RCBD1.7 Site 1 – Foxlydiate)
Policies Map: 10 and Key Diagram and 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 checked="" 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)

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

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

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

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)

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

*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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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)

Heyford Developments Ltd has a controlling interest in the land that will deliver a sustainable urban extension to the north-west of Redditch at Foxlydiate, Webheath (Site 1).

Representations have been made at various stages in the Plan-making process. Our client fully supports the Local Planning Authorities (Bromsgrove and Redditch) proposals and has previously submitted various information to demonstrate that the proposal is suitable, available and of course, deliverable within the Plan-period. Further evidence is being collated and the developer is continuing to work closely with both Authorities to substantiate the proposal and ensure that it can be delivered without delay.

It is suggested that it will be important for Heyford Developments to participate in the oral part of the examination in order to inform the discussion and hopefully assist the Inspector to achieve a good understanding of the merits of the proposal in the light of objections from competing and other interests.

Signature: 

Date: 11 November 2013

**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)

<b>ADVANCE Land &amp; Planning Ltd on behalf of Heyford Developments Ltd</b>
--

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

Page: <b>22</b>	Paragraph: <b>BDP3.2</b>	Policy: <b>BDP3 and BDP3.2</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 checked="" 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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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

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

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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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)

Not applicable

*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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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)

Heyford Developments Ltd has a controlling interest in the land that will deliver a sustainable urban extension to the north-west of Redditch at Foxlydiate, Webheath (Site 1).

Representations have been made at various stages in the Plan-making process. Our client fully supports the Local Planning Authorities (Bromsgrove and Redditch) proposals and has previously submitted various information to demonstrate that the proposal is suitable, available and of course, deliverable within the Plan-period. Further evidence is being collated and the developer is continuing to work closely with both Authorities to substantiate the proposal and ensure that it can be delivered without delay.

It is suggested that it will be important for Heyford Developments to participate in the oral part of the examination in order to inform the discussion and hopefully assist the Inspector to achieve a good understanding of the merits of the proposal in the light of objections from competing and other interests.

Signature: [Redacted]	Date: 11 November 2013
-----------------------	------------------------

**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)

**ADVANCE Land & Planning Ltd on behalf of Heyford Developments Ltd**

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

Page: <b>25</b>	Paragraph: <b>BDP4.2</b>	Policy: <b>BDP4 and BDP4.2</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 checked="" 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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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

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

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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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)

Not applicable

*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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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)

Heyford Developments Ltd has a controlling interest in the land that will deliver a sustainable urban extension to the north-west of Redditch at Foxlydiate, Webheath (Site 1).

Representations have been made at various stages in the Plan-making process. Our client fully supports the Local Planning Authorities (Bromsgrove and Redditch) proposals and has previously submitted various information to demonstrate that the proposal is suitable, available and of course, deliverable within the Plan-period. Further evidence is being collated and the developer is continuing to work closely with both Authorities to substantiate the proposal and ensure that it can be delivered without delay.

It is suggested that it will be important for Heyford Developments to participate in the oral part of the examination in order to inform the discussion and hopefully assist the Inspector to achieve a good understanding of the merits of the proposal in the light of objections from competing and other interests.

Signature: 

Date: 11 November 2013

**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)

<b>ADVANCE Land &amp; Planning Ltd on behalf of Heyford Developments Ltd</b>
--

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

Page:52	Paragraph:BDP8.1	Policy:BDP8 (BDP8.1)
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 checked="" 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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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)

<b>Not applicable</b>
-----------------------

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

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

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

(1) Justified (see Note 4)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective (see Note 5)	<input checked="" 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 6 of the Submission version of the Redditch Borough Local Plan No.4 seeks to achieve a contribution of 30% affordable housing, which is considered a reasonable aspiration. The proposed sites identified in RCB1 sites are specifically allocated to meet the growth needs of Redditch and so it is reasonable and appropriate that for these specific sites Site 1 – Foxlydiate and Site 2 – Brockhill, the affordable housing requirement should be 30% too.

In the circumstances, it is suggested that this policy (40%) does not demonstrate the coherence required with the strategies (and the co-emerging policies and requirements of Redditch Borough Council. As a result, it will create an inequitable situation that is unreasonable.

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)

If the affordable housing requirement for Bromsgrove is to remain at 40%, then at least there should be another sub-paragraph to state that the RCB1 sites will be expected to provide up to 30% affordable housing.

NB. This suggested change also applies to Policy RCB1 1 (RCB1 1.9)

*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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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)

Heyford Developments Ltd has a controlling interest in the land that will deliver a sustainable urban extension to the north-west of Redditch at Foxlydiate, Webheath (Site 1).

Representations have been made at various stages in the Plan-making process. Our client fully supports the Local Planning Authorities (Bromsgrove and Redditch) proposals and has previously submitted various information to demonstrate that the proposal is suitable, available and of course, deliverable within the Plan-period. Further evidence is being collated and the developer is continuing to work closely with both Authorities to substantiate the proposal and ensure that it can be delivered without delay.

It is suggested that it will be important for Heyford Developments to participate in the oral part of the examination in order to inform the discussion and hopefully assist the Inspector to achieve a good understanding of the merits of the proposal in the light of objections from competing and other interests.

Signature: [REDACTED]

Date: 11 November 2013