
Redditch Borough Council – Local Plan responses

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Matt Dormer
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Report Author Mike Dunphy	Job Title: Strategic Planning and Conservation Manager Contact email: m.dunphy@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk Contact Tel: 01527 881325
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor(s) consulted	No
Relevant Strategic Purpose(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finding somewhere to live• Communities which are Safe, Well Maintained and Green
Non-Key Decision	
If you have any questions about this report, please contact the report author in advance of the meeting.	

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Executive RECOMMEND to Council that:-

- 1.1 The Council endorses the officer response to the Birmingham Local Plan and Duty to Cooperate (as attached at Appendix 1) and that it is confirmed with Birmingham City Council as such.**
- 1.2 That the South Staffordshire Local Plan Statement of Common Ground (Appendix 3) is signed by the Leader of the Council.**
- 1.3 That the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area Statement of Common Ground (Appendix 4) is signed by the Leader of the Council**
- 1.4 That Council notes the position with regards to the South Worcestershire Development Plan**

2. BACKGROUND

Please note that this report has been drafted at a time when the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities is in the process of publishing reforms to the planning system. At the time of writing only a ministerial statement and a letter to all MPs was available for consideration. A prospectus for a revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also expected.

Depending on the content of the prospectus, the recommendations above may need to be reconsidered at short notice.

This report covers the response to three Local Plans in close proximity to Redditch Borough; the Birmingham Local Plan (BLP), South Staffordshire Local Plan (SSLP) and The South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP). The BLP is at its first stage of consultation, the Issues and Options, whereas the SSLP and the SWDP are both at their final stage of engagement before the plans are submitted to the Secretary of State to undergo the examination in public stage.

Birmingham Local Plan

The officer response to the BLP can be seen at Appendix 1, this response also includes a response to the Duty to Cooperate letter the Council received from Birmingham City Council (BCC) in October 2022. That letter can be seen in Appendix 2. The response is a joint response with Bromsgrove District Council, this follows the agreed Memorandum of Understanding between the two Councils which was presented to members in June 2022.

The most significant element of the BLP Issues and Options report is the identification of the housing requirement for Birmingham. 149,286 dwellings have been identified as the need, of which only 70,871 can be accommodated within the currently available land in the City, meaning that 78,415 may need to be accommodated in other areas outside of the City boundaries. The BLP identifies 6 options for delivering this growth, of which one of them is releasing Green Belt land within Birmingham. It is the view of officers that this shouldn't be an option but a strict requirement for the plan. Especially considering that there is an expectation from BCC that Green Belt land outside of the City will need to be released and allocated. Bearing in mind BCC is also promoting some Green Belt land in its ownership in Bromsgrove District as part of the Bromsgrove District Plan review, it seems a contradictory position to take at this stage. The response at Appendix 1 makes it clear that reviewing its own Green Belt should not be an option to consider, but a firm commitment of the plan.

The second part of the response is the answering of questions in relation to the Duty to Cooperate. BCC is asking if RBC can make a contribution to meeting Birmingham housing needs. At this stage RBC is not making any commitment, the only commitment RBC will make is to continue to work under the Duty to Cooperate to investigate if a contribution can be made. This commitment is reflected in a Statement

of Common Ground (SoCG) which covers the whole of the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area (GBBCHMA). This statement can be seen at Appendix 4.

South Staffordshire Local Plan

The SSLP is at the final engagement stage of plan making, if RBC were to respond at this stage it would have to be on the basis of making representations regarding the Soundness of the plan. Officers have reviewed the plan and consider there to be no soundness issues, therefore no formal representations need to be submitted at this stage. As part of the plan making process South Staffordshire Council has asked RBC to enter into a SoCG specifically in relation to the SSLP plan and also the wider arrangements for looking at the housing needs of the GBBCHMA. These SoCGs can be seen at Appendices 3 and 4. Both these statements commit the Council to continued engagement and working on a solution to meeting the wider housing needs, but at this stage neither statement commits RBC to accommodating any needs from another council. Should this ever be the case, a new version of this statement would be produced and presented to members for consideration.

South Worcestershire Development Plan

The SWDP is also at the final engagement stage of plan making, as with the SSLP officers have reviewed this plan and have no soundness concerns therefore it is recommended that the position is noted and no submissions are made, it is expected that a SoCG will be presented to RBC for signing in due course.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 There are no financial implications associated with this report

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 South Staffordshire Council and the South Worcestershire Authorities have published the plans in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 4.2 Birmingham City Council has published its plan in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 4.2 It is important that Redditch Borough Council continues to engage in wider plan making activities and under the Duty to Cooperate.

5. STRATEGIC PURPOSES - IMPLICATIONS

Relevant Strategic Purpose

- 5.1 The response to the plans or signing the SoCGs in itself does not have any direct implications for the strategic purposes at this stage. Ensuring that RBC is engaged and where appropriate influence plan making activities of adjoining authorities will ensure that the strategic purposes are not undermined by the plans of other local authorities.

Climate Change Implications

- 5.2 It is not considered that there are any specific climate change implications for Redditch Borough from plans covered in this report . Although the planning process must continue to address the wider climate change concerns, part of this is scrutinising the plans prepared by other stakeholders.

6. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 6.1 The response has no Equality or Diversity implications.

Operational Implications

- 6.2 There are no operational implications.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 7.1 The risks associated with not engaging in the plan making process and the Duty to Cooperate could be significant, both as the Councils views will not be represented, and also as the review of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan may fail under the Duty to Cooperate.

8. APPENDICES and BACKGROUND PAPERS

Appendix 1 – BDC/RBC response to the Birmingham Local Plan issues and options.

Appendix 2 – BCC duty to cooperate letter

Appendix 3 – South Staffordshire Local Plan SoCG

Appendix 4 – Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area SoCG

Executive Committee
2022

10th January

9. REPORT SIGN OFF

Department	Name and Job Title	Date
Portfolio Holder	Cllr Matt Dormer	22 nd December
Lead Director / Head of Service	Ruth Bamford	22 nd December
Financial Services	Peter Carpenter	22 nd December
Legal Services	Claire Felton	22 nd December
Policy Team (if equalities implications apply)	N/A	N/A
Climate Change Officer (if climate change implications apply)	N/A	N/A