

Appendix A

This document is a summary of the representations received to the Joint Bromsgrove District Council and Redditch Borough Council special consultation on development options for Redditch held in early 2010. Also presented is an officer response and proposed action arising from the comment which has been provided by officers from both authorities. The consultation material was guided by the development targets set out in the Panel Report which followed the Examination in Public into the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Phase Two Revision. Since this consultation was carried out, the Secretary of State announced the revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies and the coalition government has signalled its intention to make significant changes to the planning system; the joint officer response to the comments and proposed action therefore reflect this. It should however be noted that the decision to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies has been found unlawful and has reinstated the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy as part of the statutory development plan. Legal proceedings regarding the status of Regional Spatial Strategies is ongoing.

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
001 MR M COTTON	Opposed to building of thousands of houses west and east of A441 due to inadequate infrastructure, reduction of buffer between Redditch and Birmingham, encourage in migration from Birmingham, traffic problems/housing problems. Supports option adjacent to A448 as good infrastructure i.e. A448, considers reduction of gap between Bromsgrove and Redditch less harmful than other proposals	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove/ Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.
002 Mr A Cotton	Objects to proposed building of thousands of houses east or west of Birmingham Road due to problems of traffic congestion, flooding issues east of A441. Does not agree that building east of A441 will encourage building of Bordesley Bypass as RBC do not have the finance. Supports option for development adjacent to A448. Considers Stratford should be expected to accommodate more houses on its borders with Redditch.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Understands PINS said that ADR's should be used before Green Belt land in Bromsgrove is used</p> <p>Reduction in Green Belt buffer between Redditch and Birmingham encouraging in migration and not meeting Redditch's housing needs.</p> <p>Alternative option, considers Feckenham, Ham Green and Callow Hill could accommodate more houses.</p>	<p>Panel Report does not state that ADR's should be used before land in Bromsgrove is used. It does state that whilst it is appropriate to reflect a priority for Previously Developed Land it also states at Paragraph 4.17 page 95 "<i>Even land released from the Green Belt may be appropriate to bring forward at an early stage in some locations in order to facilitate wider objectives, including sustainable development</i>".</p> <p>Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove/ Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets. RBC is currently undertaking a Housing Needs Assessment and the types and tenures of homes built will reflect the outcomes of this study.</p> <p>Feckenham is defined as an unsustainable settlement suitable for local needs only and is not suitable for accommodating significant growth. This is evidenced in Redditch Borough Council's Accessibility Study and Settlement Hierarchy. Ham Green and Callow Hill are located in Redditch's sensitive Green Belt area which is also unsuitable for significant growth as evidenced in WYG Stage 1 and 2 Reports and Redditch Borough Councils Study of Green Belt land and ADR in Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection. RBC to complete HNA. Appropriate policies to be included in Core Strategy for consultation.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
003 Ms H Tonks	Opposes growth to west/east of A441 due to traffic congestion and flooding. Supports A448 due to dual carriageway access and nearby schools	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
004 Mr P Merricks	<p>East of A441- high volume of kerosene and gas pipes run across area, severe flooding, topography, Green Belt . Considers there are more viable sites within Redditch, Bromsgrove and Stratford. Should put housing in Bromsgrove as it has a shortage of affordable housing.</p> <p>Opposes designation of Redditch as an SSD as not achieved past growth targets, poor sustainable transport links to neighbouring towns and would result in increase of CO2 emissions.</p> <p>Greenfield development would not serve local economy and will not lead to rural regeneration.</p> <p>Exacerbation of commuting problem</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough including brownfield sites. Bromsgrove Council has its own allocations which will help to address its affordable housing shortage. Affordable housing policies to be included in Core Strategy.</p> <p>SSD designation was removed by the Panel in their report (R8.3 Page 219).It should be noted that Redditch Borough Council has always met its development requirements.</p> <p>Development on green or brownfield land can help to boost the local economy by creating jobs.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will include sustainable transport policies to encourage a modal</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Appropriate policies to be included in Core strategy. Further</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Supports use of ADR's and should be used before developing Green Belt	<p>shift away from commuting in private cars to more sustainable modes of transport. The levels of development for Redditch for housing and employment will need to be balanced to ensure that opportunities for employment within the Town are maintained.</p> <p>Panel Report does not state that ADR's should be used before land in Bromsgrove is used. It does state that whilst it is appropriate to reflect a priority for Previously Developed Land it also states at Paragraph 4.17 page 95 "<i>Even land released from the Green Belt may be appropriate to bring forward at an early stage in some locations in order to facilitate wider objectives, including sustainable development</i>".</p>	<p>consultation to be held on both Core Strategies in November 2010.</p> <p>None</p>
005 Mr S Cox	Opposes west of A441 option due to flooding, precious divide between Birmingham and Redditch. Supports A448 and Webheath ADR as A448 links both towns.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
006 D Hutchings	Opposes building on Green Belt land	PPG2 Paragraph 2.6 states "Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt."	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		The Councils will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this and if release of Green Belt land would be justified.	
007 Mr D Norris	<p>Opposes more development in Brockhill due to existing problems of drainage of surface water/flooding.</p> <p>Brockhill Drive traffic congestion problems</p>	<p>A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will assess flood risk on each site and suggest mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p>Transport modelling is underway to assess the impact of potential growth in each of the potential development areas.</p> <p>The Councils are undertaking further work to assess existing infrastructure and the highway network before determining which site or sites will be developed and this will be consulted on in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Complete Level 2 SFRA and update of Water Cycle Study.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be completed. Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
008 Mr I Hayes	<p>Opposes development east of A441 due to flooding issues. Supports expansion into Warwickshire due to adequate sewage disposal facilities.</p> <p>Opposed to destruction of Green Belt between Redditch and Birmingham.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
009 Cllr S Peters	Assumption that new housing in	The delivery of cross boundary	Further consultation on Core

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Bromsgrove will receive council services from Bromsgrove therefore option sites with road links to Bromsgrove should be favoured i.e. A448. Option east of A441 not easily accessible from Bromsgrove. New housing should be spread around boundary. Boundary to Redditch and Green Belt boundary will need to be redrawn in the longer term.	development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
010 Mr B Baker	<p>Considers brownfield land should be used.</p> <p>Tower blocks should be demolished and land reused and old properties updated.</p> <p>Considers proposals are short-sighted with little account taken of future quality of life i.e. due to loss of countryside and parkland. The hills, country parks and rural aspect are valuable and part of Bromsgrove's heritage</p>	<p>Current planning policy aims to develop brownfield land in the first instance.</p> <p>Demolishing tower blocks would not address housing needs as any replacements would be built at a lower density. This would incur losses to housing stock, requiring more greenfield development release to offset the loss. Besides which there are very few examples of tower blocks in the area.</p> <p>There is no intention to develop Country parks. Improvements to these types of assets will be sought and the Green Infrastructure Study will address this issue.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Green infrastructure study to be completed to inform the evidence base. Appropriate policies to be included in Core strategy. Further consultation to be held on both Core Strategies in November 2010.</p>
011 Mr J Parkes	Supports option for development around A448 as options east and west of A441 are unsuitable due to lack of infrastructure, flooding and poor access.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
012 Mr DJ Ross	Support option east of A441 as close to	The delivery of cross boundary	Further consultation on Core

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
Our Bromsgrove	M42, close to open space and parkland, close to Redditch town centre and maintains distance between Bromsgrove and Redditch.	development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
013 R& B Kelly	Objects to options east and west of A441 due to traffic congestion; lack of existing amenities such as schools, GP's; flooding. Supports option adjacent to A448 as considers infrastructure already in place and A448 dual carriageway is more suited to additional volumes of traffic	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
014 Ms J Winslow	Considers all land within Redditch should be used before any cross boundary growth is initiated, including use of ADR's and open space. Considers expansion to the north east and south should also be considered. East of A441- disadvantage is reduction of Green Belt gap between Redditch and Birmingham but this is wider than the one between Redditch and Bromsgrove West Of A441-seems most logical choice Adjacent A448- considers A448 to be a natural boundary between distinctive areas of Green Belt but would prefer development to be located to north rather than south.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough including brownfield sites. Redditch's Core Strategy will need to include policies to protect its distinctive open spaces as these are unsuitable to meet development targets. Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Concerned that decision making should be transparent.	As local authorities, we take our responsibilities for information governance seriously and strive to be open and transparent about what we do and in particular the decision making process. The Councils hold information on many topics, most of which is publicly available.	None
015 Mr S Grimes	Questions in relation to proposed development in Bordesley. Would the development be built over the gas main and the 2 12" Octane fuel pipe lines that run at the rear of my property? How close will the new development be to my property? Will any of the buildings be more than 2 storeys high? Will I get a reduction in my council tax due to buildings spoiling my view? Will I receive some sort of compensation for the noise, dirt and mess while all this work is undertaken? Where do you propose to put the main entrance to this estate? When will the final decision be made?	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. There is an exclusion zone between where development can be located and any existing underground service infrastructure. Any specific location and design details are determined at planning application stages. Regardless of the preferred location(s) planning conditions can be applied when granting planning permission that minimise disruption to existing residents. A revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy will be available for public consultation in November 2010 for both Bromsgrove and Redditch.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
016 Mr E Lison	Adjacent A448- best development option- infrastructure already in place; even distribution of housing and retains sufficient Green Belt between surrounding areas. East and West of A441- lack of infrastructure, traffic congestion; flooding; impact on villages and small communities	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		strategic locations for this.	
017 Mrs J Bonnell	Objects to development east of A441 on grounds of congestion, its Green Belt , infrastructure, topography, and possible increase in flooding. Supports option adjacent to A448 due to availability of sports, business and school amenities, easy access to Bromsgrove or Redditch on A448	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
018 Mr RN Ford	<p>Objects to options east and west of A441 due to it being Green Belt , environmental impact, flooding, traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Questions principle of development in current economic crises.</p> <p>Considers Redditch has sufficient land within its boundary to cater for growth set out in RSS.</p> <p>Points out that Ravensbank is incomplete and not fully let which considers is due to lack of interest from industry rather than lack of sufficient workforce.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It should be noted the plan period runs up to 2026 and the development targets would need to take into account temporary peaks and troughs in the market.</p> <p>A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is annually completed which details all land available for housing in Redditch.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
019 Mrs A Dixon	Supports adjacent A448 as has necessary infrastructure i.e. road network and proximity to homes. Opposes development	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	east and west of A441 lack of infrastructure, traffic congestion, pollution, adverse impact on wildlife, flooding, reduction of Green Belt adverse impact on property values	revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Property values are not a planning matter.	
020 Mr S Parkinson	Opposes development to east/west of A441 negative impact on environment, Green Belt and woodlands. Concerns over funding of infrastructure, does not consider Bordesley By pass will go ahead and impact on GP services. A448 preferred as proximity to A448 (less congested than A441)	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
021 Mr S Nichol	<p>Considers Bromsgrove and Redditch Town Centres are both rundown.</p> <p>Considers Brockhill needs local shopping facilities and is remote.</p> <p>Webheath an obvious area to develop.</p>	<p>Comments noted however both towns have regeneration plans including Bromsgrove Town Centre Area Action Plan and the Redditch Town Centre Strategy is being implemented.</p> <p>Necessary Infrastructure will need to be in place to enable any development and sufficient development at Brockhill may trigger the need for these kinds of facilities. The Councils will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Councils will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Would not favour development on any site where there is doubt regarding drainage.	It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable. On sites where there are sustainability issues, additional sustainability requirements will be required to compensate.	To investigate the potential to incorporate high sustainability measures of delivering a suitable sewerage system to sites requiring sewerage to be pumped.
022 Mr W Dutton	Opposes option east of A441 due to flooding, (Dagnell End Road) important to retain Green Belt gap between Birmingham and Redditch. Supports extension of Batchley area into Bromsgrove (west of A441) as infrastructure in place, close to Redditch TC and near to A448.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
023 HJ7BM Andrews	Concern re development at Bordesley due to traffic volumes 27000 vehicles pass property on A441, flooding. Opposed to principle of Redditch using Bromsgrove land	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
024 Mr K Powell	Opposed to east/west of A441 due to traffic congestion and flooding	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
025 Mr JH Yates	Strongly supports option 3 (adjacent A448) as all infrastructure already in place and in close proximity to schools	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Opposed to west/east of A441 due to lack of infrastructure, topography, increased traffic and congestion	revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
026 Ms J Lovett	Opposes options around Birmingham and Dagnell End Road of Bordesley due to flooding. Fuel pipe for airport runs across site. Traffic congestion leading to noise and air pollution. HGV's use Dagnell End Road making it unsafe for use by residents at busy times due also to inadequacy of pavements	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
027 Mr A Harper	Supports A448 option as infrastructure already in place. Opposed to options east/west of A441 on grounds of flooding	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
028 Mr I Osborn	Supports A448 option on grounds that area has infrastructure in place i.e. amenities and schools. Opposes east/ west of A441 options on grounds that development would impinge to greater extent on open countryside, poor road access i.e. Dagnell End Road already congested, flooding/ topography	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
029 Mr J B Haigh	Supports option adjacent A448 on grounds that already has good dual carriageway; good drainage; could be made into attractive residential area if natural features are protected; cheaper and less disruptive than other options. Opposes east/west A441 due to traffic congestion, pollution and	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	flooding	strategic locations for this.	
030 Ms R Haigh	Opposes development adjacent to A441 on grounds of traffic congestion and pollution	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
031 Ms A Cammies	Supports option adjacent A448 and Webheath as option has all infrastructure for new development i.e. schools. Opposed to development around A441 due to traffic problems and gas pipes running over Bordesley area, flooding	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
032 Mr & Mrs Bailes	Interpreted the PINS Panel Report into the RSS EiP was critical of locating housing to the north of Redditch and therefore surprised that options either side of A441 are now put forward. Opposed to development in these locations as will encourage car commuting to Birmingham. Considers it is impossible to efficiently serve these sites by public transport; lack of any infrastructure. Considers areas to the north of Redditch are car owners and high income earners but Redditch needs to reflect its industry base and to stop encouraging outward commuting. Supports option at Foxlydiate/Webheath. Considers fresh look should be given on where to locate houses and suggests locating around existing transport nodes at Bromsgrove, Redditch,	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. North Redditch contains a diverse mix of community rates of car ownership and incomes. Historically Redditch has balanced housing supply with employment land supply successfully minimising the need for outward commuting as much as possible. Development around transport nodes will be encouraged in the Core Strategies, although within Redditch accessibility is	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Barnt Green and Alvechurch</p> <p>Considers that evidence based decisions have not been made on housing allocations.</p>	<p>generally very high throughout the urban area.</p> <p>No decisions on housing allocations have yet been made but it is accepted that evidence will be needed to support decision making.</p>	None
033 N Sahota	Supports Foxlydiate/Webheath option as there are schools nearby and majority of infrastructure already in place. Opposed to options east/west of A441 as infrastructure not in place; flooding issues; unsuitable due to topography	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
034 Ms Elizabeth Spears	Supports option adjacent to A448 as considers infrastructure and topography would not be a problem. Opposed to east/west of A448 as would add to traffic congestion; lack of infrastructure; flooding.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
035 Mr M Pearce AWM	<p>AWM does not wish to comment on specific quantum of land allocated at a district level. Role to encourage balanced employment land portfolios.</p> <p>AWM welcomes the allocation of mixed-use sites. Where possible they should add to the quality and range of the employment offer within this part of Worcestershire. Providing well-located employment land would help to address problem of out-commuting.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Request that in identifying and allocating sites, the council takes the opportunity to promote sustainable energy choice and low carbon development. New urban extensions should create opportunities for micro-generation facilities.</p> <p><u>Growth options within Redditch Borough:</u> Support allocation of plots 3 and 4 of the A435 ADR for employment use. Housing site allocations need to be well-connected to employment opportunities and the wider public transport network.</p> <p>Ensure that a policy is in place that encourages employment land development as well as promoting housing development.</p> <p>Support the allocation of land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital for employment use to support and complement the existing medical uses adjacent.</p> <p><u>Growth options within Bromsgrove District:</u> Welcome allocations that consolidate and build upon the successes of existing employment sites. In terms of the allocation of other sites, encourage provision of land that is of sufficient size and well-located.</p>	<p>The Councils will investigate including appropriate policies within their Core Strategies promoting sustainable energy choice and low carbon development, particularly within Strategic Site policy.</p> <p>The use of the A435 ADR and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will need to include employment related policies including the development of new employment.</p> <p>The use of the Alexandra Hospital and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>The Councils will investigate including appropriate policies within their Core Strategies to promote sustainable energy choice and low carbon development.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
036 J Hill	Supports option 3 as considers it has all the infrastructure necessary to accommodate these homes	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
037 Mr EAW Day	<p>Supports option adjacent A448 as is most accessible. Opposes east/west of A441 as would require expensive and time consuming road building.</p> <p>Plans should put emphasis on provision of open areas and leisure centres.</p> <p>Don't want high density housing with no provision for young people.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Open space will be considered as part of the Green Infrastructure studies, which will take into account previous studies such as the Open Space and Recreation Assessment (PPG17) and Open Space Needs Assessment. Necessary infrastructure will need to be provided to enable development to happen</p> <p>Density thresholds are no longer contained in PPS3 Housing and need to be set locally. The Core Strategies will therefore need to include policies on appropriate density which reflects the needs and characters of the areas. In terms of young people is it not clear if the respondent refers to service/facility provision for younger people or housing for younger people; however a range of community facilities and services are encouraged in Core Strategy policy and any need for this will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on density policy in the Core Strategy. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Looks forward to public consultation with more detailed plans	A revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy will be available for public consultation in November 2010.	None
038 Ms C Hemming British Waterways	No comments as have no canals or assets in the area that would be affected by proposals	Noted	None
039 Mr Serrell	Opposes development east and west of A441 lack of infrastructure, drainage/sewage, traffic congestion, pollution, safety, adverse impact on wildlife, flooding, reduction of Green Belt , loss of beautiful landscape, loss of green space for walking and encouraging healthy lifestyles, loss of amenity due to changes in levels and overlooking, schools better in Bromsgrove than Redditch and new schools will have to be built leading to increased costs; more/new GP facilities will be required: increased pressure on shops in Alvechurch where there is limited parking: Aesthetic issues of mixing new development with houses on Birmingham Road, Bordesley which are all different; lose land. East of A441 has steep slopes Supports adjacent A448 as has necessary infrastructure i.e. road network, new drainage, would not affect so many houses, would not sprawl into Birmingham, still retains separation between Redditch and Tardebigge. Concerned about loss of farmland and there is a lot of empty homes in Redditch	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. It is inevitable that towns will have a certain proportion of empty homes. However Redditch's housing need up to 2026 has been determined as 7000 new homes and there are relatively few empty homes in the Town.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
040 Mr A Morgan West Mercia Police	New development will generate additional pressure on WMP and developer contributions should be secured so that the	Information provided will be taken into account when feasibility work is undertaken, Core Strategy policies	To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>appropriate level of policing infrastructure and services can be provided as other sources of funding are not available.</p> <p>Need to give full recognition to community safety and designing out crime policies in LDF documents.</p> <p>A435 ADR- no additional WMP infrastructure required. Brockhill ADR-new police post required for 12 officers base for police patrols. Webheath ADR- no additional WMP infrastructure required Brockhill GB- Covered by new police post as described above for Brockhill ADR Foxlydiate GB- Covered by new police post as described above for Brockhill ADR</p> <p>Supports west of A441 option - easier access better linkages with other development sites proposed. New police station required 20-40 police officers.</p>	<p>formulated and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is completed. Further information on the triggers for these facilities will be requested from the respondent when required.</p> <p>Both Core Strategies will contain policies which address high quality design and community safety is implicit in this approach. Redditch Borough Council has adopted an SPD on Community Safety.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The Core Strategy policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan will take this information into account.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Appropriate Core Strategy policies addressing community safety issues to be included for consultation</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
041 Mr D Bush	Opposes option east of A441 - wildlife, flooding, topography/ poor drainage	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
042 Ms R Freeman The Theatres Trust	Theatres trust has no comments to make on this document but wish to be consulted on Planning Obligations, Core Strategy and any TCAAPs	Noted	Theatres Trust to be consulted on Core Strategy and Bromsgrove TCAAP
043 Ms G Lungley Catshill and North Parish Council	Catshill and North Marlbrook Parish Council concerned encroachment of Redditch housing into Bromsgrove District. Concerned about use of Green Belt and coalescence.	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove/ Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p>
044 Ms E Atkins	Opposed to development at Webheath ADR due to additional water runoff; additional road infrastructure required for access; high landscape value; poor public transport to town centre and main employment areas	The use of the Webheath ADR within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures if necessary. A	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete Level 2 SFRA. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		<p>Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development on the Webheath ADR. Any public transport provision will be provided in accordance with the Local Transport Plan, which advocates a modal shift in Redditch. The Redditch Preferred Draft Core Strategy promotes a modal shift in line with the Local Transport Plan.</p>	
<p>045 Ms Y Goode Alvechurch Parish Council</p>	<p>Alvechurch Parish Council concerned about timing of consultation before general election, without benefit of Proposed Changes and in economic recession.</p> <p>Considers document should also refer to Bromsgrove Sustainable Community Strategy.</p> <p>Opposed to option East of A441- insufficient road infrastructure; flooding; kerosene pipework for airport. Support for A448/west of A441 support as has current road provision and good access Considers rail links between Birmingham and Redditch should be improved, new station or park and ride. Improvements to signage in/around motorway network required to ensure lorries use A435, A4023 and A448</p>	<p>GOWM advice was that the Core Strategy process should be progressed without delay to avoid a policy vacuum and to ensure that up to date policies are in place. It should be noted the plan period runs up to 2026 and this takes into account temporary peaks and troughs in the market. It is a requirement that policies contained within the Core Strategy must be flexible enough to be able to remain relevant over this timeframe.</p> <p>Each Core Strategy will refer to its respective Sustainable Community Strategy.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Signage is a matter for the Highways Agency and the County Council being the responsible</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>to reduce use of A441.</p> <p>Support use of ADR's.</p>	<p>authority for highway issues. Network rail are proposing enhancements to the Redditch-Birmingham rail service.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
046 Mrs E Cotton	<p>Supports option adjacent A448 as existing dual carriageway; proposed new Bromsgrove station; sewage problem more accessible from this site; topography better than other 2 options; no major flooding problem in this area; most cost efficient option. East/west of A441 does not have adequate infrastructure. A441 already at capacity: impact on wildlife if natural habitat disturbed i.e. wild trout in River Arrow, buzzards, foxes, badgers, great crested newt, slow worms, water voles.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
047 Mr S Thompson	<p>Supports option West of the A441. Topography needs to be taken into account and therefore development should be avoided on the hills south of Weights Lane. Building a Bordesley Bypass west of the A441 may provide a limit to the site Public transport has not been considered. A rail park and ride could be included to aid travel towards Birmingham and Redditch.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The Local Transport Plan advocates a modal shift in Redditch. The Redditch Core Strategy will need to promote a modal shift in line with the Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
048 J& AP Douglas	<p>Supports options West of the A441 and adjacent A448 as these are capable of the least invasive development of the open</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>space around Redditch. Land west of the A441 forms a natural extension to existing development and also shares some proximity to Bromsgrove Town. Land adjacent to the A448 has some association with existing development at Brockhill and has good road access with some proximity to Bromsgrove. Land east of the A441 is particularly valuable and shouldn't be developed because of tourism created by Bordesley Abbey site, golf and high quality open space. The countryside north of Dagnell End Lane is particularly attractive and shouldn't be developed. Road access is also poor. The scale of housing is not needed and not supported from community or environment viewpoints.</p>	<p>revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
049 Mr P Wells	<p>Strongly opposes proposed development in Green Belt .</p> <p>Concerns raised over the possible coalescence of the 2 towns. Pleasant rural environment will be turned into urban sprawl.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the Green Belt sites as well as other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham and minimise Green Belt land take. Coalescence of settlements would not result from any of the development</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Brockhill Woods would lose its charm with noise and pollution driving wildlife away. The land is enjoyed by dog walkers and children and provides a pleasant outlook for residents. There has already been too much development around Batchley/Brockhill. New roads will be needed and increased traffic will be a problem.</p> <p>It is not fair for Bromsgrove to lose its Green Belt and will not benefit in any way other than council tax. How will Bromsgrove cater for a further 3,000 homes?</p> <p>How is building on Green Belt being justified? There is brownfield land in Redditch and 600 empty homes.</p>	<p>options proposed.</p> <p>The use of the Brockhill ADR and Brockhill Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. All factors/constraints will be taken into account when the potential locations for development are investigated further. In any case, Brockhill wood would need to be retained should the ADR/Green Belt site be progressed. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Please see response 006. It is inevitable that all towns will have a certain proportion of empty homes. There are a limited number of empty homes in Redditch. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. Redditch has a limited number of brownfield sites to be able to allocate for development. There is therefore a need to develop on greenfield land to some extent.</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Redditch should be greener by using the land for organic food production or renewable energy.	Green policies are proposed within the Core Strategies of both Councils and it is planned that full versions of these will be available for public consultation in November 2010. Using land for food production is not prohibited by the Core Strategies.	None
050Ms S Coyne	Support growth adjacent to A448. The dual carriageway can absorb additional traffic. Bromsgrove is due a major expansion of its rail services. Journeys from this option to Redditch or Bromsgrove are equidistant. There is no risk of flooding and is not restricted by being an area of natural beauty. Further expansion here would cause relatively little disruption for existing residents. The options west and east of the A441 are not suitable due to the lack of existing infrastructure, busy roads and flood risk.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
051J & J Garner	Support growth adjacent to A448 for the following reasons: existing dual carriageway to cater for additional traffic, closer to proposed improved rail station in Bromsgrove, sewerage is more accessible, topography is suitable and flooding is not a problem. The options west and east of the A441 are not suitable due to the lack of existing road infrastructure, busy roads and flood risk. These areas have a wide range of wildlife including foxes, badgers, adders, slow worms, water voles, great crested newts and buzzards. This natural habitat should not be disturbed or destroyed.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
052 Mr & Mrs Cook	Object to development east of the A441.	The delivery of cross boundary	Further consultation on Core

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Any development should be focussed on Redditch town centre which is in need of regeneration.</p> <p>Redditch has a reputation for sprawling residential developments linked by dual carriageways and confusing roundabouts. This would be made worse.</p> <p>Development would destroy the rural feel of Bordesley and eventually Birmingham and Redditch would merge.</p>	<p>development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The emphasis will be on creating sustainable new communities and the proximity of potential development sites to the Town Centre will be of relevance in this respect. Redditch Core Strategy will contain Town Centre strategic sites to encourage regeneration.</p> <p>The road system evident in Redditch is characteristic of New Town design and is a distinctive feature which the Core Strategy will aim to maintain. Redditch has a successfully contained town, with no sprawling areas as there is a clear distinction between the rural and urban aspects.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
053 Mr & Mrs Arter	Object to development east and west of A441. There are already significant traffic problems on the A441. The Bordesley bypass needs to be built to relieve congestion that will otherwise only get worse. Flooding	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>is already a major problem and such flood plains should not be built on. There is no existing infrastructure to accommodate the increased population meaning more traffic and congestion as residents attempt to reach amenities.</p>	<p>respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
054 Mr D Wood	<p>Development should be on brownfield sites.</p> <p>If Green Belt land is needed land to the south or east should have been used because it is close to existing businesses.</p> <p>Of the proposed options the land adjacent to the A448 would be best as it has the best road links. Development around the A441 is not suitable due to congestion and flooding.</p>	<p>Redditch has a limited amount of brownfield sites to allocate for development so it is inevitable that some greenfield sites will need to be allocated.</p> <p>The land to the south west of Redditch has been considered without prejudice at an initial assessment (WYG1). The constraints in this area were considered so significant that they were discounted as viable alternative options.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
055 Dr P King CPRE	<p>The housing figures are excessive.</p>	<p>The 7000 dwellings target for Redditch set in the emerging RSS (Panel Report) was based upon the locally generated needs for development. The Borough Council contested the housing figures at the inquiry into the Phase 2 review of the RSS however this argument was not accepted by the inspectors as detailed in the Panel Report. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>There is currently lots of empty industrial property in Redditch which could be released for housing. On this basis Winyates Triangle is not needed for industrial development.</p>	<p>there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough's appropriate level of development. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. Where employment units are currently vacant it is RBC's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes. There is an identified need to plan for economic growth for the Borough of Redditch. Specifically in relation to Winyates Green Triangle the need for development in this location was identified by the RSS Phase 2 Revision Panel Report. A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progressing this matter.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>If development has to take place the most important factors are the impact on the landscape and the risk of compromising Green Belt objectives.</p> <p>Land east of the A441 should not be developed because it has historical integrity, no landscape barrier, there would be coalescence with Bordesley and Rowney Green, flooding issues and is too close to Beoley. Land west of the A441 should not be developed due to the impact on the wider landscape. Land adjacent the A448 should not be developed because it is an unnatural expansion to the town and would be harmful to Webheath. CPRE's preferred option is for the development of a sector between the Bromsgrove Highway and the ridge above Weights Farm. The area is well defined and the woodlands can be retained as open space. The two parcels of land separated by Brockhill wood could be released separately but a comprehensive AAP is recommended. These areas at Brockhill and Butler's Hill are close to the town centre.</p> <p>Development should focus on brownfield land before Green Belt release is considered.</p>	<p>All factors/constraints will be taken into account when potential locations for development are investigated.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Bordesley is not a defined settlement therefore coalescence of settlements is not a relevant consideration.</p> <p>In accordance with PPS3: Housing, efforts will be made to develop brownfield land in the first instance.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
056 S&S Franklin	Concerns about potential for employment development near Butlers Wood Cottage (land west of A441). Development here would impact on access and harm rural character of the property. Owners would be grateful for the following: 1, More details in	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>relation to development boundaries; 2, Rules that are in place to protect domestic dwellings from the encroachment of employment development; 3, Clarity on how they will be consulted on development that affects their private lane; 4, Clarity on how they will be consulted on the broader development of land on potential sites surrounding the property.</p>	<p>of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
<p>057 Mr R Hickman Halcrow Group</p>	<p>Promoting land south west of the A448 that abuts Webheath. The benefits of this area are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is well located in relation to the town centre and railway station • Vehicular travel to Birmingham is discouraged by the convoluted route • Highway improvement could be made support ADR development • Improvements to wider Webheath area • Only limited views of the site from public vantage points. <p>Further work is being commissioned to confirm deliverability of the site. An initial transport review identifies the benefits of the site and opportunities to enhance the highway network and public transport services. Development would require improvements to education facilities in Webheath area. A review of all local community facilities is underway to understand how the development could deliver a mix of supporting facilities that benefit the whole community.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>058 Mr R Amphlett</p>	<p>Support for development adjacent to the</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>A448 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A448 is dual carriageway that can cope with additional traffic • This location best supports the new rail station in Bromsgrove • The land is not in a floodplain and has limited ecological and landscape value in comparison with the other options. 	<p>development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
059 Mr J Hill	<p>It is unreasonable that Bromsgrove should have to lose Green Belt land to accommodate Redditch's housing need. It is important to retain a Green Belt buffer between Redditch and Birmingham. Infrastructure north of Redditch is not capable of supporting large scale growth and in particular the A441 is already congested. Therefore development near the A441 is not an attractive option. Development should be near the A448 to sustain high levels of commuting between Bromsgrove and Redditch. Good quality public transport should be provided as part of any development. The preferred option would be to plan a 'thin-ring' of development in 2 or 3 of the areas with most development focussed adjacent to the A448. Spreading development would be the least worst option as the traffic would be spread over a number of roads.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. In any case, efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham and minimise Green Belt land take. Coalescence of settlements will not result from any of the development options proposed.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p>
060 D&S King	<p>Vigorously object to the principal of Green Belt development due harm to wildlife and the attractive of the landscape and flooding issues.</p>	<p>PPG2 Paragraph 2.6 states "Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>When will development happen? Do we have rights to fight against these proposals?</p> <p>The proposals show no mention of the creation of recreational areas. A parkland should be created between Tackfarm barns and the proposed development thus retaining woods and meadows for the enjoyment of future generations. The woods at Foxlydiate are currently undergoing surgery. Why is money being spent to conserve and enhance woodland when housing is going to be built there? How many homes will be built and where exactly will they go? Concerns raised in relation to traffic problems and noise pollution.</p>	<p>State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt." The Councils will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this and if release of Green Belt land would be justified.</p> <p>It is not possible to predict exactly when development will take place. It is anticipated that the Core Strategies will be adopted by the end of 2012; however it is possible for planning applications to be submitted in advance of this. It is anticipated that a Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy will be available for public consultation in November 2010.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered</p>
061 Mr S Bloomfield	There are ecological and environmental	All factors/constraints will be taken into	To undertake further feasibility

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
<p>Worcestershire Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>constraints in all development areas. Background searches via Worcestershire Biological Records Centre/sub-regional GI study and a phase 1 survey on all sites is required. The impact SSSI's, SWS's and protected species need to be considered. Such constraints may limit developable areas. Any areas allocated will need to be able to accommodate grey and green infrastructure. Most urban extensions require 40% green space. Large developments have the opportunity to contribute significantly to the wider county GI network and landscape-scale biodiversity enhancement in general.</p> <p>In principal happy with allocation of ADRs in Redditch but further ecological work is required.</p> <p>A key issue will be the treatment of the SWS abutting the Foxlydiate Green Belt allocation. Further work is needed before this can be supported The Ravensbank ADR and Winyates Green Triangle are both bordered by the Ravensbank Drive SWS. There is a strong presumption against development that would have an adverse impact on SWSs and allocations here would be deeply worrying. All of the strategic growth options have biodiversity and environmental constraints that require further analysis. Buffering of the existing environmental resource, together with robust GI networks will be important and</p>	<p>account when the potential locations for future growth are investigated further. A Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out to determine any constraints to development. The Green Infrastructure Study will further address this issue.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access</p>	<p>work. Complete a Desktop analysis of available ecological information. Green infrastructure study to be completed.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>each of these sites should be a major new node on the wider Redditch/Worcestershire GI network.</p>	<p>to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progressing this matter.</p>	
<p>062 Mr N Hansen GOWM</p>	<p>Concerns raised over the time taken to reach this stage but GOWM are now encouraged by the progress being made.</p> <p>The document provides a detailed background and rationale for the development options. Proposed changes to RSS may have implications and therefore flexibility is key.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the strategy is aiming to provide the housing requirements of the RSS Phase 2 Preferred Option. Any additional evidence undertaken should be proportionate to the job being undertaken by the Core Strategy. Evidence on infrastructure will be required to show timely delivery. An implementation delivery plan will be required alongside the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Production of the WMRSS has inevitably led to uncertainty and delays in progressing the Core Strategies. It is unreasonable to criticise the Council's turn around of the cross boundary consultation, given that the Panel Report was only released in September 2009. This consultation commenced only five months following this.</p> <p>It is intended that flexibility will be built into the Core Strategies via suitable policy wording.</p> <p>Evidence on infrastructure being gathered as integral part of process to determine feasibility/viability and add certainty to plan in terms of delivery.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be progressed.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Support for joint consultation and acknowledgement that joint working will be required on both Core Strategies to ensure cross-border issues are co-ordinated effectively.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>063 Tina Green Bentley and Pauncefoot Parish Council</p>	<p>Query whether overspill expansion in Bromsgrove is still needed bearing in mind economic recession. Considers development should occur first within the boundary of Redditch before development in Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Questions LA funding and responsibility for service provision.</p> <p>Cross boundary development will impact on Green Belt and the consequences should be carefully considered Green Belt : Boundaries can only be changed in exceptional circumstances Functions of GB to prevent urban sprawl,</p>	<p>It should be noted the plan period runs up to 2026 and this takes into account temporary peaks and troughs in the market. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The homes are to cater for the needs of Redditch. On this basis access to services and facilities within Redditch is important. In the context of shared services the details of where council services are provided from will be assessed on the basis of best value.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>towns from merging and encourage rural regeneration but also retention of agricultural land and woodland , preservation of habitats, tranquillity and land access and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Option east of A441-“least undesirable” Medium sensitivity (Worcs CC Land Sensitivity Map) Due to slope of land development would look physically and socially towards Redditch and have minimal impact on surrounding countryside. GB between Redditch and Birmingham wider than that between Redditch and Bromsgrove. Therefore development here would conflict less with GB objectives than elsewhere. Coalescence with Rowney Green could be mitigated by planting of tree belt. Easy access to A441. Associated improvements to road and rail links, together with Abbey Stadium, would impact favourably on wider Redditch community Option would ensure critical mass capable of supporting range of local services could be achieved</p> <p>Option West of A441-“second choice” High sensitivity (Worcs CC Land Sensitivity Map) Farmland good quality (2 & 3a) Hewell area High Ecological value Prominent ridge line meaning that development could have strong visual impact on surrounding area Arrow valley may be located sufficiently high enough in the catchment to avoid extensive flooding. Easy access to established natural landscapes, to the town centre and employment opportunities Associated development such as Bordesley</p>	<p>strategic locations for this.</p>	

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>By- pass and railway station improvements would have wider benefits for Redditch Housing here would need to be contained by topography which would limit potential size of urban extension</p> <p>Adjacent A448- “most undesirable” Area bisected by A448 which is a ridgeway and 2 areas have different characteristics Mainly high landscape sensitivity Agricultural land classified as mainly 3A or 2 Hewell area High Ecological value Development North of A448 could be contained by topography but visible from south/east- Redditch South of A448 physically and socially separate from northern area. Economies of scale would not therefore apply when considering building and provision of services South west of A448 at edge of Birmingham plateau, land more open and poorly contained. Potential to exacerbate existing drainage problems. Increased run off into streams (Spring Brook and Swans Brook) could impact unfavourably on lower land to south east. Wastewater would require pumping over the ridge into Redditch system(already overburdened) Site located in close proximity to and partially underlain by outer sections of Water Source Protection Zone. Considers any development taking account of these factors would be expensive. Need also to update road system, comprises sparse network of narrow lanes serving scattered housing and farms. Some lanes used as rat runs from Redditch to west. Erosion of Green Belt between Bromsgrove and</p>		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Redditch Consider this option least satisfactory. Adding small parcels of housing to existing developments would make it difficult to create a critical mass</p> <p>Other options</p> <p>1) Beoley- not unknown for conservation areas to be integral part of larger urban area</p> <p>2) Studley- question reasons for discounting. Close physical, economic and social links with Redditch. Logical target for expansion. No large towns nearby with which “creeping mergers” could apply.</p>	<p>Beoley was not presented as an option for cross-boundary development during the consultation period for many factors not least as it is a village Conservation Area of distinctive rural character. Both the land to the south west of Redditch and in the vicinity of Beoley have been considered without prejudice at an initial assessment (WYG1). The constraints in these areas were considered so significant that they were discounted as viable alternative options.</p> <p>This option has already been discounted in WYG 1. It is also stated at Paragraph 8.84 of the PINS Panel Report “<i>We reluctantly conclude that it would be inappropriate to recommend development within the Studley area</i>”. The Councils will however look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
064 Mr C Lambert National Trust	<p>Content that there would be no visual impact on any National Trust property.</p> <p>Concerns over the proposed scale of development and the possibility of increased flood risk to Coughton Court (grade 1 listed). Strategic Flood Risk assessment is required to address the consequences down stream. The objective</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Level 1 SFRA completed. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will assess flood risk on proposed sites.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Complete Level 2 SFRA.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>should be to ensure that flood risk is either reduced or made no worse.</p> <p>The use of SUDS would contribute to key objectives of the Severn River Basin Management Plan and the green infrastructure objectives of the RSS and Regional Biodiversity Strategy.</p>	<p>A Green Infrastructure Study is being prepared for both administrative areas. Core Strategy policies which encourage the use of SuDS are being advocated in both Core Strategies</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure Study to be completed.</p>
065 Mr B Chandler	<p>Over several years occupants have been refused planning permission on Green Belt grounds. It is ironic that the Green Belt will now be developed.</p> <p>Inclusion of social housing units</p> <p>How will we be compensated for the de-valuation of our property?</p> <p>The road infrastructure is not suitable for more housing due to high speeds and accidents.</p> <p>The woods are of benefit to everyone and the landscape typology would not be easy to develop. Negative impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>Green Belt boundaries are tightly drawn around Redditch Town. In accordance with national planning policy in PPG2: 'Green Belt s' the Council's must retain the Green Belt but to allow an adjustment of boundaries where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Affordable housing should be provided on all housing sites in accordance with the most recent Housing Market Assessment (HMA) and Affordable Housing SPD in Redditch Borough.</p> <p>This matter is outside the scope of the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development.</p> <p>All factors/constraints will be taken into account including ecology and landscape issues, when the potential locations for future growth are investigated further. A Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>To undertake further feasibility work and desktop analysis of available ecological information.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Development should be focussed around A441 with better links to Birmingham where most people work. No local work opportunities. People would need to look towards Birmingham therefore development close to the A441 may be more practical</p>	<p>the evidence base for the Core Strategies which will identify any constraints to development.</p> <p>As far as possible the aim is to discourage people from travelling into the Major Urban Areas for work. It is intended that new development will comprise sustainable mixed use communities, enabling people to live and work locally rather than commuting to Birmingham.</p>	None
066 Mr M Whitworth	<p>Oppose development adjacent to the A448 due to the loss of Green Belt. The sprawl of suburban conurbations erodes the landscape and is not environmentally friendly.</p> <p>Flooding is a major problem in the area and has led to significant problems down stream.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Level 1 SFRA completed. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will assess flood risk on each site.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Complete Level 2 SFRA.</p>
067 Mrs D Snaddon Rowney Green Residents Association	<p>Redundant employment sites in Redditch should be developed first before Green Belt land.</p>	<p>The emphasis in the first instance will be on developing brownfield land; however there is a shortage of brownfield land within Redditch, in comparison to other locations meaning that greenfield land will also be required. Where employment units are currently vacant, it is the Council's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes. The employment required will aim to meet the needs of prospective employers.</p>	None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Perhaps land at Studley could also be used as it would reduce drainage costs to Spenal Ash sewage works.</p> <p>The Green Belt gap between Redditch and Birmingham is narrow and used for recreational purposes.</p> <p>Large areas are designated as LPA or AGLV. There are a number of environmental assets as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The River Arrow and Dagnell Brook are valuable wildlife corridors • The Roman Road (Ryknild Street) • The Worcester & Birmingham canal used by holidaymakers/tourists and fishermen • Bordesley Abbey Visitor Centre and Forge Mill Needle Museum • A fishery within Bordesley Park • Numerous SWS and ancient woodlands • A network of public footpaths and bridleways well used by ramblers and horse-riders 	<p>This option has already been discounted in WYG 1. It is also stated at Paragraph 8.84 of the WMRSS Panel Report “<i>We reluctantly conclude that it would be inappropriate to recommend development within the Studley area</i>”. The Councils will however look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham and minimise Green Belt land take. Coalescence of settlements will not result from any of the development options proposed.</p> <p>It is intended to carry out a Desktop Analysis of available ecological information. Furthermore a Green Infrastructure study is to be carried out.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p> <p>Desktop Analysis of available ecological to be completed. Green Infrastructure study to be completed.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A wide range of birds including nesting ravens, kingfishers, buzzards, other raptors, owls and 3 species of woodpecker • Many places of historic and archaeological interest as listed in the Register of Worcestershire Countryside Treasures (Feb 1973) and in a report by Cr Della Hooke for Worcestershire County Council and the Countryside Commission (Birmingham University 1989/90) <p>These assets are of great economic and social value and therefore development should not take place east or west of the A441. Further supporting documentation submitted</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
068 B&J Allen	<p>The following are key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be located in secluded location rather than on a hillside where it could potentially be an eyesore • The less that tiny country lanes are altered the better • The chosen sites should be in the least beautiful areas • Accessibility and ease of travelling <p>The best option is west of the A441. There is potential for a new rail station and the area is close to the bus station. The less roads that are built the better.</p>	<p>All factors/constraints will be taken into account, including visual/ landscape character and transport issues, when any potential locations for development are investigated. A transport assessment will be completed to assess the impact of development on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils</p>	<p>To undertake further feasibility work to determine the most appropriate location for future growth. Complete transport assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
069 Mr R Stevens	<p>Object to development adjacent to the A448 as it is Green Belt, has mature trees, heavily sloped and bisected by a stream. Development would be in conflict with council priority to “develop a cleaner/greener environment” nor will development “enhance the green infrastructure network”.</p> <p>The surrounding narrow lanes are unsuitable for increased traffic and there is no public transport.</p>	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
070 Mr S Maxwell Worcestershire County Council	<p>Foxydiate/Webheath- need to take into account ecological constraints;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contains parts of Hewell Park lake, a scheduled historic park and garden (part is also an SSSI) • A couple of grassland inventory sites are close by but none within area • Main habitats are arable and horticulture, traditional orchards, grassland and patches of scrub woodland • The western half of the area is classified of moderate importance for biodiversity and the eastern part is low to moderate <p>West of A441-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main habitats arable, horticulture and grassland, few areas of traditional orchard, woodland (Brockhill Wood and Butlers Hill 	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out. A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete a Desktop analysis of available ecological information. Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Historic Environment and Archaeology- There will be archaeology implications for all areas and the Service should be consulted at the earliest pre submission stages and during master planning to provide specialist advice and minimise risk/cost to developer. Service is currently producing Historic Environment Assessments (HEA) for Bromsgrove and Redditch- will provide integrated historic environment evidence base that will link to both the Core and GI strategies</p> <p>Provides district level assessment of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • historic environmental survival potential and sensitivity to change. <p>Based on 7000 new homes- Brockhill Wood Area -Potential need for new High School Middle schools capable of being expanded N/W Redditch- needs to be equivalent of 3 first schools. Additional 2 forms of entry could be accommodated by reorganisation of other schools Webheath ADR- could be accommodated in existing schools A435 ADR- could be accommodated in existing schools (95% of pupils at Mappleborough Green are from Redditch)</p>	<p>The Councils will draw on evidence in the HEA's to inform the decision making process and the GI strategies for the Councils. The Service will continue to be consulted on emerging plans.</p> <p>Information will be fed into evidence base and be critical part of feasibility process</p>	<p>The Service will continue to be consulted on emerging plans. To complete a GI strategy.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>
071 Mr G Mackenzie	<p>Considers consultation should have addressed Bromsgrove growth at the same time as Redditch growth</p>	<p>The consultation booklet clearly states: "the Inspectors report also has significant implications for the rest of Bromsgrove but this will be dealt with in a separate consultation exercise". There has already been substantial consultation on the</p>	<p>Further consultation to be held on both Core Strategies in November 2010.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Considers public infrastructure is already overloaded in Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Concerned over sources of employment as Redditch's traditional manufacturing base is likely to decline further</p> <p>Considers Government derived housing targets should be challenged Need for overflow space in Bromsgrove should be strongly challenged. Considers it likely that housing demand to 2026 can be met by 4000 units proposed for central Redditch and 4000 units proposed for Bromsgrove. No need to sacrifice Green Belt at Hewell on present evidence No start should be made on any of the options before the 8000 are completed.</p> <p>Considers expansion should only be permitted if public infrastructure is put into place beforehand for e.g. key projects Bordesley By pass and improvement of Bromsgrove Station needs to be finished.</p>	<p>Bromsgrove Core Strategy and this consultation brings this cross boundary issue up to date. Further consultation will be carried out in November which brings together all the issues.</p> <p>It is envisaged that associated infrastructure will be built to cater for demands of new development.</p> <p>In relation to manufacturing, Economic Development is a priority for Redditch Council and, as part of this, diversification of the economy is a key issue and it is an identified need to plan for economic growth for the Borough of Redditch.</p> <p>Government targets for Redditch related growth in Bromsgrove were strongly challenged at the RSS EiP. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. 7000 houses were for Redditch's needs and this should not be confused with Bromsgrove's needs of 4000.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their</p>	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be completed.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>All 3 options will seriously damage countryside and blight existing properties in the area.</p> <p>Alternative option-thin strip around periphery of Redditch between Beoley and Foxlydiate thereby maintaining maximum distance between 2 towns and preserving the greatest green space between the towns.</p>	<p>respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The ultimate option must be supported by robust evidence, taking a comprehensive and objective range of factors into consideration such as presence of mineral deposits, biodiversity, flooding issues, social issues such as integration of communities, provision of schools and so on.</p>	<p>To undertake further feasibility work to determine the most appropriate location for new development.</p>
072 J&K Hartigan	<p>Supports development adjacent to A448 as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides easy access to A448 direct links to Redditch and Bromsgrove • gives access to schools, leisure facilities, health services and shopping areas <p>Opposes options east and west of A441 as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A441 single carriageway and overused • No Redditch schools on north side of town • Bus links via A441 currently inadequate • New growth will exacerbate traffic delays • Frequently subject to roadworks • Frequently subject to flooding <p>Bordesley By pass rejected on the grounds of cost</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
073 Mr & Mrs T Grenfell	<p>Opposed to option east of A441 due to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding • Direct fuel pipeline for airport • Covenant on land? 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive current volume of traffic • Road needs a by pass Supports option adjacent to A448 as considers it is the obvious choice	therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
074 Miss A Grenfell	Object to development on land east of A441 because of flooding. There is a direct fuel pipeline to Birmingham Airport on the land and there is a covenant on the land. The road (A441) is very frightening to cross due to the sheer volume of traffic and therefore a bypass is required. Land adjacent to the A448 is the obvious choice for development.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
075 Mr & Mrs J Harrop	Very disappointed and concerned that 3000 of Redditch's homes will be built in Bromsgrove. This will create a greater Redditch which is in fact Bromsgrove. Options east and west of the A441 have the following advantages over the land adjacent to the A448: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to a major road • Easy access and short distance to Redditch Town Centre • Could easily be linked to existing cycle ways • Access to established facilities e.g. schools and GPs • Close proximity to previous development meaning it is easier to extend service/utilities provision • Easy access to out of town supermarket and DIY store • Will increase usage of Abbey Stadium • Less visually sensitive and intrusive The option east of the A441 has further	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>advantages over the option west of the A441. The B4101 provides good access for housing development and there is good access to open space and parkland.</p> <p>The preferred option would be either to concentrate all development on land east of the A441 or spread it between land east and west of the A441. However the majority of development should still be east of the A441 with development not spreading further west than the railway line. A new railway station should be considered north of Redditch to support development.</p>	<p>The ultimate option must be supported by robust evidence, taking a comprehensive and objective range of factors into consideration such as presence of mineral deposits, biodiversity, flooding issues, social issues such as integration of communities, provision of schools and so on.</p>	<p>To undertake further feasibility work to determine the most appropriate location for new development.</p>
076 Mr & Mrs G Hampshire	<p>Object to any development at land adjacent to the A448 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further away from town centre, employment, railway station and other amenities • Options west and east of the A441 offer better access to the rail station particularly if a new halt was added • Options west and east of the A441 are closer to an out of town supermarket, DIY store and the Abbey Stadium • The option east of the A441 has the best road access and in particular access to the M42. • Development adjacent to the A448 could lead to ribbon development between Redditch and Bromsgrove • There is already heavy pressure on the minor roads around Bentley • The option west of the A441 has the opportunity to develop a network of 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>green corridors.</p> <p>Object to development at Webheath ADR. Agree with WYG Stage 2 that the site should not be used.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
077 Mrs J Bedford	<p>Recognition that areas must grow to accommodate ever expanding population and affordable housing needs. The location will lead to more high cost executive homes and not address affordability issues</p> <p>Redditch has grown exponentially due to migration from Bromsgrove because of the big difference in property prices. Many people now commute from Redditch to Bromsgrove. Adverse impact on sustainability as the majority will commute daily to Birmingham.</p> <p>The following issues will be compounded by development east of the A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the A441 at an appropriate position is almost impossible • Infrastructure from Dagnell End Road and Icknield Street is insufficient to deal with current flooding problems • Loss of wildlife corridor, fields and Green Belt land <p>Development should be located along the A448 or extend existing development at</p>	<p>Affordable housing should be provided on all housing sites in accordance with the most recent Redditch Housing Market Assessment (HMA) and Affordable Housing SPD. A review of Redditch's housing needs assessment will be undertaken.</p> <p>It is envisaged that new development will comprise sustainable communities and wherever possible and reduce the need to commute and travel by private car.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>To complete the Housing Needs Assessment</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Brockhill. Development adjacent the A448 would have the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Bromsgrove in meeting their need by reducing migration distances and keeping people in businesses in Bromsgrove. • Ensure better access to Redditch along A448 • Promote a more balanced supply of housing tenure and complement Webheath ADR. <p>Continues to build on established business with Bromsgrove e.g. Stoke Prior.</p>		
078 Ms E Grove	<p>There is sufficient land within Redditch for development. There is no justification for further employment development with vacant employment sites in Redditch.</p> <p>Development at Bordesley Park would have a detrimental impact on the area and reduce property prices.</p> <p>The risk and frequency of flooding will increase around the A441. Traffic is already on this road and the bypass would be required. Development would result in a loss of Green Belt Redditch should not merge with Bordesley. Development will harm wildlife e.g. badgers, foxes, deer, hares etc.</p>	<p>A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is annually completed which details all land available for housing in Redditch. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p> <p>The matter of property prices is outside the scope of the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Bordesley is not a defined settlement and therefore coalescence of settlements in this location is not a relevant consideration. A Desktop Analysis of available ecological</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete a Desktop analysis of available ecological information</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
079 Ms J Ogden	<p>Raise significant concerns over the expansion of Redditch. Occupants will pay council tax to Bromsgrove but will be entirely dependant on Redditch amenities.</p> <p>No new amenities have ever been provided for occupants of the Brockhill development with some roads still not adopted and main roads without footpaths. The local school for Brockhill residents (Tardebigge C of E First School) is already over subscribed.</p> <p>With planned public service cuts how will the police and health service cope?</p> <p>Increased traffic on already busy roads will need increased maintenance but the council are already struggling to repair existing potholes.</p> <p>There is a complete disregard for the impact on woodlands and wildlife.</p>	<p>information will be carried out.</p> <p>This matter is outside the scope of the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>The Councils are undertaking further work to assess existing infrastructure before determining which site or sites will be developed. It could be that sufficient development in the area could justify the provision of some services and facilities. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Viability appraisal work will be carried out to assess the feasibility of proposed development. Planning obligations can also be used in appropriate cases to assist in enhance or to provide new community facilities.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development. Roads will continue to be maintained by Worcestershire County Council.</p> <p>A Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out to determine any constraints to development but the Core Strategies will seek improvements to ecology.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To undertake further feasibility work. Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Viability appraisal work to be carried out</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch including cross boundary locations</p> <p>Complete a Desktop analysis of available ecological information</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>There is no mention of how flooding issues in Brockhill will be overcome.</p> <p>Why is development taking place on land that was safeguarded as Areas of Development Restraint?</p> <p>Why is development not taking place closer to Bromsgrove?</p> <p>Redditch will be incurring the impact of Bromsgrove's responsibilities.</p>	<p>A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will assess flood risk on each site and identify any mitigation measures.</p> <p>Areas of Development Restraint are typically areas of land which have been "set aside" as potential land for new development if required in the future, so they are parcels of land safeguarded for future development.</p> <p>The RSS included a principle that need should be met where it arises. The proposed growth for consultation is for Redditch's needs of 7000 houses up to 2026. As Redditch only has capacity for 4000 within its boundary 3000 must be provided in Bromsgrove adjacent to the Redditch boundary. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It is proposed that Bromsgrove land will be used to meet Redditch's needs.</p>	<p>Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be completed</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
080 Mr & Mrs C Hart	<p>Land adjacent to the A448 is the only suitable site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a dual carriageway to cope with the additional traffic 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is closest to proposed new station at Bromsgrove where there will be park and facilities • The sewage problem is more accessible from this site • Proximity to schools • The topography is more suitable • There is no flooding risk here • This is the most cost effective option • The other two sites do not have the infrastructure or facilities. The A441 is already at capacity. • The around the River Arrow has a diversity of wildlife e.g. buzzards, foxes, badgers, great crested newts, adders, water voles etc 	therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
081 Ms C Battle	<p>Object to development east and west of A441 due to severe flooding problems and impact on the Green Belt. The option adjacent to the A448 should be chosen because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is good accessibility to both Bromsgrove and Redditch along A448 • A gas pipe runs through Bordesley • It is very dangerous to cross the A441 • The A441 is very busy but has poor access to public transport. <p>Development should take place in Redditch first before the use of Green Belt land. Development in the Green Belt would reduce agricultural land, wildlife corridors and degrade the ecological balance.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It is generally the intention to develop brownfield land in the first instance prior to releasing Green Belt land and this will be considered when determining the sites for development that will be consulted</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. It should be noted that not all Green Belt land is designated because it has agricultural or biodiversity value.	
082 Mr R Stone	<p>Housing should not be allowed in the Green Belt and will cause urban sprawl.</p> <p>Land west of the A441 is most problematic due to the steepness of the landscape, visual impact and the impact on woodlands. The option adjacent the A448 is not suitable as it is split by a dual carriage way although it may be acceptable to put development south of the A448. Land east of the A441 is most sensible due to access onto the B4101 into Redditch or A411 to reach the M42. The significant flooding that takes place will need to be addressed through management plans up and down stream. An extra train station should be created with a park and ride facility. If land west of the A441 is chosen traffic from the new development should be stopped from using Brockhill lane as it is not suitable. It would be better to spread development around all of the options and Webheath.</p> <p>Is there any guarantee that there will not be further housing in the future?</p>	<p>Redditch has a successfully contained town, with no sprawling areas as there is a clear distinction between the rural and urban aspects.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. It should be noted at is not envisaged that a new train station or park and ride at North Redditch can be sustained.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. There is no guarantee that there would not be further housing in the future as the demand for houses will in most areas continue to grow as the population does.	
083 Ms A Smith English Heritage	<p>Joint working and consultation on this issue is welcomed.</p> <p>Support the commitment the Councils have given to the undertaking of a Historic Environment Assessment. The results from this should inform the decision making process in terms of site selection, the balance of development between any selected sites and the master planning and design stage</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Councils will draw on evidence in the HEA's to inform the decision making process.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Councils to use evidence in the HEA's to inform the decision making process.</p>
084 T Mc Alister	<p>Why are the findings of the document 'A Study of Green Belt land & Areas of Development Restraint within Redditch Borough' being ignored? e.g. Green Belt land at Brockhill should not be developed.</p> <p>Completely opposed to development west of the A441. It is ill thought out and will cause problems for existing Brockhill residents.</p>	<p>The document 'A Study of Green Belt land & Areas of Development Restraint within Redditch Borough' is a piece of evidence to use in determining the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. There is other evidence to consider as well and a judgement needs to be made where there may be conflicts in evidence.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>What studies have been done on issues such as effects of additional traffic on the B4184, the effects on land drainage and the impact on wildlife? There is a community of bats living in the Brockhill wood and they and their roosts are protected.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess the traffic implications of developments. Also an update to the Water Cycles Strategy is to be completed which will detail what measures would need to be in place for each potential development area. A desktop analysis of ecological information will also be completed and the outcomes of this will inform a Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment. To complete a Water Cycle Strategy update. To complete a desktop analysis of available ecological information. To complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
085 Mrs P Fuszard	<p>Oppose development east of the A441. This is an area of beauty that should be preserved and not desecrated. Traffic congestion is a major problem with it being difficult and dangerous for people to get in and out of their driveways. New development would compound this awful situation. The other areas have much easier road and highway access to carry the increased traffic and have easy access to Bromsgrove and Redditch.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
086 Ms T Black Highways Agency	<p>The Highways Agency are developing a VISSIM model of the M5 and M42 junctions which will enable a better understanding of how these junctions operate.</p> <p>Growth in Redditch Borough has the potential impact significantly on junction 3 of the M42. Steps to discourage travel by private car need to be taken.</p> <p>Once the modelling work is complete the Highways Agency will be in a better position</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is envisaged that new development will comprise sustainable communities and wherever possible, reduce the need to travel by private car. A modal shift will be encouraged given the potential impacts.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic</p>	<p>Liaise with HA to understand the outcomes of the modelling.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch including</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	to assess the implications of the proposed allocations on the SRN.	implications of development.	cross boundary locations
087 T&S Latham- Marr	<p>We live on and own Bordesley Park Farm which falls within the option east of the A441. It is an anomaly that Bordesley Park Farm is within the Green Belt. The site is brownfield and is intensively developed. The site does not meet any of the 5 purposes for including land within the Green Belt. In addition the site does not fulfil any of the objectives of the use of land within the Green Belt. The site should be removed from the Green Belt. East of the A441 would be a good place to accommodate part of the housing requirement. It is a sustainable location given its close proximity to shops and services including Redditch Town Centre. We are not aware of any issues or constraints that prevent this land from coming forward. The need for development overrides any Green Belt designation.</p> <p>The approach of delivering more housing in this area of the West Midlands is supported</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The designation of this site as Green Belt is not considered anomalous as there are many existing developed sites on Green Belt land.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
088 Mr A Bateman Pegasus Planning Group (On behalf of Banner Homes)	The consultation document does not fully support the Panel's comments in respect of housing requirements. The Panel Report clearly states that the figure of 3000 is only to 2021 and that between 2021-2026	The Panel Reports reference to an additional 2000-3000 dwellings between 2021- 2026 is related to Bromsgrove's needs. It does not relate to Bromsgrove and Redditch's cross boundary	None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>consideration needs to be given to the potential for a further 2000-3000 dwellings. The consultation document should be based on these figures because of the need to show that the Core Strategy is soundly based and can deal with flexibility issues. The public have not been properly informed with regards to the additional 2000-3000 dwellings.</p> <p>300 dwellings per annum need to be completed between 2011 and 2026. This would be difficult to achieve on one site and therefore at least 2 sites need to be identified. Lead in times and challenging annual provision rates may mean that further additional sites will need to be identified.</p> <p>The development should be spread over all of the areas identified. This is due to a number of factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to correctly look at alternative options as part of the evidence base to show soundness of approach • The need to reduce the impact of development on the landscape and surrounding environment • The need to make best use of existing infrastructure within Redditch • The need to ensure future infrastructure provided in this area will benefit as many people as possible 	<p>requirements.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Councils appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to ensure that the housing provision figures are achieved within the plan period. <p>The consideration of alternative sites should not just be restricted to large SUEs but also smaller sites to fulfil the identified housing needs. Using a range of sites will help to ensure delivery within the plan period. The WYG study into the future growth implications of Redditch Second Report is a helpful starting point in terms of identifying suitable sites. The report gave some consideration to landscape and environmental issues although further work is required in this in this area. The landscape considerations clearly showed that the area of land between the A441 and the railway at Bordesley (area 1) was of low to medium visual sensitivity and the preference would be to direct development to this area. Despite this conclusion WYG's development strategy is then to ignore this site and develop the rest of Bordesley. Despite the fact that from a landscape perspective Bordesley Park is more sensitive. In terms of facilities the site is close to the Abbey Retail Park together with a large Sainsbury's store, the town centre, large areas of open space and the Abbey Stadium. This sports stadium provides a sports hall with 5 courts and a fitness centre, an athletics track, football pitches and a crèche. Development here would make best use of these facilities and also means that there is no need to provide costly additional facilities elsewhere. The</p>		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>site is close to existing employment provision at Enfield. In a development of 600-800 units a primary school can be provided if required and any additional small element of retail. It is important to consider what benefits development could have on the surrounding area. The main benefit here would be the development of the Bordesley Bypass. This would link Redditch with the M42 via the Alvechurch bypass. This would discourage traffic from going through Bordesley Village. Enhanced public transport provision would also assist along the route into the town centre. The advantage of a development of 600 to 800 dwellings is that it would allow the identity of the existing village to remain as a separate entity rather than being absorbed into Redditch. This has benefits in terms of urban design solutions to the settlement as a whole.</p> <p>Due to the amount of growth proposed there is a concern that 3,000 homes may not be completed by 2021. It is unlikely that any development would commence before 2014. This would leave 7 years until 2021 and on the basis of the basis of 4 developers building a maximum of 50 dwellings per annum and on the basis that completions would probably 50 in 2014/15, 150 in 2015/16 and 200 thereafter only 1,200 would be built by 2021. Also if site delivery was delayed there would be no contingency plan. Therefore allocating only one SUE would mean there is a real risk of not meeting strategic housing requirements.</p>	<p>After some investigation, the Councils have not been made aware of any developer concerns regarding delivery by 2021; however these are sites to be delivered by 2026. The Councils are aware that some development can come forward immediately subject to infrastructure being in place.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>A dispersed option of growth adjacent to Redditch should be pursued including ADR land and Green Belt land in both Redditch and Bromsgrove. Development should be located adjacent to the radial routes into the town such as the A441 and the A448. As evidenced within the WYG Report there are development sites within these areas that are relatively unconstrained and a combination of sites is capable of accommodating RSS targets. The land at Bordesley has been identified as a sustainable and suitable location for development and can accommodate 600 to 800 homes including key facilities and infrastructure. The site is on the floor of the Bordesley valley and therefore development would have only have a limited impact on the landscape as stated in the WYG report (Jan 2008). There are good linkages to the town centre and local employment. The rail links could also be utilised to create a park and ride facility. Development here would function as part of the Redditch urban area and through careful master planning the integrity of Bordesley Village could be retained. Development neighbouring the A448 with land at Bordesley are considered to be suitable and sustainable locations for growth.</p>		
089 R Higrove	<p>Development should first be located within the Redditch boundary. Land adjacent to the A448 has infrastructure and mixed uses. Development here would ease pressure of the A441. The A441 already has up to a</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>1000 vehicles and there are no opportunities to ease congestion. I have no confidence in the by-pass ever being built. Bordesley is an integral part of a network of communities that revolve around Bromsgrove. The nature of area (east and west of the A441) would be radically changed by development and would mean a loss of Green Belt. There are also significant flood problems that affect the area.</p> <p>There is no need for further commercial or industrial development due to the number of current vacant premises.</p> <p>Development should only take place within the Redditch boundary or adjacent the A448.</p>	<p>of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The ELR identifies all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. Where employment units are currently vacant it is RBC's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes. There is an identified need to plan for economic growth for the Borough of Redditch.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
090 Mr L Teague	'Shell shocked' that our Green Belt is going to be sacrificed to allow thousands of new homes to be built to accommodate ever increasing populations.	Local Authorities should retain the Green Belt but allow an adjustment of boundaries where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6 th July 2010 there is now	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Object to development adjacent to A448 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow lanes cant cope with increased traffic and even the A448 will not be able to cope • There already too many accidents, it is too dangerous. • It would cost millions of pounds to improve roads • There would be increased litter • Light pollution – there is currently no street lighting at all • Public transport is poor with none in Bentley and a once hourly service in Foxlydiate • There is currently no sewerage system • All water would drain into the Bentley Stream System which is heavily overloaded • Flooding is already a problem • The loss of landscape and reduced Green Belt between Redditch and Bromsgrove • No shops <p>Land in Redditch should be developed either at Webheath, Feckenham or Astwood Bank.</p>	<p>the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		alongside the potential development targets.	
091 S Darby	Support growth adjacent to the A448. Object to any development east or west of the A441 due to excessive flooding and traffic.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
092 Mr J Hill	<p>General election may impact on decisions on housing numbers in area and current economic recession impacted on supply and demand.</p> <p>All sites in booklet have problems</p> <p>All ADRs in Redditch should be developed first</p> <p>Land for industrial purposes should be taken on strictest sequential basis with the emphasis on filling Ravensbank Business Park first</p>	<p>It should be noted the plan period runs up to 2026 and this takes into account temporary peaks and troughs in the market.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted however the Panel Report states at Paragraph 4.17 page 95 "<i>Even land released from the Green Belt may be appropriate to bring forward at an early stage in some locations in order to facilitate wider objectives, including sustainable development</i>". The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are vacant units in the Borough however from evidence base work it is considered that the majority of vacant units are not suitable to meet predicted future needs of economic development. Therefore there is a need to identify land for a variety of</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Identify land for variety of employment uses.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Opposed to development east of A441: Traffic congestion. Large scale sporting facility Abbey Stadium likely to generate high traffic demands. Regular flooding/ Water table has risen. Fuel pipe to Birmingham airport. Supports options adjacent A448 and west of A441: A448 dual carriageway giving good access and waste water to Sprenal clearer route</p>	<p>employment uses to cater for the employment land requirements. Ravensbank Business Park is currently being built out.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
093 Mr R Barnett	<p>Development is supported adjacent to the A448 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, There is a dual carriageway with good links between Redditch & Bromsgrove 2, Best links to the proposed new train station at Bromsgrove with large car park 3, The land doesn't flood and is of no Special Scientific Interest 4, There are no major infrastructure problems and limited disruption to local people 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
094 Mrs R Campbell	<p>Object to development of Webheath ADR due to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost of pumping foul • The inappropriate cost of coping with gradients as well as destroying landscape • WYG did not recommend use of the ADR • Mr Dyer, Inspector of RP12 refused development in the western areas and release of ADR 	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, to seek LA approval and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that financial provision could be sought in their financial programme to deliver this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>only if drainage and highway connections could be resolved</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over increased traffic • Possible contamination of Curs Lane Wells and Foxlydiate Woods • Increased flooding in Feckenham 	<p>Viability appraisal work will be carried out to assess the feasibility of proposed development. The Councils are undertaking further work to assess relevant factors/constraints before determining which sites or sites will be developed. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) assesses flood risk on each site.</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch including cross boundary locations. Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be completed.</p>
095 Miss A Overton	<p>Objects to all proposals on the grounds that Green Belt should mean Green Belt forever.</p> <p>Green space is essential to the health and well being of our nation. There are serious long term consequences to expanding towns.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Green space and health issues this will be considered as part of the Green Infrastructure study.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
096 Deleted			
097 Mr & Mrs Harvey	<p>Concerns and disappointment of possible development in Brockhill area and therefore may need to move house. The Brockhill estate is big enough as it stands and enough further development would make</p>	<p>Brockhill is part of the Redditch urban area. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Brockhill itself feel like a town.</p> <p>There is currently sufficient available residential and commercial property. Existing residential areas should be redeveloped instead.</p> <p>Fail to see why a further 7000 dwellings and employment land are needed to the possible detriment of current estates and town residents.</p> <p>Urban open space in Redditch should be retained.</p>	<p>development targets.</p> <p>Redevelopment opportunities have been considered through the SHLAA and ELR. There is still a need to provide new dwellings in addition to this.</p> <p>The housing and employment targets consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this is based on the projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will seek to maintain the open space standards in Redditch as such standards are an integral part of the character of this New Town.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Open space issues to be addressed in Core Strategy. Further consultation to be held on both Core Strategies in November</p>
098 Mr S Louth BNP Paribas Real Estate	The Law Society occupies premises at Ipsley Court, Redditch which is an office development of 3,530m ² and set within a 3acre site. Whilst the company currently has no plans to vacate the site it is important to consider the suitability of the site for a range of residential uses (open market, care home or nursing home) in the longer term. The surrounding area is residential in character and accessible by a choice of means of transport with nearby shops and amenities	This proposal should be submitted as part of the SHLAA process and will be reviewed for the next Redditch SHLAA.	Law Society to be informed of SHLAA process

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	such as Arrow Valley Park. The site has potential for residential development in the future.		
099 Ms H Pankhurst Natural England	<p>Biodiversity constraints on the sites/areas which must be considered prior to the final selection. Those of immediate note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foxlydiat area – Foxlydiat Wood Local Nature Reserve, Foxlydiat and Pitcheroak Woods Special Wildlife Site, Hewell Park Lake SSSI • Area west of the A441 – The replanted Ancient Woodland sections Brockhill Wood and Butlers Hill Wood and the River Arrow Special Wildlife Site, which has a direct connection to Dagnell End Meadow SSSI <p>Recommend a desktop survey of the sites and their surroundings, drawing upon existing information including the county's Habitat Inventory and protected species records held by Biological Records Centre. Welcome the use of the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment, however, a number of sites/areas are shown to be highly sensitive, which suggests a presumption against development. How will the Council deal with this information? Have alternative, less sensitive sites been considered and discounted? Will adequate mitigation be secured through CS policies? In terms of Green infrastructure, Natural England</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt areas within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A desktop analysis of ecological information will also be completed and the outcomes of this will inform a Green Infrastructure Strategy where details of site specific requirements for green space can be incorporated to mitigate against a developments effects. Where appropriate Strategic Sites in the Core Strategy can include relevant targets to be achieved. Officers have investigated other sites in Redditch's South West Green Belt as alternative sites but these have been dismissed because of their significant constraints.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Complete a Desktop Analysis of available ecological information. Complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>advocates the delivery of 40% green space within urban extensions, in line with best practice.</p>		
<p>100 Mrs R Whiteman Environment Agency</p>	<p>The Environment Agency question whether sites can come forward immediately for development? Has consideration been given to any potential infrastructure upgrades required and the timescales, provider commitment and costs for delivering these upgrades? Flood risk was evident as part of the level 1 SFRA on a number of sites and there are a number of un-modelled water courses, which require further assessment in considering flood risk to the identified sites. Welcome the production of a level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>All sites will require minor and/or major infrastructure upgrades for water supply and waste water, for example the WCS identifies A435 ADR, Brockhill ADR, Webheath ADR and Foxlydiate Woods as requiring infrastructure upgrades for water supply. Sewage treatment works are currently either at or nearing their capacity - any new sewage infrastructure generally would not be allowed to contain storm overflows; therefore the surface water and foul elements should be separated, utilising SUDs. Webheath ADR and Foxlydiate Woods are identified within the WCS as requiring major infrastructure upgrade for capacity of waste water infrastructure.</p> <p>As infrastructure upgrades are required for each site the EA question whether there is</p>	<p>As stated in RBC's draft policy all sites for development that were included in the consultation material could come forward immediately in accordance with the policies in the development plan. Infrastructure information will be re-tested as part of the refresh to the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Water Cycle Strategy update on required sites. Details of site specific mitigation measures on the strategic sites can be included in the Strategic site policies.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Phasing of some sites may be required in light of the revocation of the RSS</p>	<p>To complete Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Water Cycle Study update</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>enough detail within the evidence base to confirm the phasing of development is not required. We would seek clarification on this point and the infrastructure planning process (including an implementation plan). Early open engagement with the relevant utility companies is seen as essential for addressing deliverability of sites and consequently the CS.</p> <p>We would expect to see policies within the CS relating to the sustainable use of water and demand management of water, including targets for water efficiency, for example that new housing development is constructed to level ¾ of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Planning authorities should ensure that new development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promote designs and layouts that secure the integration of waste management facilities, including a commitment to waste minimisation. Early consideration should be given to protecting and enhancing through the location, layout and design of the proposed development. On all sites, especially brownfield, should take into account contaminated land and groundwater vulnerability.</p>	<p>announced on 6th July 2010. There is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate levels of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The need for phasing will be dependent on the types of locations put forward. The locations for major development have not yet been determined making it difficult for utility companies to feedback on timings, costs, upgrades etc.</p> <p>Agreed. A policy on water efficiency should feature in the Redditch Core Strategy and requirements will be based upon the revised Water Cycle Strategy outcomes.</p>	<p>Complete the refresh to the Water Cycle Strategy. Include water efficiency in Core Strategy policy.</p>
101 Mr N Denison/R Mitchell	A) Support to develop land to the East of A441, land to the West of A441 (area to the	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
(WYG Gallagher Estates)	<p>east of the railway line only) and Brockhill ADR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gallagher Estates Limited (GEL) owns most of the land and has an option to purchase all; this can ensure timely delivery of necessary development and infrastructure. Around 98.5 ha gross of the GEL controlled land within Bromsgrove is potentially developable, able to deliver around 2600 houses, 14.3ha of employment land (based on the suggested design of the Bordesley Bypass in the report), around 1ha new local centre and around 2ha primary school, substantial areas of informal open space, without encroaching into the 1:100 year flood plain. • Within easy driving and cycling distance of Redditch town centre and train station. • In close proximity to the Arrow Retail Park (which contains a large food store) • Well related to existing major employment areas • Easy access to a range of recreational facilities (e.g. leisure centre, outdoor sports facilities, a new planned swimming pool in the Abbey stadium site, the Arrow Valley Country Park, a golf course) • Served by a full range of schools • Majority of land outside the designated Landscape Protection 	<p>changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Area and Area of Great Landscape Value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A major opportunity to create a linked, multifunctional network of green space • Transport Assessment conducted shows M42 junction 2 is able to accommodate all the developments without any improvements • GEL is willing to provide both the land required to build the relief road and an appropriate contribution towards its development if the areas mentioned are developed • No over-riding constraints to the development of land to the east of A441 in terms of provision of water, gas, electricity and telecommunications facilities <p>B) Support to develop land to the West of A441 (area to the east of the railway line only), Brockhill ADR for employment use: Commercial interest to this land is relatively high compared to other parts due to the accessibility of this land to the main road network. Safeguard the land to bring forward a Bordesley relief. Support Brockhill ADR used for employment, together with the ADR, the area can form a major new employment area. Transport Assessment shows that the 20ha employment use can come forward before the completion of the relief road. Existing sewage discharge can accommodate the land to be used for employment without materially worsening the existing network. Infrastructure relating</p>		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	to portable water, electricity, gas and telecommunications can be provided through extension of the existing networks.		
102 Mr T Richards H&W Earth Heritage Trust	Encourage development outside of designated landscape areas. Should consider the natural environment when drawing the preferred option. Ensure the natural environment is fully integrated and enhances as the result of any development	There are no formal landscape designations on land within Redditch. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. To inform this decision making a Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out together with a Green Infrastructure study. This will form part of the evidence base and will identify any constraints to development and/or appropriate mitigation measures.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete a Desktop analysis of available ecological information
103 Mr J Coleman William Davis	<p>East of A441 – Proposed site(s): Bordesley Park - Storrage Lane to the north, Dagnell End Road to the south, Icknield Street to the east, Bordesley Village/ Birmingham Road to the west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Dagnell End is the south east corner of the Bordesley Park site, lying to the north of Dagnell End Road and west of Icknield Street. • Land to the west of Dagnell Brook is the middle part of the site, to the west of Dagnell Brook. <p>Specific attributes of the Bordesley Park site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physically adjacent to the developed northern edge of 	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Redditch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the site will still leave the gap between Redditch and Birmingham substantial and would not give rise to any threat of coalescence • Enclosed/ defined by local topography • The character and quality of surrounding rural villages – Beoley, Rowney Green and Bordesley, can be safeguarded appropriately through the development of the Bordesley Park site • Development of the site can be linked into existing service facilities and can deliver improvements to transport infrastructure and to service utilities infrastructure <p>Development, whilst necessarily taking account of site factors such as floodplain of the Dagnell Brook, can retain and develop elements of Green Infrastructure</p>		
104 Miss V Kendrick CPRE	<p>The Winyates Green Triangle (WGT) is a wetland nature site and given that access facilities are already available, the idea of a 'Diversification Park' should be accommodated there.</p> <p>There is nothing site specific mentioned about the WGT (yellow on the map) except that the site will be examined in Stratford upon Avon DC's Core Strategy. According to Stratford DC, RBC has identified to use the site as 'Diversification Park'.</p> <p>Stratford DC supports the principle of this</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A detailed ecological survey has been</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Do not progress Winyates Green</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>form of employment use and has a proposal, by which one of the requirements is 'to retain and where necessary replace the mature hedgerow along the western boundary of the site'. The question is how to 'replace' a mature hedgerow? The East of Redditch Proposals Map of Stratford DC shows the Far Moor Lane boundary of WGT along Longhope Close. This boundary length is a mature hedgerow with veteran oaks along the Green Lane. The Green Lane follows the WGT boundary to the A435 where there is a 'white' gap. It is considered that the WGT and the white gap could serve as a linear park and include cycle and pedestrian routes, linking to the Ardens Close Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progressing this matter.</p>	<p>Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>
<p>105 Miss V Kendrick CPRE</p>	<p>Foxlydiate/ Webheath – Hewell Road is a busy road and divides the Foxlydiate area. The view was fields with trees/ woods at the far distance, which is of high landscape value.</p> <p>West of the A441 – Brockhill Road is a narrow, pretty quiet road. There were fields and at the far end trees and woods. The opposite side had fields and copses of high landscape value. Proposals close to Butlers Hill Wood and Brockhill Wood should be immediately beside the boundaries to avoid fly tipping and storage of goods of any sort, as this happen around all Redditch woods. A clear buffer strip is required to protect the open space and for it to be monitored. East of the A441 – Weights Lane is a single width track, with newly planted whips and a</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt areas within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	view of industry below on one side, and has the boundary of the prison on the other side. Would people buy a property next door to a prison? Both East and West of A441 - It is suggested that the Bordesley Bypass could progress and the train station being re-located along the line. But there is nothing to support their achievements.		
106 Ms D Williams ST Water	Involved in the Water Cycle Study to identify any water infrastructure issues, hence no comments.	Noted	None
107 Mr & Mrs S Walker	East & West of A441 – A441 very busy, lack of infrastructure, topography of the surrounding land leading to flooding, increase in traffic on a single road. Will spoil the view to the back of our garden. Adjacent A448 – infrastructure already in place, proximity to schools.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
108 Mr & Mrs S Bloomfield	Objects to Option adjacent to A448 particularly Upper Bentley and Banks Green due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of identity • Reduction in gap between Bromsgrove and Redditch • Loss of Green Belt land • Loss of working farms • Major infrastructure improvements required, roads and utilities • Disastrous effect on local environment and identity of local villages 	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch's development targets.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.
109 Mr M Thomas	Does Redditch still need 7,000 homes now it is no longer an SSD? Development to the north of Redditch will encourage migration from MUA. Option adjacent to the A448 is	Housing figures that were consulted on were set by the WMRSS. The target of 7000 for Redditch was based on population projections and Redditch's	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>preferred.</p> <p>Extend the A435 dual carriageway to accommodate development between Redditch and Studley.</p> <p>Develop on Redditch's Parkland instead of the Bordesley countryside.</p>	<p>indigenous needs up to 2026. The designation of an SSD did not influence these figures. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>This option has already been discounted in WYG 1. It is also stated at Paragraph 8.84 of the PINS Panel Report "We reluctantly conclude that it would be inappropriate to recommend development within the Studley area". The Councils will however look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is annually completed which details all land available for housing in Redditch. The Core Strategy will seek to maintain the open space standards in Redditch as such standards are an integral part of the character of this New Town.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Include appropriate policies in relation to open space. Further consultation to be held on both Core Strategies in November</p>
110 Mr M Sackett Miller/Persimmon (111)	The urban extensions must be planned on a cross boundary basis applying spatial planning principles and not slavishly adhering to the rounded housing growth and employment land splits, where greater	The joint consultation booklet stated " <i>It should be stressed that the boundaries of the options presented below are flexible and represent potential locations for growth. As these boundaries are not fixed</i>	Future proposed urban extensions to be planned and negotiated to achieve the most sustainable planning outcomes.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>sustainability can be achieved through careful master planning.</p> <p>Support Brockhill ADR and the two Green Belt areas to be allocated for housing. Support development of Webheath ADR. Opposed to residential use of A435 ADR as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remote from town centre • not well integrated with existing residential neighbourhoods, • lacks the scale to create balanced local communities. • coalescence with Mappleborough Green • more suitable for employment use • no proposal from Stratford-on-Avon to include the narrow strip between A435 and the Redditch ADR land • WMRSS Panel report indicated that development here would be limited due to traffic problems on the A435 <p>Support to exclude 1) the southwest greenbelt areas of Redditch (near Webheath ADR/ a new settlement), 2) greenbelt near Astwood Bank and/or Feckenham, 3) existing open space, as potential locations for strategic housing growth</p> <p>Opposed to allocation of land for development at the East of A441 (Bordesley Park), Land in the Arrow Valley areas between the A441 and the railway line, reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of openness through 	<p><i>the amount of new dwellings in each option is not specified at this stage”.</i></p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The evidence underpinning the judgements to exclude these areas as potential development options remains relevant and un-opposed, therefore these options are not recommended to be included in further consultation.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District’s appropriate level of growth. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>encroachment and sprawl into a sensitive area of greenbelt north of the town, which is perceived as an open lung between Redditch and Alvechurch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significantly narrowing the gap between Redditch and Alvechurch • Complete coalescence between Redditch and Bordesley, unless development restricted to south eastern part of the East of A441 area. • Adverse landscape impact on the sensitive Arrow Valley and Bordesley Park character areas • Greater likelihood of car-borne commuting to Birmingham and Solihull due to location on A441 corridor (against Panel Report Policy SS11), so its strategic accessibility to the M42 should not be seen as an advantage. • Poor integration within the existing urban area of Redditch • Further away than land at Brockhill East to the town centre and not significantly closer than land at Brockhill West • No development should be considered north of Weights Lane. • Progression of Bordesley Bypass is not dependent upon the selection of the East of A441 option as implementation policies can secure contributions from any selected sites. 	<p>revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Bordesley is not a defined settlement and therefore coalescence of settlements in this location is not a relevant consideration.</p>	

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WMRSS & BDC refuted the conclusions of the WYG2 report which suggested 'Bordesley Park' as the most suitable location for growth. <p>Support - Adjacent A448 (east of A448 'Brockhill West' owned by Miller Homes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inspector of Bromsgrove Local Plan modification stage recognised the sustainability of the location (i.e. land west of Brockhill including land at Oxstalls Farm) and the land's limited role against Green Belt purposes but concluded that a strategic policy context was required. • The northern part of Foxlydiate/ Webheath integrates directly with the adjoining Brockhill development where access links already exist (i.e. the distributor road network of the town via Brockhill Drive, and the strategic road network via the A448 junction at Foxlydiate) • There are clear opportunities to create an effective green infrastructure on the edge of the town which protects and enhances the setting of Hewell Grange Park • Logical direction of growth to the existing Brockhill development that has been designed, approved and implemented, to be extended westwards. The Redditch Growth Consultation documents have identified the release of the 		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Brockhill ADR and Green Belt land in Redditch as necessary for the provision of 4000 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redditch <i>Revised Development Strategy</i> paper indicates Foxlydiate greenbelt site a capacity of 190 dwellings, assuming development at Brockhill West would provide retail facilities. A cross-boundary comprehensive mixed use development of some 2000-2250 dwellings would ensure a wide range of facilities and public transport improvements to the benefit of the wider area. • FPCR has examined the landscape sensitivity and potential visual impact of development and concluded that the area is well contained within the wider landscape and that large scale residential and mixed use development can be satisfactorily accommodated at Brockhill West. • RPS Engineering has formulated a drainage strategy in liaison with Severn Trent Water and a surface water strategy in accordance to EA's requirements. • Can deliver 2000 to 2,250 dwellings up to 2026 <p>Opposed to allocation of land south of the A448 for development because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its poor potential for integration with the town and greater likely dependence on car borne travel. 		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is more suitable for employment use due to its location relative to the A448 and maybe considered to provide a longer term opportunity to create a 'gateway' investment location on the western approach to Redditch. <p>Support - West of A441 (Central part 'Brockhill North and East' owned by Persimmon)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can deliver 1,850 dwellings (850 in Redditch; 1000 in Bromsgrove) • Housing would be provided in conjunction with the IN67 existing employment land allocation in Redditch plus other social and green infrastructure and facilities • Further potential for employment land on Redditch ADR (controlled by Gallagher Estates) and Weights Farm Business Park (controlled by Gallagher and Persimmons) • Provide significant improvement to the foul drainage network. • Western part of the West of A441 option is exceptionally well contained in the landscape where views from the north and northwest are screened by Butler's Hill Wood and the ridgeline which is proposed to be kept free from built development screens views from the east. • Based on the assumption that Bordesley Bypass is completed, the roundabout at Weights Lane would 		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>become part of the distributor road and provide another alternative to Windsor Road reducing any congestion pressures that may otherwise result.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land adjacent to the railway line is a logical extension of the Brockhill ADR lands and forms the lower slopes below the ridgeline • Minimise any perception of narrowing of a gap between Redditch and other settlement. • FPCR has examined the landscape sensitivity and potential visual impact of development and concluded that the area is well contained within the wider landscape and that large scale residential and mixed use development can be satisfactorily accommodated at Brockhill North and East. • Concurs with RBC consultation paper that there would be no significant positive or negative effects in SA terms if Brockhill North and East were developed. • Can integrate with existing communities within the town, and to extend and improve public transport services to the benefit of the wider area • To achieve the most sustainable form of development, Green Belt land in Bromsgrove district next to the Brockhill ADR should be 		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RPS Engineering has formulated a drainage strategy in liaison with Severn Trent Water and a surface water strategy in accordance to EA's requirements. • Logical direction of growth to the existing Brockhill development that has been designed approved and implemented to be extended westwards. And the Redditch Growth Consultation documents have identified the release of the Brockhill ADR and Green Belt land in Redditch as necessary for the provision of 4000 dwellings. • Employment use to the east of the railway is suitable because it can create a 'gateway' investment location on the northern approach to Redditch, adjacent to the planned roundabout junction between the A441 Bordesley Bypass, Weights Lane and the current A441 and Dagnell End Lane. • Urban extension to the north west (including Brockhill West and incorporating land at Brockhill East, has the potential to expand the existing green infrastructure already established in the borough through the retention of green corridors along the Red Ditch and Batchley Brook valleys and linking the existing areas of woodland. • Will not significantly reduce the gap 		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>between Redditch and the surrounding villages of Blackwell and Alvechurch due to the substantial size of the gap. Also, the railway line served as a defensible boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brockhill East, West and North areas are closer to facilities and can most readily be integrated with the town <p>Support for urban extension to the north west (including Brockhill West and incorporating land at Brockhill East, has the potential to expand the existing green infrastructure already established in the borough through the retention of green corridors along the Red Ditch and Batchley Brook valleys and linking the existing areas of woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will not significantly reduce the gap between Redditch and the surrounding villages of Blackwell and Alvechurch due to the substantial size of the gap. Also the railway can act as a defensible boundary. • The land has been assembled and is promoted jointly by house-builders with considerable experience in delivering large scale mixed use urban developments. There is no significant constraint to the master planning of the area and the delivery of development. • The Brockhill East, West and North areas suggested above can fully 		

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>meet the 3000 dwellings requirement.</p> <p>Propose land to the north of Brockhill Wood to be included for long term development beyond 2026. May be suitable for long term development beyond 2026, linking urban extensions at Brockhill East, West and North proposed for the current development.</p> <p>Brockhill ADR and land at Abbey Stadium site - It was concluded in 2006 through Local Plan No.3 that land in the Brockhill East area was needed for employment use. The employment land proposal was therefore part of a comprehensive scheme where the costs of the infrastructure needed for the area would be paid for through the residential element. As a result, there have been delays in securing the delivery of the IN67. Appeal for the application for retail and day nursery uses on land fronting Hewell Road in association with road access details into the ADR land and B1 use on at first phase of the IN67 was partially allowed without the retail element, which make the scheme unviable and IN67 remains unserved. A 14 dwelling residential scheme on the Hewell Road will be determined in March 2010, which will allow a first section of the access road towards the ADR and IN67 site to be implemented.</p> <p>Green Belt land at Brockhill - Mixed use urban extension for which the detailed</p>	<p>The use of sites for safeguarded land will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development sites and targets.</p> <p>Noted. Application approved and access to enable delivery of IN67 can be established.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>disposition of land uses remains to be determined. If to be developed for residential use, can deliver around 400 dwellings having regard to the landscape constraints and opportunities for mixed use approach.</p>	<p>Capacity of Green Belt area at Brockhill is estimated at around 300 dwellings, combined with 425 on Brockhill ADR and other necessary facilities or services. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>112 Mr R Wells Savills</p>	<p>Supports use of Ravensbank ADR and considers it should be brought forward in the Bromsgrove Core Strategy as employment site to meet longer term requirements of Redditch. Considers it should be brought forward in advance of other new greenfield allocations, as the principle has already been adopted in local plan. The ADR is close to the A435 and the motorway network, make it an attractive proposition to business. Logical extension by enlarging the successful Ravensbank estate.</p> <p>Proposes adjacent area for extension of development, part of which falls within Stratford on Avon district. To reconsider the use of the Winyates Triangle for residential development, due to its proximity to the existing housing along Far Moor Lane.</p>	<p>The Ravensbank ADR has been designated to deliver employment development to meet Redditch's needs. This does not however pre-determine that any further delivery on Ravensbank should be developed before other greenfield sites.</p> <p>A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site. Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		<p>Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable in this plan period; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progressing this matter. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS.</p>	
<p>113 Mr & Ms DS/C Marks/ Hirst</p>	<p>Opposed to development of Green Belt in Redditch at Foxlydiat as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to have only been selected as it is one of the few remaining areas within Redditch • Area is rural and quiet • Not well served by public transport • Highly sensitive wooded estate • Drainage difficult on site • Area attractive to wildlife • Not well served by infrastructure, shops, petrol stations, limited schooling, no restaurants, no recreational amenities • Inadequate road network • Proximity to Hewell Grange Prison and need to keep roads free from congestion <p>Opposed to option in Bromsgrove to develop adjacent to A448</p>	<p>The use of the Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Public transport provision will be in accordance with the Local Transport Plan, which advocates a modal shift in Redditch. The Councils are undertaking further work to assess relevant factors/constraints before determining which site or sites are suitable for development. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) assesses flood risk on each site. It will be a requirement of the developer to consider the sewerage system required, to seek LA approval and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. A desktop analysis of available ecological information will be carried out.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on unspoilt area • Traffic noise and pollution • Visual impact on crest of a hill; • Redditch is a “town of the shires” and should remain so <p>Considers Brockhill more suited to development as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of Brockhill ADR predicts its future development • Area already blighted by existing development • Land contours hide industrial areas • Closer to town centre and local amenities <p>West of A441-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convenient to transport routes to employment in the town centre or north to Birmingham • Should not be development in Brockhill Wood <p>East of A441-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best option in terms of location and accessibility • Least affect on wider area <p>Alvechurch/M42 (from Bordesley towards M42)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally placed • Unattractive countryside • Flat • Probably not prone to flooding • Better in terms of infrastructure 	<p>revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easily accessed to Alvechurch (shops. Post office, schools, hairdressers) <p>Would help with Alvechurch regeneration</p> <p>Other options- Beoley</p> <p>Astwood Bank/Studley as-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to A441 and A435 Well placed to develop towards Stratford Infrastructure would require less development Countryside less rolling and interesting More easily integrated 	<p>Beoley was not presented as an option for cross-boundary development during the consultation period for many factors not least as it is a village Conservation Area of distinctive rural character</p> <p>This option has already been discounted in WYG 1. It is also stated at Paragraph 8.84 of the PINS Panel Report “<i>We reluctantly conclude that it would be inappropriate to recommend development within the Studley area</i>”. The Councils will however look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
114	deleted		
115 Mr J Keevil	<p>Opposed to development adjacent to Upper Bentley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already severe flooding issues in the area and further development will exacerbate the problems Traffic – already busy on the country lanes at peak hours, which is quite dangerous Should consider filling the empty houses before develop more 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. It is inevitable that towns will have a certain proportion of empty homes. However Redditch’s housing needs up to 2026 are for 7000 new homes</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
116Mr Carl Davis	<p>Opposed to development of Brockhill ADR, Green Belt adjacent to the Brockhill ADR</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>and Foxlydiat woods because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape - Current Brockhill estate nestles in a natural bowl, the hill gets higher up towards Hewell Lane that means development will become more visible from public footpaths off Hewell Lane, making the greenbelt boundary less obvious. Same applies to the hill at Foxlydiat which can be seen from distant. • Drainage – the fields to the south west of Brockhill towards the Bromsgrove Highway Island (see map) often gets water saturated and there is a livestock watering hole underneath. • Biodiversity – Old oak trees around Brockhill ADR have been the nest sites for buzzards. Deers appeared in the fields. Development will affect the diverse wildlife. • Traffic – The island fed by Hewell Lane, Brockhill Drive, Birchfield Road and the Bromsgrove Highway is currently over-capacity. Any development will worsen the traffic problems and make it very risky to walk along Hewell Lane with the fast traffic (60-70mph). Significant highways modification will be needed if development proceeds. • Greenbelt function – development will significantly reduce the gap to villages of Bentley, Banks Green, Tardebigge (and Tack Farm). 	<p>consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) assesses flood risk on each site. A Desktop Analysis of available ecological information will be carried out. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development. Open space will be considered as part of the Green Infrastructure study, which will take into account previous studies such as the Open Space and Recreation Assessment and Open Space Needs Assessment (PPG17). Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets.</p>	<p>to be delivered. Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be completed. Complete a Desktop analysis of available ecological information. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch including cross boundary locations. Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection. Green Infrastructure study to be completed.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Support to develop East of A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good access to town centre, A441 and motorway <p>Alternative proposal – Golf Course. Many green spaces not currently accessible to the public (such as golf courses). Why would we develop on established Green Belt in preference to golf courses?</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will seek to maintain the open space standards in Redditch as such standards are an integral part of the character of this New Town.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
117 E Neale Warwickshire County Council	<p>Support the use of Winyates Triangle ADR for employment but subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of the mature planting along the A435 corridor as it provides a strong buffer between the rural character to the east and the urban form of Redditch to the west. • Preservation of the separate identity of Mappleborough Green • The resolution of the access issues 	<p>A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progressing this matter. Winyates Green Triangle is not designated as an ADR.</p>	Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.
118 Mrs P Gateley	Opposed to development of Webheath ADR, greenbelt land near Foxlydiat and area adjacent to A448:	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the distance between Redditch and Bromsgrove, no defensible boundary • Why is the Green Belt no longer sacrosanct? <p>Mismatch of housing numbers and jobs (no jobs for people due to the decline of manufacturing industry) How can the government decide that more houses will be needed when people are leaving Redditch?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavily flooded at Copyholt Lane, Cur Lane, Holyoakes Lane, Gypsy Lane, more development will worsen the existing flooding problems 	<p>alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Development targets consulted upon were allocated through the Regional Spatial Strategy taking note of national population projections. These development targets for Redditch Borough were for natural growth needs. In relation to manufacturing, a priority for Redditch Council is Economic Development, as part of this diversification of the economy is a key issue. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment and Level 2 SFRA is conducted to assess flood.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be completed</p> <p>To complete the Transport</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing roads can't accommodate more traffic • Drainage and sewage system need to be upgraded to accommodate the development. Millions of pounds would have to be spent to satisfactorily deliver a good drainage/sewage system due to the steep slope of the site and the upgrading of the areas roads. • this area slopes away steeply from the B4096. How will the roads cope with houses/business premises on the high steeply sloping ground, generating more water into the ground? • It is desirable to have large swathes of green between urban developments? <p>Options east and west of the A441 have more room to spread if the Green Belt is to be destroyed.</p> <p>What is there to attract people to Redditch with the decline in manufacturing?</p>	<p>completed which will assess traffic implications of development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required and to implement the system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Topography is a consideration when determining the location for development but not necessarily a constraint.</p> <p>A Green Infrastructure study is being carried out which will examine such issues.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The WMRSS identified that 68 hectares of land for employment development would be required for the Boroughs needs up to 2026, 31 hectares of which to be provided</p>	<p>Assessment for Redditch</p> <p>Complete further feasibility work to determine the most appropriate location for new development</p> <p>None</p> <p>Green Infrastructure strategy to be completed.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		within the Borough. There is a need to identify land for a variety of employment uses to cater for the employment land requirements. There is an identified need to plan for economic growth for the Borough of Redditch. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6 th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
119 Mr C Narrainen	Support option adjacent to A448 Bromsgrove Highway	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
120	deleted		
121 D Clark	With regard to the above policy document the council(s) should go to the web address as below and consult the Network Rail Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS) for information on railway infrastructure developments in their area. http://www.networkrail.co.uk/asp/4449.aspx	Comments noted	None
122 Mr M Whitworth	Objection to Foxlydiate/Webheath Opposed to building on Green Belt and the area floods	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be completed.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) assesses flood risk on each site	
123 Mr P Frost	Support east of A448 and west of A441, should be planned together incorporating a green corridor. Good transport system by A448. National grid has IP Governor station at Tack Farm and Weights lane. West of A448 would be less cost effective.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The provision of green corridors will be considered in the Green Infrastructure Study.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Green Infrastructure study to be completed.
124 Mr T Reeves	Foxlydiate/Webheath has poor topography for development, local flooding issues and a number of woods acting as a constraint	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) assesses flood risk on each site	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to be completed.
125 Mrs D Snaddon Rowney Green Residents Association	Supplementary info to response No67 List of birds seen in area of Rowney Green as in WMRSS SA states that "birds provide	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	a good indication of the state of wildlife in the countryside”	revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
126 H Davies Tutnall and Cobley Parish Council	<p>Not convinced 3000 houses are needed and believe figures based on out of date statistics.</p> <p>Also many empty houses in area which could be brought into occupation.</p> <p>Believes Bromsgrove DC has already met governments housing target</p> <p>Foxlydiate/Webheath (Adjacent A448) and Brockhill (west of A441) Opposed to development on grounds of : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effects of traffic due to </p>	<p>RBC contested the housing figures at the EiP into the Phase 2 review of the RSS however this argument was not accepted by the Inspectors as detailed in the Panel Report. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District’s appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It is inevitable that towns will have a certain proportion of empty homes. However Redditch’s housing need up to 2026 has been determined as 7000 new homes and there are relatively few empty homes in the Town</p> <p>This is a separate issue. This consultation was based on Redditch’s growth needs up to 2026. Further consultation in relation to Bromsgrove’s needs is scheduled for November 2010.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>inadequate capacity of existing roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate infrastructure for e.g. schools, medical facilities etc • Adverse impact on Green Belt • Doubts if there will be sufficient employment for additional 3000 people leading to increased commuting and its adverse impact <p>Supports development at Bordesley (east of A441) as does not think development here will have adverse impact on Parish</p>	<p>therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
Respondent No./Name	Summary of comment	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
317 BEDFORD-SMITH	<p>Strongly opposes development at Webheath ADR. Reasons against development due to a number of concerns: <u>Foul sewerage pumping restrictions</u>, Two Foul sewers are required which will need a pumping mechanism which is expensive</p> <p><u>Flooding</u> Increase of flooding downstream which will be expensive to rectify and likely to increase due to development.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be requested on sites to compensate for this. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Complete Level 2 SFRA and request and Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment. Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p><u>Traffic</u> Extra traffic along Blackstitch Lane and Heathfield Rd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety issues at Church Rd due to restricted sight lines • Diminishing capacity at Junction 5 of M5 and Junction 3 of M42 • All development should be North West of the A448 • Construction of Bordesley By-pass is required 	<p>Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures if necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development at the Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p>
<p>127 HEAPHYS</p>	<p>Support development to the north or north west of the town due to the location of the Abbey Stadium.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. It is accepted that proximity to such facilities can influence the decisions on which locations are more preferable for development.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>128</p>	<p>High density infill development in existing</p>	<p>Previous infill development sites in</p>	<p>To complete a Transport</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
HEMMING	<p>communities is unsustainable and should not be pursued particularly in areas such as Headless Cross and other western areas as it leads to pressure on water and power supply and traffic issues.</p>	<p>Headless Cross (e.g. along Feckenham Road) have an average density of 14.6 dwellings per hectare which is significantly lower than in other areas. Officers consider that the infill development at Feckenham Road is in-keeping with the character of the immediate area and the resulting lower density levels were appropriate in this location. Water and Power supply can be provided anywhere in the Borough. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development.</p>	<p>Assessment for Redditch Borough.</p>
129 DIOCESE	<p>Want to ensure that communities are built not just houses. This has implications for community facilities and the phasing of development. Each new development should have a full range of community facilities for example using existing church buildings for wider community use. Developments should be phased to ensure small communities are formed with the facilities they need.</p> <p>Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy should be used for community facilities.</p> <p>Environmental considerations must be a high priority, with existing important habitats preserved with other green spaces provided. Houses should be constructed to the highest environmental standard.</p>	<p>This approach is advocated at national level and has many benefits. Officers will ensure this approach is taken.</p> <p>Planning obligations can be used to assist in enhancing existing community facilities and providing new community facilities, ensuring it enables development.</p> <p>This approach is advocated at national level and has many benefits.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Public transport must be provided to all parts of each development to reduce private car use wherever possible.	Public transport provision will be in accordance with the Local Transport Plan, which advocates a modal shift in Redditch. The Preferred Draft Core Strategy promotes a modal shift in line with the Local Transport Plan.	None.
130 WAREING	<p>Housing is required. Support the proposal to build 3,000 houses in Bordesley/ Beoley but it should be a balanced community.</p> <p>There is spare land suitable for housing in Redditch and in adjacent areas of Warwickshire, which should be utilised.</p>	<p>Beoley was not presented as an option for cross-boundary development during the consultation period as it has been deemed unsuitable, as stated in the consultation leaflet. Bordesley is a potential option to be investigated further.</p> <p>A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is annually completed which details all land available for housing in Redditch. A previous study ('Study into the future growth implications of Redditch Phase 1,' by WYG) discounted land in Warwickshire between The Slough and Icknield Street Drive/ Washford Mill Island. A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core</p>	<p>To investigate Bordesley as a development option.</p> <p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss this matter.	
131 SANDERS	<p>Support for Bordesley By-pass.</p> <p>Owner of land East of A441 (no location plan supplied), reasons provided for suitability of land for development.</p>	<p>Given that the delivery of cross boundary development is being reconsidered, the need for the Bordesley bypass is uncertain. The Transport Assessment will assess whether Bordesley By-pass is required.</p> <p>Respondent has been advised to submit site to Bromsgrove District Council. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered for Redditch. To complete a Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
132 HATTERSLEY	<p>Would like input into the HCA's proposal for the A435.</p> <p>Any future employment development needs to be kept to the west of Claybrook Drive, far from Mappleborough Green and proposed new homes (due to impact of noise and smell).</p> <p>Tree plantations along Claybrook Drive</p>	<p>Officers endeavour to engage all landowners to ensure comprehensive delivery sites. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The land to the west of the southern part of Claybrook Drive is already developed with employment uses. Should the A435 ADR site (i.e. east of Claybrook Drive) be progressed the impacts of development types can be mitigated against.</p> <p>The tree plantations may provide a</p>	<p>Continue to engage with all participating landowners to progress delivery of the Core Strategy. Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>need to be retained, preserved and improved upon.</p> <p>Request a technical specification of the definition of affordable housing. Concerned about proposals to build affordable housing in Mappleborough Green. Higher value and quality houses should be provided in the land surrounding Broadacres Farm.</p> <p>Housing built by the HCA should be sympathetic to the location of Mappleborough Green.</p> <p>Question the amount of research done of the traffic flows on the A435 and Claybrook Drive at peak periods, consideration needs to be given to additional traffic from a number of new homes proposed.</p>	<p>suitable buffer where Officers consider there to be value. However it should be noted that unless said trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order land owners are within their rights to remove trees.</p> <p>Affordable housing is defined by PPS 3 'Housing' and will be included in a glossary to the Core Strategy. Affordable housing should be provided on all housing sites in accordance with the most recent Housing Market Assessment (HMA) and Affordable Housing SPD.</p> <p>Development in any area should be sympathetic to its environment. Should this site be progressed, the character of housing would have to reflect its situation in Redditch and accessed from Redditch's road network.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will consider traffic flows on the A435.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To determine the amount, type and tenure of affordable housing required on strategic sites in accordance with the HMA and SPD.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p>
133 BISSELL	Object to Development on Webheath ADR & surrounding area of Foxlydiate	The use of the Webheath ADR within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
198 ROSE			
201 JACK	- WYG study confirmed ADR was unsuitable for housing development and demand it to be reinstated as Green Belt	The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch	None
202			

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
MOBERLEY 203 HETHERINGTON		Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. This study will however be a piece of evidence to justify the future allocations of sites in the Core Strategy alongside other pieces of evidence. The Webheath ADR has never been designated a Green Belt land and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a change to the Green Belt boundary.	
224 CARPENTER			
226 HOMBACH			
231 STEWART	- lanes not roads, no pavements	A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development at the Webheath ADR.	To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.
232 HANDS			
233 BATTY	- flash flooding will increase	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures if required. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.	Complete Level 2 SFRA and request and Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment.
236 BADGER			
237 CLULOW			
238 ROSE			
239 WILLIAMS			
241 SIMS	- pumping sewage uphill is not sustainable	It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable	None.
242 MCKINNON			

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
243 GROOM		and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.	
246 EVANS			
247 ALLEN	- miles from town centre	Officers acknowledge this a disadvantage to the site for new development is its proximity to Redditch Town Centre and that there are more sustainable options for development.	None.
251 ROSE			
252 MELLEY	-protected species will be destroyed	An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to development.	Complete an analysis of available ecological information.
253 GRIFFITHS			
259, 260, 261, 262 HAIGH	- local services infrastructure is inadequate	Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development on any site.	To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
279 MCQUAID	- RSS target of 7000 houses is too high - Impact of recession – unemployment and repossessions, Redditch population is not growing	The housing target for Redditch which was consulted upon was based on the projected need of the Borough set by the WMRSS. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
285 COOPER			
286 MCQUAID			
290 CLIFTON			
292 DAVIES			

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
306 TONGUE 316 MERCER/NEASOM	Support for: - building 4000 dwellings at Bordesley Park in Bromsgrove and at Brockhill - RBC must fully utilise all other building locations which are closer to supportive infrastructures	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. None.
134 FLOWERS	If Foxlydiate is selected for development there should be assurance that new feeder roads will be built to carry traffic on and off the A448 (Bromsgrove Highway) directly into the new expansion area (current congestion on Church Rd and Blackstitch Lane is dangerous). Concerns raised about traffic congestion along Heathfield Road, Church Road and Blackstitch Lane.	The use of the Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will consider traffic flows on and off the A448 from the possible Foxlydiate development area.	To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.
135 MORRIS	Oppose development at Webheath. The area contains trees, landscape and plentiful wildlife. Winding lanes and fields are beautiful and valuable. Hedges and trees are required in Callow Hill and beyond Pumphouse Lane for visual screening, noise reduction and habitats.	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to development. It is agreed that screening in the form of trees and hedges will be required where it is deemed appropriate.	Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR. None.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>The network of lanes and roads is not suitable for heavy traffic – a survey of Heathfield Road is needed. Against the idea of altering narrow lanes to accommodate the increase in traffic, as this would change the character of neighbourhood. Using areas near more suitable roads would be more practical.</p> <p>The style of recent developments does not blend with the area, modern housing would be discordant and it would be inappropriate to surround Norgrove Court with houses.</p> <p>Concern over whether Redditch really needs more housing and whether infrastructure is in place – schools, employment and health care.</p> <p>Pasture land should not be used before all derelict land is used.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will consider traffic flows on Heathfield Road.</p> <p>Development in any area should be sympathetic to its environment, specifically if it is affecting the setting of a listed building. This will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Housing figures that were consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough including any potential development on derelict land.</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
136 MATCHBOROUGH	Concerned that allotments on A435 ADR will be lost and if they are, questions	The current Local Plan for Redditch Borough has a saved policy to protect	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
ALLOTMENTS	whether an alternative site would be offered. There are waiting lists for allotments in Redditch.	allotments and should this site be progressed, Officers would recommend to carry this through to the Core Strategy and to influence the layout of development at the A435 ADR.	to be delivered. Officers to continue discussions with landowners/ developers of the A435 in terms of the allotment provision.
137 LLOYD obo BUBB 145 PARTRIDGE	<p>Landowner of part of the Webheath ADR. Considers that the ADR is in a suitable location and offers an opportunity to create a sustainable extension to Redditch town. Consider that Redditch should use all of its available land for the proposed increase in future housing including the ADRs. ADRs should be identified as strategic sites for development in the short term capable of meeting the Borough's own needs within the administrative boundary.</p> <p>Only minor improvements to the highway infrastructure needed to serve new development.</p> <p>Two previous local plan inspectors have considered the Webheath ADR to be acceptable in principle.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Some parts of the ADRs may be required to meet long term needs due to uncertainty of delivery.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will consider the highway infrastructure required to serve new development.</p> <p>This is a consideration when determining appropriate sites for designation within Redditch.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>None.</p>
138 BARBER	Objects to proposed development at Webheath ADR because roads and lanes are not capable of taking the extra traffic that will be generated and the infrastructure is not in place to cope with additional population.	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will look at the potential impact of development on Webheath ADR on surrounding roads. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Objects to proposed development at Webheath ADR because of impact on the land – noticed that the Bow Brook has pollution and suspect’s sewage seepage through the water table.</p> <p>Suggests a better option for development would be Bordesley, Brockhill or land in the New Town area adjacent to the main B’ham-Alcester Road as these areas have easy access to the motorway system and towns and cities.</p>	<p>The Bow Brook pollution is caused by nitrates, evidenced in the Worcestershire Biodiversity Action Plan, this is not sewage related.</p> <p>For this consultation, a choice between Webheath ADR and Bordesley was not an option. Bordesley was an option for the location of the cross-boundary growth required in Bromsgrove. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough including the former new town areas. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
140 COLVIN	<p>New building will put extra strain on existing infrastructure or require new infrastructure.</p> <p>Building houses further from the town centre creates communities dependent on car use – not environmentally responsible – or isolates people – not socially responsible.</p> <p>Why building new industrial facilities in Redditch when there are empty lots on existing sites? Why building new houses on</p>	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>One of the aims of the Core Strategy is to improve the vitality and viability of the Town Centre, therefore decision making on the allocations for development will consider this to ensure that sites are well located and integrated into the existing community.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are vacant units in the Borough however from evidence base work it is considered that</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>green sites when there are plenty of derelict properties and sites in the town that should be compulsory purchased for the good of all? Redeveloping brownfield sites wherever possible would be more environmentally and socially responsible.</p> <p>More developments like the recent development near the train station are needed to serve the town better and take the town forward in sustainable, responsible ways.</p> <p>Suggests empty site near mosque and redevelopment of properties by the train station should be concentrated on rather than development on green spaces.</p>	<p>the majority of vacant units are not suitable to meet predicted future needs of economic development. Therefore there is a need to identify land for a variety of employment uses to cater for the employment land requirements. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. The Council would not be able to compulsory purchase as this is a costly, unviable approach. There are very few derelict sites within Redditch</p> <p>The Redditch Core Strategy will include plans to redevelop and regenerate Redditch Town Centre.</p> <p>The Edward Street site near the train station is a Strategic Site that has been focused on within the Redditch Core Strategy. Officers are not aware of any other empty sites near the mosque that are capable of development.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
141 COLVIN, J	Objects to Option West of A441 due to high visual impact of area. Current view of countryside contributes to quality of life. Concerns that flooding may be an issue as development would lead to more rapid run-off.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
142 REEVES	Supports large developments outside of the town area as opposed to on open spaces within the town. Supports three options	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>under consideration as they are the least congested.</p> <p>Questions over open space behind property specifically requesting clarity over possible future development</p>	<p>revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>As open space this area is afforded some protection; however this does not prohibit a planning application coming forward. It would then be up to the developer to demonstrate that the value of the development would outweigh the value of the open space. The site behind the respondent's property was included in the Council's disposal sites; however this has since been discounted as a potential site by the property services department.</p>	None.
143 GLASS	<p>RBC should change Webheath ADR to Green Belt and not build on it. Webheath ADR is unsuitable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of suitable road infrastructure - environmentally unfriendly need to pump sewage - risk of increased flash flooding - destruction of local wildlife - lack of local services & infrastructure <p>General support for building of new homes at Bordesley Park, Brockhill ADR and brownfield sites within Redditch.</p>	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		<p>respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	
<p>144 STYLER</p>	<p>Strong objection to development at Webheath ADR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this proposal has been raised before and turned down at two public inquiries - Webheath has had more than its fair share of development in the last 20 years. Alternative sites should be found. - infrastructure is inadequate - wildlife, trees, hedges, fields would be lost, area is of great natural beauty. - ADR should be turned to Green Belt based on findings of independent consultants study 	<p>The Core Strategy covers a new Plan period and consequently there is a need to consider areas for development. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to development.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has no value as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary and the study by WYG did not attempt to demonstrate these exceptional circumstances. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Complete Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>146 COOKE</p>	<p>Questions the need for more commercial premises (in relation to the proposals at</p>	<p>There is an identified need to plan for economic growth for the Borough of</p>	<p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Winyates Green Triangle)</p> <p>Questions the need for more houses as the warehouses on the east side of Ravensbank Drive are not big employers.</p> <p>The proposed A435 development would have a very negative impact on Mappleborough Green.</p>	<p>Redditch. A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss this matter.</p> <p>The housing figures consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market.</p> <p>Development in any area should be sympathetic to its environment. Consideration of negative impacts on neighbouring settlements is considered through Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, where negative impacts are identified mitigation measures are also proposed. Officers consider that the impacts on Mappleborough Green would not be significant. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>The cross-boundary sites are a massive intrusion on the Green Belt and will have a serious deleterious impact. For the health and welfare of the town it is critical that green areas are maintained.</p> <p>Underlying social issues such as the breakdown of the family, immigration, holiday home ownership, etc are the issues that need to be addressed urgently.</p>	<p>development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>These are issues that cannot be addressed through the Core Strategy</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p>
147 SINCLAIR	<p>Objects to development at Webheath ADR & Foxlydiate/Webheath for reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor existing infrastructure - both sites slope away from existing settlements - poor existing roads at full capacity - potential to damage existing water courses with contamination following gravity levels to the south east - pumping sewage up hill - no community assets (apart from Webheath church) - no local public transport so total reliance on motor car - damage to valuable agricultural land resource 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess the traffic implications of developments. Also an update to the Water Cycle Strategy is to be completed which will detail what measures would need to be in place for each potential development area.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete a Transport Assessment. To complete a refresh to the Water Cycle Strategy.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
148 BISH	<p>Concerned that not enough weight is given to climate change and fuel shortages. Must be encouraging worldwide population reduction by 2020 so there should be no extra housing required. By 2020 all towns should be on the way to food self sufficiency, therefore need more farmland, not less.</p> <p>Accepts all Redditch proposals apart from Webheath ADR which would require improved roads that would damage adjoining farmland and create noise and fume pollution to existing properties. Concerned about A435 problems on single carriageway and its impact on the Washford junction which may become dangerous.</p> <p>Acknowledges that the ageing population requires different types of property. As population increase should mainly be catering for the elderly, no further employment sites should be needed, other than hospitals, care homes and services for the elderly (plus jobs in agriculture/food supply). There is currently a serious excess of 'employment' land.</p> <p>Redevelop the Abbey Stadium underground and build houses on top (as in Toronto & Winnipeg, Canada).</p> <p>Studley road infrastructure is poor for industrial HGVs. Convert empty industrial units to housing and smaller industrial units</p>	<p>It is not realistic to assume that the population will reduce to the extent where no extra housing will be required. The Core Strategy will contain a policy to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development.</p> <p>Homes for the elderly is an issue considered through the development of the Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that there are vacant units in the Borough however from evidence base work it is considered that the majority of vacant units are not suitable to meet predicted future needs of economic development. Therefore there is a need to identify land for a variety of employment uses to cater for the employment land requirements.</p> <p>Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have received planning permission.</p> <p>Studley Road is a road that serves a number of existing employment areas. A Transport Assessment will be completed</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>where there is existing schools, shops and public transport. Dingleside school could be rebuilt with housing above (as in Japan).</p> <p>All cross-boundary sites in Bromsgrove are adverse and likely to cause flooding. None are close to existing amenities so extra transport/pollution will occur and extra land must be used for schools and shops.</p> <p>None of the sites are 'hidden' from view. Building on the sides of these hills will be impossible to screen. Suggest linear development up Weights Lane and along the railway of both housing and industry with access on to Cobley Hill plus an extra railway station. The suggested scale seems wholly unacceptable on land suited to sheep and arable farming or woodland development.</p>	<p>which will indicate the capacity on Studley Road. Where employment units are currently vacant, it is the RBC's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>When any development site is allocated the landscape and topography on site will naturally dictate the layout of development. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
149 BLAMIRE-BROWN	<p>Support for development at Option adjacent to A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - dual carriageway has greater capacity than the single carriageway A441 - infrastructure is already in place - close to the existing Bromsgrove concentration of housing where facilities already exist - closer to employment opportunities that may arise from the strategic development of 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>the IT Technology Employment Corridor. Object to development adjacent to the A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - topography of the surrounding land would in flood risk to existing housing and roads - lack of existing infrastructure - A441 is already congested as it is only a single carriageway 		
150 GEE	<p>Strong objections to both options adjacent to A441. Support for Bordesley Bypass, which if built would make Option west of A441 marginally less objectionable as new development could link to it. Option East of A441 would exacerbate flooding problems and the A441 will also have to cope with increased traffic from the Abbey Stadium development.</p> <p>Observe that there are a large number of vacant industrial and commercial units in Redditch and empty retail units in the Kingfisher Centre. Implies employment opportunities are likely to be limited and casts doubt on the projections for housing need of 7,000 dwellings.</p> <p>Suggests three possibilities that should be investigated more fully before thinking of development on Redditch's northern boundary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In reference to Bromsgrove SHLAA 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are vacant units in the Borough however from evidence base work it is considered that the majority of vacant units are not suitable to meet predicted future needs of economic development. Therefore there is a need to identify land for a variety of employment uses to cater for the employment land requirements. There are a minimal number of empty retail units both in and outside of the Kingfisher Centre.</p> <p>Birmingham's capacity is already exceeded as demonstrated by its need to locate development in Bromsgrove.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>which states that Birmingham's needs are to be considered separately from Redditch's needs: a large proportion of Redditch's residents were from Birmingham or have parents who were. Birmingham could provide around 5,000 dwellings on its southern boundary (at the Longbridge site) as people may prefer to live in Birmingham.</p> <p>2. Bromsgrove SHLAA discounts 132 sites. Questions whether it is more important to preserve these sites than sites north of Redditch.</p> <p>3. Suggests development to the south-east of the Alexandra Hospital, towards Studley would be more preferable than development to the north of Redditch as it would be easier to provide bus services to other parts of the town.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>This option has already been discounted in WYG 1. It is also stated at Paragraph 8.84 of the PINS Panel Report "<i>We reluctantly conclude that it would be inappropriate to recommend development within the Studley area</i>". The Councils will however look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p>
151 BRADSHAW	Object to development at Webheath ADR: - roads surrounding the ADR are too narrow and congested and could not cope with construction traffic	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development on the Webheath ADR.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- local services could not cope with more houses. Problems with parking around existing schools causes problems and it is difficult to get a doctors appointment as they are so full</p> <p>Support for Bordesley Park in Bromsgrove and apartments at the Abbey Stadium.</p> <p>Questions who is going to buy new housing in current economic situation as there are hundreds of houses up for sale in Redditch.</p>	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have received planning permission and do not include any residential provision.</p> <p>The housing figures consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Deliver Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p>
<p>152 O'NEILL</p> <p>154 OSTROUMOFF</p>	<p>Objects to development at Webheath ADR: - infrastructure is inadequate and cannot cope at present - unacceptable impact on the environment with an increase in flash flooding and protected species and wildlife would be destroyed.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. All constraints will be taken into account when the potential locations for future growth are investigated further.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Webheath ADR should be changed to Green Belt .</p> <p>Support for development at Brockhill ADR and Bordesley Park where there is near complete infrastructure and in a more suitable location being close to the main road networks.</p> <p>RBC should fully utilise all other building possibilities which are also closer to a supportive infrastructure.</p>	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p>
153 THEOBALD	Local Plan No 3 independent consultant ruled Webheath ADR unsuitable for development based on infrastructure. Webheath does not have a district centre. New housing could not be supported without the augmentation of the infrastructure. Current roads are all too narrow to support more traffic at rush hour. Little social infrastructure in the area. If there is further housing development in this area there must be better connectivity to the Redditch highways.	It was established at Local Plan No.2 and concurred at Local Plan No.3 that the ADRs were deemed suitable to meet future development needs and the ADR designation means that these site are suitable for development post 2011. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure / community facilities will have to be in place to enable any development. A	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Webheath ADR.	
155 MOXON	<p>Object to development at Webheath ADR: - narrow roads - area of natural beauty with an abundance of protected animal species such as newts and bats.</p> <p>Webheath ADR should be changed to Green Belt</p> <p>Support development at Brockhill and Bordesley as they both have infrastructure in place.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
156 THOMAS	<p>Options east and west of A441 are least desirable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase use of a congested road - increase the risk of flooding 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
157 PRESTON	<p>When Redditch was designated as a New Town the Green Belt was meant to be safeguarded. Poses several questions regarding proposed development:</p>	<p>The housing targets consulted upon were set in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Panel Report (September 2009) based on projected need. In light of the</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Who's idea is it to build thousand of houses, etc, for which there is no need?	revocation of the RSS announced on 6 th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
	Why could the public not vote on it?	The public are being consulted upon in the Core Strategy process. Consultation on the WMRSS Phase II Revision took place between January 2007 and March 2007, and again December 2007 to December 2008. The Examination in Public took place between April and June 2009. These consultation stages allowed the public to be involved in the WMRSS Review, which many Redditch residents took the opportunity to do.	None.
	Who owns the land now and how much will it cost?	There is a range of landowners for all of the development sites. Landowners will be consulted as part of the delivery process. Land values vary and cost will be borne by the developer.	None.
	Is it right to build on a flood plain?	A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures if necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.	Complete SFRA Level 2.
	Why are you seeking to add to the congestion problems?	A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of future development in and	To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Why are you seeking to destroy and concrete over beautiful natural landscape?</p> <p>What employment is referred to in the leaflet?</p> <p>Why is Redditch Council seeking to allow Bromsgrove to spoil the area of Green Belt adjacent to Redditch?</p> <p>Why has this plan been imposed on us?</p> <p>Will my Council Tax be reduced due to the severe adverse effect this plan will have?</p>	<p>around the Borough.</p> <p>Given the shortfall in Redditch of brownfield sites for development it is inevitable that some greenfield land will be developed in this plan period. The most sensitive landscape will always be protected from development.</p> <p>In terms of employment types this is defined as B1 (offices and light industrial), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (warehouse and distribution).</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has not yet been adopted and there will be opportunities to consult on plans, they are not imposed.</p> <p>This is not a planning matter.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
158 ARNEY	<p>As the RSS extends to 2026 it must be capable of being continually revised and adapted to accommodate the changing circumstances and events that will not be foreseen.</p> <p>The plan area is unnecessarily handicapped</p>	<p>The WMRSS was produced by the West Midlands Leaders Board (formerly Regional Assembly). Revision of regional documents does not come under the remit of Redditch Borough Council.</p> <p>Administrative boundaries are arbitrary</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>by the current county administrative areas. The eastern boundary with Warwickshire is arbitrary and confining. The direction of growth would be forced away from the common centre and at greater distances from existing infrastructure. If the Green Belt is to continue in its present policy rationale and current shape, then this would further contort the growth pattern of an extended urban area. This comment is made in recognition that new settlements continue to be found unacceptable to the local authorities and existing communities within North Worcestershire.</p> <p>Not convinced that employment land requirements need to relate to a set figure. Previously, manufacturing/service industry/warehousing has been provided in blocks. Only 11% of the economy consists of manufacturing. Other uses have different land-based demands i.e. not specifically allocated employment centres.</p> <p>Redditch is fortunate in having areas of woodland, spinneys, grass and parkland which support a rich variety of wildlife and have a high level of biodiversity. The RSS must define and protect these areas from development by appropriate legislation.</p> <p>Objects to any development at Hunt End Dingle. Has previously challenged proposals to sell the land.</p>	<p>and do not necessarily pose a barrier to sustainable development should cross-boundary development be necessary. Infrastructure is a consideration when determining the preferred locations for development. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Employment land by definition is made up of B1 (Office, light industrial), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (warehousing) uses. It is necessary to have employment land targets to ensure a balance between housing and employment.</p> <p>Planning policy and other legislation protects Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves within Redditch Borough. It is not anticipated that any of these designations will change through the Core Strategy.</p> <p>This site has been removed from the Council's land disposal program and the SHLAA.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
159	Comments in relation to the A435 ADR and	The current Local Plan for Redditch	Officers to continue discussions

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
LANDSCAPE AND COUNTRYSIDE, RBC	the allotments within the ADR. Considers the amenity value of the allotment site is great and should remain as allotments. There is a waiting list for allotments.	Borough has a saved policy to protect allotments. Should the A435 be required as a strategic site Officers would endeavour to carry this through to the Core Strategy and to influence the layout of development at the A435 ADR.	with landowners/developers of the A435 in terms of the allotment provision.
160 WMRA	<p>Welcome the fact the Bromsgrove and Redditch are working together.</p> <p>Approach set out in consultation booklet appears to be moving the Redditch and Bromsgrove Core Strategies towards conformity with that element of the emerging WMRSS Revision concerned with delivering growth requirements of Redditch.</p> <p>Appears to be a discrepancy in the consultation booklet whereby the balance of employment land between the three sites identified within Redditch totals 44hectares; whereas elsewhere reference is made to the need for only 31 hectares of employment land within the Borough. Any increase in the provision of employment land above this latter figure needs to be subject to testing and justified as per the emerging WMRSS Phase 2 Revision policy PA6A.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review is updated annually. The draft update went to Executive Committee on the 26th May. In the update report the Employment Land Review identified additional employment land over and above the 31ha. This is because there was uncertainty over some of the cross border sites and it was considered necessary to identify additional employment land within the Borough to ensure the indicative long term target was achieved. The West Midlands Leaders Board has been notified regarding this issue.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
161 LEEMING	Object to development at Webheath ADR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why is the advice of independent consultants being ignored? - road infrastructure is not suitable - local topography does not lend itself to building or suitable drainage 	The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete a Transport Assessment. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- no local infrastructure to support more houses/population</p> <p>Brockhill and Bordesley would be more suitable for new houses as they have better road access and local amenities.</p>	<p>these recommendations. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Webheath ADR. Topography is a consideration but not necessarily a constraint to development on a site. Necessary infrastructure will need to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Brockhill ADR. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
162 COOPER	Support proposal to turn Webheath ADR to Green Belt .	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.	
163 HOLBROOK	Object to development at Webheath ADR: - road infrastructure is not suitable and are currently at full capacity - wildlife should be given serious thought - designated 'accident area' and further building would create more areas where accidents take place Webheath ADR should be turned to Green Belt .	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Webheath ADR. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to development. Following officer consultation with Worcestershire County Council it has been confirmed that no designated 'accident areas' exists at Webheath.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR. Complete Transport Assessment
164 SINCLAIR	Object to development at Webheath ADR and Option Foxlydiate/Webheath: - development would be at the top of a watercourse and would be built on steeply sloping land. This will have a detrimental effect of allowing water to flow off slopes at great speed, leading to more flooding downstream in the area of Norgrove and Feckenham. - own property (Mill Cottage, Norgrove Court) has previously seriously flooded, as	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch. Complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>has Feckenham. Development would make this problem worse with more frequent and sustained flooding. Will developers pay to clear up the mess and cost of additional insurance cover?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - infrastructure, particularly roads and sewage provision are holly inadequate. <p>There must be more suitable locations for development.</p>	<p>flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development on the Webheath ADR. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	None.
165 WILCOX	<p>Support development option adjacent A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - good road accessibility - would necessitate the improvement of the public transport network - would bring Redditch and Bromsgrove demographically closer - there is no obvious boundary to potential development - would provide a much-needed mix of housing, shops and schools sufficiently close to Redditch and Bromsgrove town centres. <p>Object to options east and west of A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A441 is already inadequate - flood problems would be exacerbated by further development 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
166 FECKENHAM	<p>Serious concerns about the proposal to develop Webheath ADR:</p>	<p>The only planning application that has been submitted and determined on the</p>	None.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
PARISH COUNCIL	<p>- reference to 1993 Inspector refusing planning permission for reasons of foul and storm water drainage and insufficient highway access</p> <p>- question if the Priestbridge works would be able to cope satisfactorily with new development</p> <p>- risk of run-off from proposed development which would likely increase the risk of flooding at Feckenham. The village was flooded in 2007 and Astwood Lane has been closed due to flooding</p> <p>- Geology of land means little water can permeate the ground. Storm water from the ADR finds its way to the two major faults (Lickey End and Longbridge) which combine at the Feckenham Switching Station resulting in flooding at Feckenham</p>	<p>Webheath ADR was submitted by the Norgrove Consortium, determined July 1995 was refused for reasons of prematurity not on issues related to drainage or highways.</p> <p>Wastewater would have to be pumped to Sernal sewage works if development falls within the Priestbridge catchment area.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the potential impact of development on flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the majority of Redditch is underlain with impermeable soils. Other sustainable drainage methods have been identified in the Water Cycle Strategy.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p> <p>Include the requirement for suitable sustainable drainage in Core Strategy policy.</p>
167 KNIGHT/HEMMING	Concerns over proposed development in Brockhill Area. No 'through roads' which gives a sense of security, and gives	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>residents a feel good factor and a high sense of community</p> <p>- current issues between residents and the Council because the estate has not yet been adopted by the council. Current litigation needs to be finalised before more houses lead to more disputes.</p>	<p>alongside the potential development targets. The Core Strategy seeks to ensure the existing road hierarchy is maintained. Currently in Redditch roads that provide direct access to properties are generally no through roads, where feasible this will be continued in new development.</p> <p>Current litigation issues would not prohibit future development occurring. A number of roads at Brockhill have already been adopted, including Brockhill Drive. Other roads within the development cannot be adopted until the associated areas of open space have been adopted as the drainage arrangements are linked. The largest area of open space (known as Area 1) appears to be technically suitable for adoption and this is presently being pursued by the legal teams at RBC and the developer. Adoption of this area will in turn trigger adoption of the associated road network. There is a S104 agreement between Persimmon Homes and Severn Trent regarding adoption of the sewers and the Council's Operations Manager is liaising with both parties to secure adoption as soon as possible. The open space area on the land east of Brockhill Lane (known as Area 2) is also technically suitable for adoption but there are a number of land ownership issues to resolve. In addition, RBC needs to establish a right of way off the access track to Lowans Hill Farm in order to be able to maintain Area 2 once it has been</p>	<p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- often faced with extensive flooding and border the 'extreme flooding' boundary. Worry that new development would exacerbate the problem. Seek reassurance from the Council that insurances are in place to compensate.</p> <p>- What will happen to the oil and gas pipe line? Will this pose any risk?</p> <p>- Local search reveals residents are responsible for the local chancery –</p>	<p>adopted. With regard to the smaller areas of open space, there are some outstanding issues regarding encroachment and unauthorised drainage works which need to be followed up and these are being actively pursued with the developer.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Brockhill ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures which will be necessary to make any development acceptable. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development. The Council will not provide compensation for any flood damage, this is a matter for individual property insurance.</p> <p>The impact of any potential development on the oil and gas pipeline will require further investigation however there is an exclusion zone between where new development can be located and the existing gas pipe.</p> <p>This is not a planning consideration.</p>	<p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>consider this is something that should be highlighted to new residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider the covenant prohibiting public houses should be honoured as pubs and shops lead to increased anti-social behaviour, crime, intimidation of local residents and graffiti and litter. - How will the police cope with a greater area? - Worries that affordable housing will lead to more antisocial behaviour because resident's aren't personally responsible for their properties and so disrespect others properties and privacy - Consider that residents of Bromsgrove and Redditch should receive the same council service (e.g. recycling), to avoid segregation. 	<p>Covenants on land are not a planning consideration.</p> <p>West Mercia Police have been consulted throughout the Core Strategy process and they have identified their requirements to support new development.</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 3 requires the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>The type of service provision is not a planning matter.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Officers to continue to liaise with the West Mercia Constabulary.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
168 LOWE	<p>Support option adjacent to A448 as the pre-existing high capacity infrastructure is in place and is close to schools. Object to option east of A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Green Belt - flood plain - already suffers poor quality infrastructure. <p>The area is a long distance from the telephone exchange leading to the unavailability of broadband services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adds to creep towards Birmingham <p>Option west of A441 has recently been</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove and Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	heavily developed and requires a period of social cohesion.	development targets.	
169 HILL	<p>Object to development at Webheath ADR: - further pressure on local schools</p> <p>- traffic problems on Heathfield Road in term time indicates the area is at the limit of growth</p> <p>-environmental/traffic chaos inflicted upon Astwood Bank should not be replicated in Webheath</p> <p>- limited development of small sites in Webheath should be allowed - planners must not be given a permit to ruin one of the 'jewels' in the crown of Redditch</p> <p>- environmental reasons alone mean no more large scale housing is needed in Webheath</p> <p>- Let's have some politicians with guts – who will stand up to the politburo/central planners</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p> <p>All constraints will be taken into account when the potential locations for future development are investigated further.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
170 RICHARDSON	<p>Object to development at Webheath ADR:</p> <p>- inadequate infrastructure of local services</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>such as shops, GPs and schools</p> <p>- increased risk of flooding</p> <p>- development would destroy the small amount of beautiful countryside left in Redditch</p> <p>Webheath ADR should be changed to Green Belt .</p>	<p>place to enable any development.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>As far as possible the SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough mostly within existing urban areas. The Borough is made up of approximately 50% designated Green Belt and Open Countryside and there are significant areas of open space.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Delivery Plan.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
171	Object to development at Webheath ADR:	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and	Further consultation on Core

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
HILL	<p>- What evidence is there to dismiss the findings of the independent report that found Webheath ADR unsuitable for development?</p> <p>- road infrastructure cannot cope with current volumes of traffic and pavements on surrounding roads are narrow - transport links to town centre</p> <p>- destruction of what is basically Green Belt will result in the loss of wildlife and established trees and hedgerows</p> <p>- flooding issues</p>	<p>other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>The housing figures for Redditch should be further contested. If the town has no further capacity within its own areas without destroying pleasant areas to live, even with government pressure we should stick to our principles and say no.</p> <p>The council should work on the people of Redditch's behalf. Believe that no one thinks the building of any houses on Webheath ADR is a good idea.</p>	<p>Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>The Borough Council contested the housing figures at the inquiry into the Phase 2 review of the RSS however this argument was not accepted by the inspectors as detailed in the Panel Report. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Representations have been received in response to this consultation opportunity that support development of the Webheath ADR. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
172 JONES	Objects to development at Webheath ADR: - fields are Green Belt and home to lots of	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>diverse wildlife. use the fields to walk dog; would be gutted to lose this piece of English countryside</p> <p>- area is overpopulated and Heathfield road is already very dangerous with no speed restrictions. 600 more homes with no alternative roads would be life threatening.</p>	<p>exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p>
174 GRIFFIN	<p>Objects to development at Webheath ADR:</p> <p>- access to the area is via 'lanes' not roads which are already under pressure and most of the lanes do not have footpaths.</p> <p>- local services infrastructure is poor</p> <p>- sewage disposal has to rely on various pumping stations to accommodate the local terrain</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>To investigate the potential to incorporate high sustainability measures in delivering a suitable sewerage system to relevant sites.</p>
175 HARTGA	Do not believe all the proposed housing is necessary.	Development targets consulted upon were allocated through the Regional Spatial Strategy based upon national population projections. Development targets for Redditch Borough were for	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>The continual devastation of green areas should cease and both Redditch and Bromsgrove Councils should fight governmental pressures.</p> <p>Those with ample funds and mobility will always be able to find a suitable property. The real 'have nots' should require social assistance to keep a roof over their heads but this means low rises close to town centre development.</p> <p>Why not start with the land occupied by many empty commercial units?</p>	<p>natural growth needs. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Borough Council contested the housing figures at the inquiry into the Phase 2 review of the RSS however this argument was not accepted by the inspectors as detailed in the Panel Report. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Currently all sites of 15 dwellings or more provide a percentage of affordable units regardless of location.</p> <p>Where employment units are currently vacant, it is the Council's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
176 LATTIMER	Option adjacent to A448 is most suitable: - already good road infrastructure in place - the area would benefit from the shops, schools, employment and other essential services that development would bring - only limited views from publicly accessible areas for part of the site	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
177 CLOGGAN	Support option adjacent A448: - the infrastructure is in place - would be quicker and cheaper to put in place. Options east and west of A441 are unsuitable because there is no infrastructure in place and the traffic is already congested.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
178 SINCLAIR	Object to development at Webheath ADR: - no provision for shops, schools or public transport - poor existing roads at full capacity and full of potholes - employment sites are distant. The labour market has contracted and Redditch has few jobs to offer.	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR. Concerns about potholes are not a Core Strategy matter and should be directed to Worcestershire County Council as the Highway Authority. Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site. For Redditch the development targets consulted upon were based on the projected need. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch. None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- foul drainage will have to pumped – expensive and not environmentally friendly</p> <p>- storm drainage is poor and flooding is an issue in the area</p> <p>- few developers interested because the site is problematic</p> <p>- site found to be unsuitable by consultants (WYG)</p> <p>- takes prime agricultural land out of production</p> <p>- this is not a democratic decision. It is pretended that residents comments will be taken in to consideration but the plan is a</p>	<p>2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Representations have been received from developer and landowners in support of development of the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information including agricultural land classification will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to development.</p> <p>Consultation comments continue to form a valuable part of the evidence base behind decision making.</p>	<p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>To complete an ecological assessment.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>foregone conclusion</p> <p>- this is a Government directive to the WMRSS to provide accommodation for their encouragement of large-scale immigration</p> <p>- have the Environment Agency and English Heritage been consulted?</p>	<p>Development targets consulted upon were allocated through the Regional Spatial Strategy based upon national population projections. These development targets for Redditch Borough were for natural growth needs and not for any migration into Redditch. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Both of these agencies have been consulted and have submitted representations that will inform the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
179 DEWHURST	Why is Webheath ADR being considered again when it was already determined unsuitable?	The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6 th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>If option adjacent to A448 is to be considered a viable option infrastructure should be a first priority. Existing services have already reached saturation point, especially water, sewerage and roads and are not capable of handling proposed development. If Webheath ADR is to be included then the situation would be exacerbated with all traffic merging on to Church Road and Foxlydiat Lane.</p> <p>How does Redditch gain, i.e. in terms of Council Tax from development in Bromsgrove adjacent to the boundary? There is more likely to be a burden on education, health and social services rather than a benefit.</p>	<p>of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>If development were to be located in other Districts, the District responsible for the services to that development would gain the Council Tax. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
180 THORNTON	<p>Support option adjacent to A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - infrastructure is in place - schools are more accessible - dual carriageway running through area - good direct communication with both Redditch and Bromsgrove and Redditch Hospital <p>Object to options east and west of A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - single carriageway to Redditch - traffic would be added to Dagnell End Road which is already unsuitable for the volume - greater distance from Bromsgrove - areas consist of hills - flooding on Dagnell End Road 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
181 VICKERS	<p>- insufficient school places</p> <p>Object to development at Webheath ADR as infrastructure is totally unsuitable.</p> <p>Demand that Webheath ADR is changed back to Green Belt .</p> <p>Bordesley and Brockhill are much more suitable for expansion.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
182 SUTTON	<p>Support option adjacent A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good accessibility to both Redditch and Bromsgrove - Close to existing schools if full development potential is not achieved - Sufficient space to build appropriate mix of housing, employment and other community facilities with minimal impact on existing communities and services - Housing here would benefit Bromsgrove 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>which has a shortage of affordable housing and struggles to keep its workforce balance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Redditch can realise the potential of existing sites before moving onto Green Belt land and reducing agricultural land, wildlife corridors and degrading the ecological balance - Redditch and Bromsgrove can develop a closer relationship between housing and employment opportunities - More opportunities to develop sustainable transport links - Access to Bromsgrove rail link is easier <p>Objections to development in the vicinity of A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less desirable topography in this vicinity - Inadequate road and footpath network - Traffic congestion - Bordesley Bypass should be constructed before future development increases traffic congestion - All children in this vicinity require transport to get to schools - Drainage infrastructure inadequate <p>Poor public transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of Green Belt land will reduce buffer of agricultural land, wildlife corridor and will degrade ecological balance - No nearby employment opportunities - Constrained by high volume fuel transit pipeline - Flooding implications 		
183 THOMAS	<p>Support for development at Webheath</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing junction in place and impact would be lessened 	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Objection to development East of A441 - Birmingham Road, Dagnell End Road, Icknield Street and Beoley would not cope for the volume of traffic associated with 7000 new dwelling - Adverse flooding within East of A441 area</p>	<p>targets.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>184 SPARROW</p>	<p>The Green Belt Foxlydiate/ Webheath option is home to a wide variety of wildlife (foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels, native birds). The hedgerows and trees are home to wildlife and are a natural landscape feature. Land is considered to be reasonable quality agricultural land. Water drainage is a concern if land is developed as run – off is huge. Due to land topography any further development would be visible to many houses and look into gardens. Concern over the proximity of the prison – closing the gap between the prison and the town would make escape easier. Concern over helicopter noise. Hill up from Brockhill estate to the roundabout for access to the A448 is a hazard, speed is also an issue. Cars go too fast coming towards Lily Green Lane roundabout and on Lilly Green Lane. This is a safety concern. Current dead end is used as parking.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p>
<p>185 HARPER</p>	<p>Option East of A441 does not seem to be as close to the infrastructure as the Foxlydiate / Webheath option. It is also prone to flooding despite work to rectify this. Option West of A441 does not seem to be</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>as close to the infrastructure as the Foxlydiate/ Webheath option.</p> <p>The A441 is not capable of carrying the current traffic or the increase if option East or West of the A441 were developed.</p>	<p>respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
<p>186 TIMOTHY</p>	<p>Question why Bromsgrove's options were stipulated to be adjacent to the boundary of Redditch. This is a further expansion of Redditch with associated strain on social and road infrastructure.</p> <p>Concern over history of flooding in the Brockhill/ Batchley area caused by previous development in Brockhill. Flooding is frequent and damaging with nothing being done to resolve or alleviate as builders and council are denying responsibility.</p> <p>Significant strain on road infrastructure around Brockhill Lane, Crumpfields Lane etc all of which are inadequate for large development.</p> <p>Adding additional large scale residential construction to the Brockhill area will exacerbate the lack of community within the existing development. The desire to 'shoe horn' in three storey properties per square meter has been at the expense of any sense of identity for development - pub, shop, leisure/ community facilities. Prior to</p>	<p>The options consulted upon adjacent were to meet Redditch-related growth, Bromsgrove District has separate requirements to meet its own needs elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development options.</p> <p>At the time the original Brockhill development was given planning permission there was no mechanism in place to ensure that these types of facilities were provided and therefore market forces dictated there was no need for this type of provision. However, should Brockhill be progressed as a development</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>any development in this area the flooding and amenity issues should be resolved first.</p> <p>Received consultation leaflet after consultation events had taken place</p> <p>Concerned about future development in Brockhill/Webheath areas: - existing Brockhill estate has no community identity due to lack of amenities and facilities. Placed additional burden on Batchley's insufficient facilities. - track record of irresponsible building and lack of proper infrastructure, i.e. inadequate drainage and flood prevention. Neither developer or Council taking responsibility for problems. What effect will more properties built on flood risk land have on the drainage system?</p>	<p>site, there could be a concentration of development to sustain and require provision of additional community facilities. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures.</p> <p>Officers understand that a resident of Brockhill distributed leaflets independently of the Council and this could have been after the consultation events. However, the consultation was advertised through the local press, on the Council's website and at Neighbourhood Group Meetings. Contact telephone numbers and e-mail addresses were provided on the leaflet to allow residents to contact the Councils if they wanted more information on the consultation.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. Planning legislation requires the proper consideration of infrastructure provision. An infrastructure delivery plan is being produced to support the Core Strategy. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Why have Bromsgrove's options been designated as being required to be in Green Belt land adjacent to the boundary of Redditch?</p> <p>Does anyone work in the best interests of Redditch or are we the dumping ground for unwelcome, unsupportable and unsightly development?</p>	<p>Development at Brockhill ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures.</p> <p>The options consulted upon adjacent to the Boundary of Redditch are to meet Redditch-related growth, Bromsgrove District has separate development requirements to meet its own needs elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>All Local Planning Authority areas in the West Midlands were allocated development targets through the Regional Spatial Strategy based on national population projections. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
187 STYLER	To build any extra houses on the ADR in Webheath is an accident waiting to happen. The current main access (Heathfield Rd and Blackstitch lane) can not sustain anymore traffic, even if new access roads are built.	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development options.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Local schools are currently over subscribed.</p> <p>Webheath still has an identity and small community spirit this proposal will destroy this.</p> <p>Sewerage and drainage is not sustainable in this area as it would have to be pumped.</p> <p>Bordesley park option is a much wiser option with excellent access options.</p>	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that a community will grow in size as a result any development. However the development of a residential community would not have a detrimental effect on the community spirit.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>None</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
<p>188 STYLER</p>	<p>Access to proposed ADR in Webheath is a serious concern; the one way system used previously did not work. If Bromsgrove Land is being used these 600 dwellings should go there. Both Foxlydiate and Brockhill have better road access.</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council has an obligation to listen to its local people and challenge the Government to its building quotas.</p> <p>Sewerage and drainage would have to be pumped and this is not environmentally friendly.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development options.</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council made representations and appeared at the Inquiry into the WMRSS and presented the case advocated in WYG 2 for a lower housing target. However, the evidence was not accepted by the Inspectors. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Flash flooding will increase.</p> <p>Webheath ADR should be returned to Green Belt to protect the Newts, Bats, Owls and Orchids etc.</p>	<p>and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. An analysis of available Ecological information will be carried out to identify any constraints to development.</p>	<p>The Councils have completed a SFRA Level 1. To complete a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2.</p> <p>Carry out analysis of available ecological information.</p>
189 PHILLPOTTS	ADR land on Webheath should not be developed on but should revert to Greenbelt as stated in the original preferred strategy.	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.	None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
190 QUARTLY	<p>Object to developing 600 homes on Webheath ADR as:</p> <p>1. Land should be turned back to Greenbelt.</p> <p>2. Community spirit and village atmosphere would be eroded</p> <p>3. Resulting in too busy roads and loss of countryside</p> <p>4. Webheath ADR is unsuitable for this development.</p>	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Webheath is within Redditch's urban area and is not considered a village. Residential development is not likely to diminish community spirit.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p>
191 WILLIAMS	<p>Priority is to identify where the A441, at the south end of the Alvechurch bypass will link with Bromsgrove and the A448 to define the boundary of new development. Then identify the boundary within which development would occur and move the RBC boundary to the line of the proposed new road. If the above is approved - support exists for: Development at Option West of A441</p> <p>Part of Foxlydiate /Webheath Option – east of A448. The benefits would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - development contained by proposed new road - land would be available for future use up 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>to the proposed new bypass</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic relief on A441 north of Redditch/south of Alvechurch bypass. - Greenfield sites at Astwood Bank and Feckenham would remain untouched - The east of A441 (AONB) would remain untouched 		
192 BLADON	<p>Support for Option West of A441 as: This Green Belt area may be considered more favourable because a new railway station: 'Redditch North' might need to be built. If Option West of A441 was used – would a new dual carriageway road be built between the A441 and A448 through this area?</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
193 GILMORE	<p>Concerns for provision of schooling in proposed areas. Pupils may be required to travel to the other side of Redditch for schooling</p> <p>Many residents are concerned with the impact of the proposed access road through part of Morton Stanley Park relating to housing in and around Webheath and Norgrove</p>	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. Where there is a demand for school provision created by new development this will need to be provided in this locality.</p> <p>This has not been considered as a viable option relating to development since 1992 and did not form part of what can be consulted upon.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p>
194 BEST	<p>Object to Development on Webheath ADR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Webheath ADR is further away than Callow Hill – so additional costs of pumping sewage would be incurred. - How can this be in line with Government policy on carbon emissions? 	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- WYG study confirmed ADR was unsuitable for housing development and should be reinstated as Green Belt – on what grounds was this report rejected? This report had the support of RBC officers and Planning Committee. How can unsuitable land suddenly become suitable?</p> <p>- The Core Strategies document page 7 states Green Belt development options to the south west of Redditch have not been considered on sustainability grounds due to infrastructure constraints</p> <p>- development options to the north east of Redditch within the Bromsgrove District at Beoley have not been considered due to many disadvantages of development i.e. topography, limited linkages, merging of settlements, Beoley Conservation Area.</p> <p>- What is the Council's policy for ensuring all planning options are robustly considered and without prejudice?</p> <p>- RBC should consider all development</p>	<p>is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. The Core Strategy for Redditch will ensure that new development in the Borough is built to high environmental standards by ensuring that new development is in line with the national requirements for the Code for Sustainable Homes.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations.</p> <p>Both the land to the south west of Redditch and in the vicinity of Beoley have been considered without prejudice at an initial assessment (WYG1). The constraints in these areas were considered so significant that they were discounted as viable alternative options.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>options</p> <p>Country lanes are dangerous and increased traffic flow would make them a death trap. Church Rd has been designated a Walking Bus route – local residents horse riding, jogging, cycling and walking would be put under danger.</p> <p>- local infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate additional development</p> <p>- flooding will increase</p> <p>- ADR is an AONB – abundance of wildlife will be affected</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>Webheath ADR is not a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to potential development.</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR.</p>
195 TAYLOR	Objection to build 600 houses on Webheath ADR:	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>The roads are just lanes, no pavements exists, unsuitable pump sewage, flooding issues, protected species (newts, bats, orchids and pheasants) will be destroyed.</p> <p>Development would cause traffic congestion and noise, over crammed buses, loss of</p>	<p>targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess potential flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development. An analysis of available ecological information (including protected species) will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment will consider what transport infrastructure, including</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment. Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary. To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch. Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary. Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Infrastructure cannot support a further 600 homes as existing lanes could not support traffic increase, sewage pumping problems would result, schools, doctors & dentists would be oversubscribed & natural environment would be destroyed.</p> <p>Negative impact on property values.</p> <p>RSS target of 7000 houses is too high</p> <p>Support for further development of Brockhill and Bordesley Park as these locations are closer to infrastructure of the Town.</p>	<p>the Green Belt boundary, the study by WYG did not attempt to demonstrate these exceptional circumstances for Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Property values are not a planning matter.</p> <p>Housing targets consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Complete an analysis of available ecological information.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
197	Object to Development on Webheath ADR	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and	To complete a Transport

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
ROWELL	<p>- Many roads are lanes (which do not even provide public footpaths) with excessive traffic e.g. 3 local farms tractors halt traffic flow</p> <p>- WYG study confirmed ADR was unsuitable for housing development</p> <p>- Uphill sewage is environmentally unfriendly</p> <p>- flash flooding occurs</p>	<p>other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. The Webheath ADR remains capable and deliverable for potential development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25</p>	<p>Assessment.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Complete Level 2 SFRA.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- protected species will be destroyed.</p> <p>- inadequate infrastructure – Heathfield Rd has one post office and Birchfield Rd has one Green Grocers - both attract increased traffic – houses have limited off road parking, infrequent bus services, two small primary schools. Foxlydiate area is even less adequate to support additional development</p> <p>- RSS target is too high. Impact of recession on Redditch means people do not have funds to move and the area is not attracting an influx of people into Redditch and young people will move out of Redditch during the next 2/3 decades</p> <p>- other locations are better for development</p>	<p>'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development.</p> <p>Housing figures consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential</p>	<p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>and infrastructure</p> <p>Support for development at Brockhill and Bordesley Park (Bromsgrove) as both these areas are nearer to supportive infrastructure</p>	<p>sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>199 SEABOURNE</p>	<p>Webheath ADR: Objection to build 600 houses – Webheath cannot sustain any more large scale housing developments.</p> <p>ADR was classified as unsuitable for further development & should be changed back to Green Belt land</p> <p>Current infrastructure unable to support increase traffic levels. Oversubscribed local schools, poor bus routes. No GP surgeries or large shops in local area.</p> <p>Support-housing development at Brockhill/</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', which considered this matter however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Bordesley Park</p> <p>Why achieve RSS target of 7000 houses when we are in a recession and Redditch population is not growing dramatically?</p> <p>Develop houses at Brockhill</p>	<p>development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The 7000 dwelling target consulted upon was set by the WMRSS and was based upon meeting local needs. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
200 DREW	<p>Support for A448 (Webheath ADR/Foxlydiate Lane)</p> <p>- This option offers better access to the new railway station with its park and ride</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete a Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>capacity for 354 cars and links to Birmingham, Worcester and London</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - housing development is required closer to Bromsgrove Town which has a shortage of affordable housing. Industry near the town struggles to find/keep a sufficient workforce due to this shortage - A448 has excellent links to both Redditch and Bromsgrove centres. The present A441 and surrounding areas of road network are already over capacity. Daily congestion in Bordesley. Areas surrounding A441 have poor public transport links to local towns. Development here would lead to increased transport use & CO2 emissions - Development either side of A441 would be more costly due to flooding - there are at least 4 scarce wildlife species around the A441 - a further reduction in the Green Belt buffer between Birmingham and Redditch should be avoided - there is an underground kerosene gas pipeline running across land either side of 	<p>therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Bromsgrove District has its own housing and employment targets to be met elsewhere in the District. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline possible mitigation measures. Costs associated with flood mitigation would be borne by the developer.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development within Redditch.</p> <p>Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove/ Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets.</p> <p>There is an exclusion zone between where new development can be located</p>	<p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	the A441	and the existing gas pipe. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	to be delivered.
204 CUNNINGHAM	<p>Extremely concerned about development of the three ADRs, particularly the A435 ADR.</p> <p>Consultation material makes no acknowledgement of the Matchborough Allotments located within the A435 ADR. Allotments are currently a full occupancy and demand for allotments is at an all time high. Allotments contribute to family well being, community spirit, healthy eating, sustainability and biodiversity. Request that Redditch Borough Council will protect and continue to maintain that area as an allotment site for Matchborough.</p> <p>Reports commissioned by the Council concluded that the A435 ADR should NOT be developed. Disappointed that WMRSS Panel Report rejected these conclusions. Urge the Council to argue vigorously that the original conclusions are still valid and that the arguments put forward by the Inspectors do not take into account the view</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>It was not possible to mention every feature on the sites included as part of this consultation however officers are aware of the importance of these allotments in Redditch. The current Local Plan for Redditch Borough has a saved policy to protect allotments and should the A435 be progressed as a development site, officers would endeavour to carry this through to the Core Strategy and to influence the layout of potential development at the A435 ADR.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Officers to continue discussions with landowners/developers of the A435 in terms of the allotment provision.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>of local residents of either Redditch or Mappleborough Green.</p> <p>Development of this area would bring about a merger between Redditch and Mappleborough Green.</p> <p>It should not be developed but re-designated as Green Belt land.</p>	<p>for this.</p> <p>Development in any area should be sympathetic to its environment. Consideration of negative impacts on neighbouring settlements is considered through Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, where negative impacts are identified mitigation measures are also proposed. The impacts on Mappleborough Green would not be considered to be significant and no merger would be necessary if the A435 ADR is to be progressed as a development site.</p> <p>The A435 ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
205 DEVEY	Concerned about development in Webheath area. Remind Council that they promised to change Webheath back to Green Belt land.	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. There was no promise from Redditch Borough Council, the previous edition of the emerging Core Strategy (Preferred Draft Core Strategy) consulted upon Webheath being designated as Green Belt based upon the conclusions of the WYG2 report; the findings of which were dismissed by the WMRSS Inquiry Panel Report. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional	None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Foxlydiate lane is not suitable for heavy or volume traffic</p>	<p>circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p>
<p>206 NEWBURN</p>	<p>Object to development at Webheath ADR: - total compromise to our environment</p> <p>- potential threat to financial investment</p> <p>- RBC must change Webheath ADR back to Green Belt land as previously promised and not build on it</p> <p>- Webheath ADR is unsuitable for</p>	<p>The environmental effects of potential development at Webheath ADR could be mitigated against. Stringent measures to enhance the environment can be included in planning policy should this site be progressed for development. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>This is not a planning matter.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt . There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. There was no promise from Redditch Borough Council, the previous edition of the emerging Core Strategy (Preferred Draft Core Strategy) consulted upon Webheath being designated as Green Belt based upon the conclusions of the WYG2 report; the findings of which have been dismissed. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>development. It has narrow lanes, no pavements and issues with pumping sewerage are clearly evident. Development of the scale intimated needs sustainable local services infrastructure.</p> <p>- RBC must give better consideration to more suitable locations in the wider area. Utilise areas where there has been recent large scale developments where there may be scope for more, i.e. Brockhill ADR. Consider allocating a greater number of dwellings at Bordesley Park and apartments within the leisure development at the Abbey Stadium.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Assessment. Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
207 BULLIVANT	Objects to development at Webheath and Foxlydiate:	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Webheath should be designated as Green Belt as promised</p> <p>- Country lanes with no pavements.</p> <p>- Lanes often flood and the proposed development will increase flash flooding</p>	<p>targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. There was no promise from Redditch Borough Council, the previous edition of the emerging Core Strategy (Preferred Draft Core Strategy) consulted upon Webheath being designated as Green Belt based upon the conclusions of the WYG2 report; the findings of which have been dismissed. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Development of 3000 homes in the Brockhill and Bordesley Park area would be more suited to the environment and the communities.</p> <p>7000 houses is far too high for these areas and our local community.</p> <p>Questions should be asked about local services/facilities being able to cope before decisions are made.</p> <p>There are other building locations closer to services/infrastructure better able to cope than those suggested areas of Webheath and Foxlydiate.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Housing figures consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p>
208 EDWARDS	Support for Webheath /Foxlydiate option - existing A448 is an acceptable road	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>network system able to cope with increased traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the present A441 and surrounding roads are at full capacity - the land surrounding the A441 is on a flood plain - Bromsgrove's major rail station expansion with park and ride would complement the Redditch facility and make journey times to both towns easy. 	<p>changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>to be delivered.</p>
<p>209 SMITH</p>	<p>Amazed that the WMRSS has ignored the latest report on building expansion in this area. They appear to have made their judgement on old and outdated reports. Webheath ADR is unsuitable for future development.</p> <p>The Webheath ADR is not compatible for the increased need for services i.e. 1500 – 1800 extra vehicles on the existing lane structure. Adjoining Foxlydiate Lane is an even greater hazard than other local lanes. Bordesley Park and the completed Alvechurch bypass would take most of the extra traffic to Birmingham where most of the people buying these houses would be working.</p>	<p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at Webheath. A proportionate employment target for Redditch should be developed which should encourage a reduction in journeys to and from the MUAs.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>As Redditch has a falling population the RSS target is far too high. Most of the recent building in Redditch has yet to be lived in. Sure that Redditch can build enough housing inside Redditch for the local demand. Should there be a change of Government and old building policy in the near future, hope that the Council will quickly cancel all of these 'out of the hat' housing figures.</p>	<p>Development targets consulted upon were allocated through the Regional Spatial Strategy taking note of national population projections. Development targets for Redditch Borough were for natural growth needs and are based on the latest population projections. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>210 SMITH</p>	<p>Objection to development at Webheath ADR and Foxlydiat:</p> <p>- Why is WYG2 statement that Webheath ADR is unsuitable for development now being disregarded?</p> <p>- None of the roads in this vicinity are suitable to accommodate additional traffic</p>	<p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a transport assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- This area is primarily used for country pursuits</p> <p>- Pumping sewage up hill is environmentally unfriendly</p> <p>- Flooding would lead to loss of wildlife including badgers, muntjac deer and newts</p> <p>- Webheath ADR should be reinstated as Green Belt</p> <p>Support for development at Brockhill and Bordesley</p>	<p>Public Rights of Way can be retained irrespective of development in an area.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline where necessary the mitigation measures.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary. Development at Brockhill ADR is required and Bordesley is a potential option to be considered further.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>7000 dwellings is too high</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was this figure arrived at? - It should be reassessed in light of current economic climate <p>- Future housing should be built in locations close to good infrastructure</p>	<p>of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Housing figures were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this is based on the projected need. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
211 AMPHLETT, J	<p>Support for development at Foxlydiate/Webheath adjoining A448</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A448 would cope with additional traffic increases - A441 and surrounding road network is full to capacity and could not cope with additional housing - Bromsgrove is due a major expansion of its rail station with park and ride facility. This would complement the Redditch station and journey times to both from Foxlydiate/Webheath would be similar and acceptable - This area not in a floodplain and not an area of natural beauty/ conservation requirements - Development here could be accommodated without major infrastructure requirement and disruption to existing 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	residents		
212 GILL	<p>Objection to new housing at Webheath - Property market is slow so there is no logic in building more homes</p> <p>- Road network inadequate</p> <p>- Supporting services i.e. schools and shops would not cope</p> <p>- Worcestershire countryside is an important asset for Borough residents and wildlife</p> <p>- Sewage disposal could be a realistic problem i.e. pumping uphill</p>	<p>Housing figures consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at Webheath.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Given the lack of capacity within Redditch's urban area, it is inevitable that some development on greenfield sites will be necessary. Where greenfield sites are required for development the green infrastructure within the development can be an important asset and biodiversity can be enhanced around these areas.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a transport assessment.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>To complete a Green Infrastructure strategy.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- WYG2 identified that Webheath ADR was not suitable for development. It should be put back into the Green Belt .</p> <p>- Redditch town should be contained within the existing area. Development should be aimed at areas which are sustainable, close to services, amenities, town centre and have superior transport infrastructure</p>	<p>required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>The WMRSS identified that Redditch does not have the capacity to meet the needs of the population hence the need for cross boundary development in Bromsgrove and Stratford and the need for this consultation. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
213 PRESTON	<p>Support for Option 3 as relevant infrastructure in place. Options 1 & 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of infrastructure - Likelihood of flooding - Increase in traffic on already congested roads 	<p>It has been deduced from respondent 214, as responses from next door neighbours that Option 3 refers to Foxlydiate/Webheath and Options 1 and 2 refer to East & West of A441. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
214 MORRIS	Support for Option 3 as relevant infrastructure in place and easy access to the A448 will assist traffic flow Options 1 and 2: - Likelihood of flooding - Increase in traffic on already congested roads	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
215 SHOWELL	Objection to housing at Webheath: Redditch has had more than its share of expansion. It has more than doubled since the 1960s. Webheath became a retreat for residents because of the New Town onslaught. There must be land available by building in pockets rather than building estates. This	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Housing figures consulted upon were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. This is not a factor in determining where the development could be located. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. None. Complete the Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>would eliminate the need for additional infrastructure.</p> <p>Site occupied by Mettis should be used for housing development and Mettis relocated to a purpose-built site.</p>	<p>Borough. However it should be noted that building in pockets still adds pressure to existing infrastructure. Therefore additional infrastructure would still be required to support development.</p> <p>The site currently occupied by Mettis Aerospace is still in operation and therefore it is not considered appropriate to reallocate the site for an alternative use. The land Mettis currently occupies is a Primarily Employment Area; therefore the Council aim for this land is to retain it for employment purposes.</p>	None.
216 READ	<p>Support for development at Foxlydiate/Webheath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing dual carriageway would cope with traffic increases (A448) - A441 is already busy and would not cope with traffic increases - Not in a floodplain - Not subject to being an area of natural beauty with wildlife issues 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
217 MORGAN	<p>Support for development at Foxlydiate/Webheath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing A448 dual carriageway would cope with traffic increases - A441 & Dagnell End Road are already busy and would not cope with traffic increases - Infrastructure in place to accommodate new homes - Not in a floodplain 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the</p>	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not subject to being an area of natural beauty with wildlife issues - Development here would not cause disruption to existing residents - Bromsgrove is due a major expansion of its rail station with park & ride facility. This would complement the Redditch station and journey times to both from Foxlydiate/ Webheath would be similar 	Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.	
218 SHOWELL	<p>Objection to housing at Webheath area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic pollution and congestion - Will spoil village status - Contaminated water from building area will enter Norgrove Lake. Is this a health hazard? 	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Webheath is within Redditch's urban area and is not considered a village.</p> <p>Planning conditions could be in place to ensure the impact of any construction is minimised. Post construction all surplus water will be required to drain into an appropriate drainage system.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
219 READ	<p>Support for development at Foxlydiate/Webheath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing dual carriageway would cope with traffic increases - A441 is already busy and would not cope with traffic increases - Not in a floodplain 	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	- Not subject to being an area of natural beauty with wildlife issues		
220 AMPHLETT, S	Support for development at Foxlydiate/Webheath: - A448 will cope with traffic increases better than A441/surrounding roads which are already at capacity - Expansion of Bromsgrove railway station will support extra population in this vicinity - Not in a floodplain - Not subject to being an area of natural beauty with wildlife issues	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
221 SADLER	Supports development on the site adjacent to the A448 due to the following reasons: - The present A441 and surrounding road network are already at full capacity; - Bromsgrove is due a major expansion of its Rail Station, with a park and ride facility. The Bromsgrove Town Centre is also due a major redevelopment, this would be an ideal facility for those living on the A448 area. - The designated area of land is not on a flood plain or area of natural beauty; - Further expansion could take place without major infrastructure problems.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
222 STRATFORD-ON-AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL (OFFICER RESPONSE)	The principle of employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle is acceptable, although there are still significant issues to be resolved such as ecology and access.	A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be	Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Concerned about the scale and impact of development on the A435 ADR. The separate identity of Mappleborough Green should be preserved. The nature of the A435 ADR offers a buffer between the rural character to the east and the urban form of Redditch to the west, this should be retained, specifically the mature trees offer a good buffer. Consequently the scope for appropriate development on the A435 ADR is limited.</p>	<p>unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progressing this matter.</p> <p>Development in any area should be sympathetic to its environment. Should the development of the A435 ADR be progressed, the character of the housing would have to reflect its situation in Redditch and it would need to be accessed from Redditch's road network. It is agreed that there are constraints on site and mature trees serving a buffering purpose which will limit development opportunity. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>223 GRIFFITHS</p>	<p>Objects to development within the Webheath and Foxlydiate areas. There are other brownfield and green areas surrounded by main roads that offer more obvious locations for transport and facilities etc. RBC should fully utilise all other building locations which are closer to supportive infrastructures.</p>	<p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Why are the conclusions of the WYG Report (2009) that found Webheath ADR to be unsuitable for development, not being upheld?</p> <p>Change Webheath ADR back to Green Belt and not build on it.</p> <p>Development on Webheath is not suitable for the following reasons: - the lanes are not suitable for an influx of traffic. An increase of traffic is dangerous to children, the environment and residents, some areas have no footpaths. There is not a good bus service to the larger sporting, shopping and leisure facilities within Redditch.</p> <p>- Pumping sewage uphill is not environmentally friendly or sustainable;</p>	<p>for this.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is little employment in the area; - Flash flooding will increase; - Protected species such as newts, bats, and orchids will be destroyed. Protected Oak trees and a variety of wildlife in the area; - Local Services and infrastructure are inadequate - Area proposed as part of development is part of the National Cycle Way and the School Walking Bus Route; 	<p>these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site but not a constraint to development in this location.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The Webheath ADR is some distance from the National Cycle Network which runs through Redditch Arrow Valley Park into Redditch Town Centre. Any potential development would not prohibit access to schools, indeed accessibility can be enhanced.</p>	<p>additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete a Level 2 SFRA</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers to investigate the potential to incorporate increased accessibility to schools and cycle routes.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Local Community Police Officers report that anti-social behaviour is a problem in the area as some young people have nothing to do, building more homes with sporting facilities so far away does not make sense.</p> <p>- Well being and health of residents will be affected. This contradicts other policies and practices the Council supports to help local people with healthy lifestyles; this demonstrates a lack of 'joined up' thinking.</p> <p>Considers Foxlydiate is also unsuitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lanes, not roads, no pavements - sewage pumping issues - in the winter Foxlydiate lane was closed. Church Road was inaccessible to traffic and someone was skiing on the hill which demonstrates how much the hills are a feature. Support development in Bordesley park and Brockhill – much more obvious sites. Both are closer to main roads linked to Birmingham and the motorway network causing less congestion and reduced impact to rural roads. <p>The reason people want to live in Webheath is the availability of green areas, yet you seem intent on forcing more and more people into the area and destroying its appeal. If you build on Webheath ADR you will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pump sewage many miles (wasted energy contributing to climate change). 	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Improving the health and well-being of the Boroughs residents is a key priority of the Core Strategy. It is considered that residents will still be able to pursue a healthy lifestyle regardless of the location of future development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their</p>	<p>Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>2. Have to widen country lanes (by CPO of residents from gardens)</p> <p>3. Have to create footpaths (by CPO of residents front gardens)</p> <p>4. Have poor local employment (commuting – cars buses contributing to climate change)</p> <p>5. Have other unnecessary infrastructure (health, schools, etc).</p>	<p>financial programmes.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the existing road structure would be altered to accommodate development on the ADR. There would need to be additional road access to serve the development, however the opportunities for recreation along existing lanes would be maintained. CPO is not necessary to enable development at Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site but not a constraint to development in this location.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>225 HARRIS LAMB</p>	<p>Accommodating Redditch's Housing Requirements within Bromsgrove District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The preferred option for development would be land east of the A441. An advantage of development in this area is its close proximity to Redditch town centre, and Abbey Hotel and Abbey Stadium. - Development at this location would encompass ribbon development of Bordesley and would result in a natural progression to the urban area of Redditch. - If development does occur here, consideration must be given to the need for Bordesley Bypass. Improvements to public transport to the town centre will be required as part of any large scale extension. Public transport should be linked to existing facilities such as the Abbey Hotel. 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>If it is determined that land east of the A441 should not be developed then land west of the A441 should be utilised.</p> <p>Accommodating Redditch's Housing Requirements within Redditch Borough: - Prior to releasing ADR and Green Belt for residential development, greenfield sites within Redditch should be looked at, specifically within the urban area. Three sites should be put forward on behalf of RSM Leisure to accommodate future housing growth in Redditch; they are greenfield sites in the urban area which is more preferable than developing ADRs and Green Belt.</p>	<p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. The suitability of the submitted sites will be considered as part of the next SHLAA review. The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>227 HAYES</p>	<p>Hopes Webheath will be given the title of Green Belt.</p> <p>Webheath cannot stand any further infrastructure, nor any more people or traffic.</p> <p>Best site for development is Brockhill ADR and Bordesley Park. These sites are advantageous because of direct access to A441, and M42.</p>	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>The SHLAA and Employment Land Review identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough and there are sites in Webheath that are capable of development, inclusive of infrastructure.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Enfield Industrial Estate is suitable for housing, businesses should be moved to a more eco-friendly site outside the town centre.</p>	<p>strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Enfield Industrial Estate is still in operation and therefore it is not considered appropriate to reallocate the site for an alternative use. The estate is within a designated Primarily Employment Area, therefore the Council aim for this land is to retain it for employment purposes.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>228 RODD</p>	<p>Opposes development on Webheath ADR for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ADR should be returned to Green Belt as recommended by the WYG report; - There are lanes not road, and there are no pavements. The road system cannot cope with such a level of development; - The topography is not suitable for 	<p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Topography is a consideration but not</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>environmentally sustainable sewage disposal, and there is likely to be an increase in flash flooding;</p> <p>- Risk to protected species;</p> <p>- Lack of basic infrastructure.</p> <p>Supports proposal to build 3,000 or more homes at Bordesley. Supports development on Brockhill ADR.</p> <p>In addition apartments could be developed at Abbey Stadium as part of the leisure development.</p> <p>Use of other sites with appropriate</p>	<p>necessarily a constraint to development. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information (including protected species) will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have already been given planning consent.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential</p>	<p>promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>infrastructure should be used in the first instance, and the conversion of vacant units is more desirable.</p>	<p>sites for development within Redditch Borough. There are very few vacant units within Redditch that can be used for housing.</p>	
<p>229 BOURNE</p>	<p>Opposes development in Webheath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are other brown and green sites which are closer to supporting infrastructure that could be used; - Accessibility is an issue in terms of roads not being suitable to cater for development; - Conservation is also an issue, there are TPO's, protected species, and other wildlife - Infrastructure is not in place to support development. Local schools, shops etc. are at capacity. - Both Bordesley and Brockhill are closer to main roads. 	<p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Webheath should be designated as Green Belt	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.	None
230 HAWKINS	<p>Webheath ADR: - Topography means additional houses would result in flooding;</p> <p>- Topography also means that pumping sewage uphill is unsustainable – this would be required to service the existing sewage treatment works as well as upgrading, or a new station with associated pumping pipe work would need to be constructed. Both options are not environmentally friendly.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p>	<p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New infrastructure will be required, particularly road development which would erode the landscape character and Green Belt ; - There are no footpaths (specific reference is made to Church Road, Heathfield and Blackstitch), the creation of footpaths would narrow roads further; - Why is there a need for 7000 houses? 	<p>Necessary infrastructure would need to be in place to enable any development. Should development at Webheath be progressed, access to the Webheath ADR will not affect Green Belt land.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure would need to be in place to enable any development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>The housing target for Redditch is based on the projected need of the Borough. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
234 HEALEY	<p>The areas West and East of the A441 will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have severe infrastructure problems particularly with regards to road capacity. This will have a result on commerce in the Town Centre; - The Bordesley By Pass would be required in advance of any building in this area; - Flooding is an issue in the area <p>The option adjacent to the A448 would be a preferred choice as the infrastructure would cope better, and there are no apparent</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	flooding issues in the area. Development here would also provide an opportunity for future development along the A448 corridor.		
235 BAKER	<p>Objects to development at Webheath ADR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should be turned back to Green Belt and not built upon; - The lanes are not capable of accommodating further development and there are no pavements in the area; - There would be a need to pump sewage uphill which is not environmentally friendly; - There would be an increase in flash flooding; 	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Development will destroy habitats and protected species;</p> <p>- Infrastructure in the area is inadequate.</p> <p>Development should be focused in Bordesley Park. Development at Brockhill should be maximised.</p> <p>Other brownfield sites should be used, as well as incorporating development at the Abbey Stadium. There are also empty units in the Borough which could be utilised for development.</p>	<p>flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for potential development within Redditch Borough. Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have recently been granted planning permission.</p>	<p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
240 THE COAL AUTHORITY	No specific comments at this stage.	Noted	None
244 HEASEL-GRAVE	Webheath ADR: - Should be returned to Green Belt and not built on;	Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in	None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- the roads can not cope with additional traffic and there are a lack of pavements in the area;</p> <p>- Wildlife and protected species will be destroyed.</p> <p>Foxlydiate is unsuitable for the same reasons.</p> <p>7000 target is too high.</p> <p>The most sensible places to build are Bordesley and Brockhill.</p>	<p>this location.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The housing target consulted upon for Redditch this is based on the projected need of the Borough set out in the RSS. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	to be delivered.
245 BARTLEY	<p>Webheath ADR: - Change back to Green Belt as per WYG report;</p> <p>- Does not have suitable roads or pavements</p>	<p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. There was no promise from Redditch Borough Council, the previous edition of the emerging Core Strategy (Preferred Options) consulted upon Webheath being designated as Green Belt based upon the conclusions of the WYG2 report; the findings of which have been dismissed. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure would need to be in place to enable any development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete a Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Flash flooding will increase</p> <p>- Protected species and habitats will be destroyed;</p> <p>- Infrastructure is inadequate;</p> <p>- 7000 target is too high;</p>	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The housing target consulted on for Redditch was based on the projected needs for the Borough set in the RSS. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All other building locations should be utilised that are closer to supporting infrastructure; - Pumping sewage uphill is neither environmentally friendly nor sustainable. 	<p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>
248 HART	<p>Support development adjacent A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - already has a dual carriageway to accommodate increased traffic - Bromsgrove is building a new electrified railway station with park and ride facilities - proximity to schools - sewage problem is more accessible from this site - topography is more suitable (the other 2 options have gas pipes running under them) - no flooding in this area (the other 2 options are in the flood plain and frequently food) - this must be the most cost effective option - the other 2 options do not have the facilities or existing infrastructure (A441 is already at capacity) - area around the river arrow has a diversity of wildlife and habitats will be destroyed by development 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
249	Webheath ADR is unsuitable for	A Transport Assessment will be	To complete a Transport

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
BONHAM	<p>development: - existing road infrastructure</p> <p>- requirements for extensive sewerage infrastructure</p> <p>- would remove important amenity land (in terms of outstanding aesthetics and rich flora and fauna)</p> <p>Note that independent consultants stated that Webheath ADR is unsuitable for development.</p>	<p>completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>There would be open space provision within any new development in accordance with the Redditch Borough Open Space Needs Assessment (2009). An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils</p>	<p>Assessment.</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Note that the Borough has not re-designated Webheath ADR as Green Belt despite its promise to do so.</p> <p>Support development at Bordesley Park.</p> <p>Leisure development at Abbey Stadium should incorporate residential development.</p> <p>Commend further (sympathetic) development of Brockhill ADR including attention to improving amenities.</p>	<p>therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. There was no promise from Redditch Borough Council, the previous edition of the emerging Core Strategy (Preferred Options) consulted upon Webheath being designated as Green Belt based upon the conclusions of the WYG2 report; the findings of which have been dismissed. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have already been granted planning permission.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete an</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Urge Borough Council to continue to facilitate development in all other possible areas within the Borough, in particular brownfield sites and re-utilisation of derelict premises.</p>	<p>alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will need to be in place to enable the development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>None</p>
<p>250 MARSHALL</p>	<p>Support development adjacent to A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - housing development is actually required closer to Bromsgrove town which has a shortage of affordable housing. This shortage causes unnecessary commuting from outside of the area and industry struggles to keep a sufficient workforce. - existing A448 can cope with increased traffic and has excellent links to Redditch and Bromsgrove - A441 and surrounding roads are over capacity - areas around the A441 have poor public transport links to local towns (Redditch, Worcester, Bromsgrove, Stratford-upon-Avon). Development here would increase use of private transport. - this option will offer better access to the new Bromsgrove railway station and park and ride facility - severe flooding problems either side of the A441 - at least 4 nationally scarce/significant species on land around the A441 - a further reduction in the Green Belt buffer between Birmingham and Redditch should be avoided 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	- underground gas pipeline either side of A441.		
254 TOWNSEND	Support for option around A448 - A448 is a good spinal connection between the two towns and is able to take advantage from both Redditch & Bromsgrove facilities - commuters have access to both Redditch and & Bromsgrove railway stations - the A441 can flood and if houses were developed here work would be required on the road system	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
255 WELLS	<p>Objection to Webheath ADR (especially Crumpfields Lane and Pumphouse Lane) - WYG study confirmed ADR was unsuitable for future development - demand it to be returned as Green Belt - the cost of developing this site would be phenomenal - the surrounding roads cannot accommodate hundreds of additional vehicles - new development would create additional pressure on all services i.e. drainage, schools. New housing should be placed near to facilities and amenities which are already in place (to make them a viable option)</p> <p>Support for - more low cost/suitable areas e.g.: - Abbey Stadium - between Brockhill and the Bromsgrove to Redditch by – pass - Greenlands has Brownfield sites that would benefit from residential use – a school is already built and bus routes are in</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Webheath ADR has never been in the Green Belt. Officers consider that Webheath ADR has no value as Green Belt. The costs of development will be borne by the developer. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough including investigations of sites within Greenlands. The Abbey Stadium redevelopment has already been granted planning permission. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete a Transport Assessment. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>place</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bromsgrove should develop the land along Portway which has access to Redditch's industrial estates & the motorway network 	<p>and the revocation of the RSS. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
<p>256 FREELAND</p>	<p>Support for Webheath /Foxlydiate option but objects to options east and west of A441:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The A448 has an acceptable network system capable of absorbing the extra load - The A441 & surrounding roads are at full capacity. Roads works also cause traffic congestion so additional housing will increase congestion/traffic jams. - There would be less disruption on a site near the A448. - During construction, major disruption would occur around the A441 site. - The A441 is subject to frequent flooding, the A448 is not - Bromsgrove is due a major rail station expansion so it seems natural to fit the expansion near the A448. 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete a Transport Assessment. None</p>
<p>257 CRUXTON</p>	<p>Against Webheath ADR option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Webheath should revert back to Green Belt land as stated in the original preferred strategy. <p>The ADR land is not suitable & is unable to accommodate these proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the roads cannot accommodate an 	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>increased level of traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local services are not in place to be able to service an increased local population (e.g. schools & GPs) - the land is also very important for the sustainability of the environment & is enjoyed frequently by local residents & ramblers <p>Support for Bordesley Park option as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - infrastructure is in place to support proposed new dwellings <p>Overall objection to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7000 new homes is far too high in current climate. Little evidence to support the need for such high numbers. How was this figure calculated? 	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Housing figures consulted on were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected need. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market. The housing target is calculated based on past trends and population projections. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
258 SMITH	<p>Concerned that public money was spent on the White Young Green study that in effect was pointless in the eyes of the panel.</p> <p>What is the rationale for NOT building at Bordesley, apart from objections from local people, Bromsgrove Council and local MP? Bordesley could be argued as a better solution as the road infrastructure exists, there is an established rail link and it is nearer to the motorways.</p> <p>Crumpfields Lane has seen an incredible increase in the volume of traffic using it over the last 15 years. This would become worse as a result of development. Vehicles have</p>	<p>strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The study was required to provide an independent view to inform the preparation of the Core Strategies for Redditch and Bromsgrove. The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>This consultation did not present a choice between Webheath ADR and Bordesley. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	ruined verges and hedgerows where they have forced routes through. If 600 houses are built on the ADR what assurances will there be to safeguard our residential and country lanes from becoming even worse than they are now?		
264 Rose	<p>Object to development at Webheath ADR and Foxlydiate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - White Young Green report found the Webheath ADR unsuitable for development - There are lanes, not roads, no pavements - miles away from the Town Centre, no employment in the area - local services infrastructure is inadequate - pumping sewage is not environmentally friendly or sustainable. 	<p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Believe that RSS target of 7000 is too high.	The development targets consulted upon for Redditch Borough were based on projected need set by the RSS. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	Strategies and level of development to be delivered.
265 NETWORK RAIL	For information on railway infrastructure development in the area look at the Network Rail Route Utilisation Strategy (RUS).	Noted	Consult the RUS.
267 GRIFFITHS	<p>Consultation is a sham, evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - timescales - conversations overheard between individuals involved in the planning service that 'the decision to build on Webheath has already been made' <p>- proposals ignore the findings of the White</p>	<p>The consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>The consultation material did not present Webheath ADR as an 'alternative option' due to the limited genuine alternative options within Redditch Borough, the consultation material made it clear that all of the ADRs would be required to be developed to meet the development targets. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The consultation material had to adhere</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Young Green report</p> <p>Objects to development at Webheath ADR/Foxlydiate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WYG report was accepted by RBC Planning Committee and officers. I was led to believe this was adopted by as policy and forwarded to the WMRSS. Difficult to understand why RBC is allocating 600 houses on Webheath ADR, only a few months after the WYG Report was supported. - RBC should change Webheath ADR back to Green Belt and not build on it. - access roads are little more than country lanes and are completely unsuitable to support development. Increase in traffic is dangerous to children, the environment and local residents. Some areas have no pavements and insufficient width to expand. Access roads suffer from disruption during flooding or snow. Little public transport in the area and little local employment which will increase car usage. 	<p>to the findings of the WMRSS. The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations.</p> <p>The findings of the WYG report were not adopted as formal Redditch Borough Council policy only evidence, as the Core Strategy has only been presenting consultation opportunities. See comment above regarding the WMRSS.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- The availability of local services and infrastructure is already inadequate. Further development will compound these problems.</p> <p>- The contour of the ADR land between Pumphouse lane and Crumpfields lane drops rapidly into a valley. Consequently, the risks of flooding will be significant and flash flooding will increase.</p> <p>- Requirement to pump sewage uphill which is not environmentally friendly or sustainable.</p> <p>- Local Community Support Officers report</p>	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Topography is a consideration when determining the location for potential development but not necessarily a constraint. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit potential development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>Safety and anti-social behaviour will be</p>	<p>Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Complete Level 2 SFRA and request.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>antisocial behaviour is a problem. Webheath is remote from shops, sports facilities, entertainment and local industry. More houses will make this problem worse.</p> <p>- There are protected Oak trees in the area and a wide variety of wildlife. Protected species will be destroyed.</p> <p>Development in other areas such as Bordesley Park and Brockhill appear much more obvious sites. Development in closer to the town centre and can be easily linked to existing road system.</p> <p>Complain that the RSS target is too high to sustain. RBC should challenge this allocation rather than quietly acquiescing. By complying with centrally imposed targets RBC is not acting in the best interests of the people of Redditch.</p>	<p>taken into account when designing new communities. If there are particular anti-social behaviour issues that individuals are aware of these should be directed to Local Community Support Officers or the Borough Councils Community Safety Team. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The 7000 dwellings target consulted upon for Redditch was based upon the locally generated needs for development. The Borough Council contested the housing figures at the inquiry into the Phase 2 review of the RSS however this argument was not accepted by the inspectors as detailed in the Panel Report. The status of the planning system at the time of consultation meant that there was little opportunity but to comply with the RSS findings unless there was sufficient evidence to justify an alternative</p>	<p>To complete an analysis of available ecological information.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		<p>approach. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	
<p>268 FROST</p>	<p>Support for: - Webheath/Foxlydiat option east of the A448 and option West of the A441. They should be planned to be developed together with a large green corridor incorporating Foxlydiat Wood, Brockhill Wood with Forge Mill and Beoley Paper Mill, providing a cycle pathway, picnic areas, seating children's play area with also newly planted conservation areas. - The area east of the A448 already has in place an improved road system from the A448 to Windsor Rd and 5 traffic islands that already have existing roads leading towards the options. - The area is already served by public transport and local shops at Batchley and schools should be sited by Green Corridor and have access to field area adjacent - National Grid has an IP Governor station at Tack Farm and Weights Lane may be able to supply further gas to the area. Object to Webheath /Foxlydiat option: - is not a cost effective viable proposition as a new road system would be required to carry the extra vehicle numbers. - existing gas, water and electricity supplies</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>are at the extremities of the supply network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there would be a limited number of residential properties in the proposed development option - the public should be invited to Consultation Board meetings to express knowledge and concerns but unable to vote 		
<p>270 NATIONAL TRUST</p>	<p>Amount of development proposed for Redditch has risk of flooding at Coughton Court. The National Trust considers the proposed development should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment that addresses the downstream consequences - ensuring flood risk potential is reduced/ controlled.</p> <p>An approach securing the following additional benefits is required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the use of Sustainable Drainage System- to contribute to key objectives of the Severn River Basin Management Plan - WMRSS Green infrastructure objectives - Regional Biodiversity Strategy 	<p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary. The potential impacts of flooding downstream of Redditch will form part of the SFRA level 2 however detailed effects of flooding in this location will be covered in the SFRA for Stratford on Avon District.</p> <p>Requirements for Sustainable Drainage System are included in the emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure is an integral part of planned development.</p>	<p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
<p>271 TAYLOR</p>	<p>Objection to development in the Webheath vicinity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WYG2 concluded that Webheath ADR was unsuitable for development and should be returned to Green Belt - WMRSS objective of urban renaissance advocates the concentration of 	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>The WMRSS objective would have been achieved in Redditch with the potential</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>development near to all sustainable services. All other building locations should be utilised to their maximum before disturbing the current environment in Webheath. Proposals do not maximise the use of brownfield development for sustainable and affordable housing. Inadequate road/pavement infrastructure</p> <p>- Increase in traffic not desirable</p> <p>- Inadequate sewage infrastructure which requires up hill pumping</p> <p>- Flooding implications</p> <p>- Visually attractive rural area</p>	<p>sites for development identified in the SHLAA and ELR within the urban area of Redditch and this includes Webheath. The opportunities for brownfield development have been exhausted. Appropriate affordable housing would need to be provided on relevant sites. Any necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at Webheath.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p>Redditch is surrounded by landscape of high to medium sensitivity to development so any development proposed would need to respect these sensitivities.</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete a Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disturbance and destruction to wildlife, including protected species such as bats, orchids and great-crested newts - Loss of obesity reducing and stress relieving activities such as walking, cycling and horse riding along the rural lanes - Insufficient local school - Capacities would be exceeded at doctors surgeries and shops to an unsustainable level - Inadequate public transport to town centre, bus & rail facilities and Abbey Stadium - Not near to employment sources Support for development at Bordesley Park and Brockhill: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More environmentally friendly 	<p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to development.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the existing road structure would be altered to accommodate development on the ADR should this option be progressed. There would need to be additional road access to serve the potential development, however the opportunities for recreation along existing lanes would be maintained.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development at the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>ecological information</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Easier to improve existing infrastructure</p>	<p>Irrespective of the location of development, necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>
<p>272 ROSE</p>	<p>WMRSS target of 7000 homes for Redditch should be revised in light of the recession. Redditch is 37th in the league table for UK Repossession Hotspots. Government states that repossession hotspots are at greater risk due to higher levels of unemployment and repossession court orders</p> <p>Redditch is 31% more deprived than the rest of Worcestershire</p> <p>Objection to development at Webheath ADR: - Not sustainable</p>	<p>Housing figures consulted on were set by the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. For Redditch this was based on the projected needs. The level of repossessions in Redditch does not have any impacts on population growth. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' states that areas of deprivation should be regenerated this can be aided through new development.</p> <p>Potential development at Webheath ADR is considered to be less sustainable than development within the urban area. However it is more sustainable than other discounted options for example Green Belt extension, Green Belt new settlement, development on open space and extensions to Astwood Bank and Feckenham. The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Away from local employment - Sewage will need to be pumped <p>Support for development at Bordesley Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affordable housing should be built close to town centre, supportive infrastructures, road networks and employment locations </p>	<p>Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. A pumping mechanism will only be required to the point where gravity system will take over.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
273 PARSONS	<p>Objection to development and expansion of Redditch:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unreasonable that future housing is to be built to the north and north west of the town. There is little evidence that other areas have been given full consideration - North and north west is already built up with little greenbelt or green space left - By accepting 3000 dwellings of 	<p>WYG 1 study assessed all areas surrounding the Redditch urban area. Through SWOT analysis and examination of constraints, areas to the north and north-west of the town were deemed to be the most appropriate direction for Redditch's long term growth.</p> <p>The 3000 dwellings to be located in</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Bromsgrove's target, Redditch is essentially assisting Bromsgrove but bearing the burden on its infrastructure. Bromsgrove will accept the Council Tax but if Redditch had to provide the services, the costs and inconvenience will be placed on Redditch residents</p> <p>- Disagree with the appointment of the RSS [WMRA]. They should not be making decisions which impact on local residents</p> <p>- Significant development at Brockhill has resulted in increased traffic which is likely to get worse. Limited public transport services in Brockhill</p> <p>- Rail capacities are restricted due to single track and inadequate station parking</p> <p>- Lack of footpath network in Brockhill area limits alternatives to car usage</p> <p>- Flooding implications in Brockhill area</p>	<p>Bromsgrove, but adjacent to the Redditch boundary were to meet Redditch's needs and reflected the requirements of the RSS. Bromsgrove District has a separate housing target that will be met elsewhere in the district. Council tax should be received by the Authority which would provide the services to that community.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>Network Rail has not indicated that a new railway station will be required; however necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Should development in this area be progressed it is possible that footpath linkages at the site and connecting to the site can be enhanced.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures. Flooding issues are</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Should the Brockhill ADR site be progressed, officers to consider measures to enhance the footpath network.</p> <p>To complete a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Impact on wildlife species, in particular Great Spotted Woodpeckers, Muntjak deer</p> <p>- Highly visible ridge-lines</p> <p>- Development should be directed to the South West of the A448, possibly enlarging Webheath ADR</p> <p>- Some consideration should be given to development south west of Redditch – south of Callow Hill and east of A435</p>	<p>an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>Topography is a consideration when determining the location for potential development but not necessarily a constraint.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>WYG 1 study assessed all areas surrounding the Redditch urban area. Through SWOT analysis and examination of constraints, areas to the north and north-west of the town were deemed to be the most appropriate direction for Redditch's long term growth.</p>	<p>To complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
274 HATTON	Objection to development at Webheath ADR and Foxlydiate Green Belt :	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- ADR should be returned to Green Belt as recommended in WYG2</p> <p>- Inadequate road system</p> <p>- Inadequate sewage system which would require pumping</p> <p>- Impact on wildlife</p>	<p>changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements will be considered in the Webheath Strategic Site Policy.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment</p> <p>Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Insufficient local amenities</p> <p>Support for development at Brockhill and Bordesley Park</p>	<p>potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
275 MILES	<p>3000 houses should not be built adjacent to Redditch in Bromsgrove as this would expand the urban conurbation of Redditch. Green Belt should not be used for development, it should remain as Green Belt . Support for development at Foxlydiate/Webheath:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A448 would cope with traffic increase. A441 and B4101 would require significant widening and are at capacity - A448 option is not on a floodplain - A448 option is not adjacent to an area of natural beauty or wildlife preservation area - A448 option does not pose significant infrastructure problems or disruption to existing residents - Major expansion to Bromsgrove's railway station, including park & ride would complement Redditch station - Travel time to each town centre would be almost the same from this option 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. All of the options would require necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
276 TURLEY	<p>Additional growth for Redditch and Bromsgrove should be embraced given its</p>	<p>The Redditch Core Strategy has an objective to improve the vitality and</p>	<p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
ASSOCIATES OBO SCOTTISH WIDOWS	<p>potential to underpin existing and future investment in Redditch Town Centre. Any development to meet the strategic housing requirement should be well related to the town centre as it can enhance the appeal of the town centre.</p> <p>Opportunities to maximise use of public transport should be encouraged. Every effort should be made to provide attractive, reliable and safe public transport services from any of the proposed strategic sites</p> <p>A435 ADR and Webheath ADR are not well located in relation to the town centre. A435 ADR performed less favourably than other ADRs in the recent Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Development of the A435 ADR should be discouraged and the residual housing requirement of around 360 dwellings be accommodated in alternative locations</p> <p>Development of Webheath ADR should only be permitted if infrastructure connections to the town centre can adequately be provided</p> <p>Ancillary development should be limited to essential uses. New local/district centres should not compromise efforts to enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre</p>	<p>viability of the town centre. The Councils will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Agree. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development in all locations.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>District/local centres are intended to meet daily needs for basic items and therefore should not compromise the vitality and viability of the town centre.</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>None</p>
277 RENNIE	Development of the Foxlydiate/ Webheath Green Belt option is least favourable option.	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Other two options could easily be developed partially over the Bromsgrove boundary where the land does not rise quickly.</p> <p>Any development should be low-rise and unobtrusive.</p> <p>Drainage problems should be dealt with adequately to prevent future flooding.</p> <p>Concerned about the accessibility of the footpath system and the impact of future development on the landscape.</p>	<p>therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Topography is a consideration but not necessarily a constraint when determining the preferred locations for development.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that any development will be high rise.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development on flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p>The Worcestershire County Landscape Character Assessment forms part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and its findings will be taken in to consideration when determining the preferred location(s) for development. The accessibility of the footpath system should not be compromised as a result of development and improvements should always be sought.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p> <p>None.</p>
278 GVA GRIMLEY OBO HCA	Broadly supports the proposal to deliver new development on all ADRs in Redditch. In particular development on the A435 ADR and land adjacent to it in SoA District.	The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>The land at the southern end of the A435 ADR could be successfully developed for housing if that was the most appropriate use for it. HCA wishes to reserve its position in respect of the southern parcels of land subject to consideration of matters in more detail.</p>	<p>therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Should the A435 be progressed for development, in line with the background document produced for consultation, Officers consider that the southern parcels of the A435 would be better suited to employment use as this is compatible with the adjacent employment uses. Officers will continue to engage with the HCA regarding this site.</p>	<p>Officers to engage with HCA regarding A435 strategic site.</p>
<p>280 BARLOW</p>	<p>Support development of the A435 ADR. Consider that the administrative boundary between RBC and SoADC should be revised. This is an arbitrary line on a plan and does not reflect features on the ground. It makes little sense to exclude this land from development when there is a clearly defined boundary to the north and east (A435/A4023) The land administered by SoADC should be within the proposed development area.</p>	<p>Noted. Officers have and will continue to engage with the landowner and SoADC Officers regarding this site.</p>	<p>Officers to engage with HCA & SoADC Officers regarding A435 strategic site.</p>
<p>281 WARBY</p>	<p>Objection to development of Webheath ADR. Existing small lanes and minor roads will be difficult, if not impossible to widen to cater for additional traffic flows. Transport assessments on which the extent of the development is based were conducted back in 2002. As a resident I do not believe these calculations accurately reflect the real figures. Methods used to calculate future traffic growth are very poorly based and unrealistic and need to be more</p>	<p>An up to date Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR. The TA will be carried out by the County Council as the transport authority.</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>representative of the population in the area. There are fundamental failings in the Assessment and its recommendations are not based on accurate data and does not represent the level of issues that would arise from an additional 600 homes.</p> <p>Accident incidents have increased over the last 5 years. There is no scaling up of these figures in the Transport Assessment to show that there would be an unacceptable level of accidents on the local road network. Junction of Blackstitch Lane/ Middlepiece Drive is already an accident blackspot. Figures may not accurately reflect the level of incidents as some are not reported to the police due to no injury.</p> <p>Assumptions cannot be made that affordable housing units do not contribute to peak time trip generations. It cannot be assumed that those in affordable housing units do not have cars.</p> <p>Not good planning to increase the amount of affordable housing in an area where there is currently a higher proportion of high end properties and the local amenities cater for the current population.</p> <p>Heavy construction traffic in this area will impact on the existing transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Information received from Worcestershire County Council Collision Safety Investigation Team states that where members of the public deem an area to be unsafe they should contact the County Council directly. However the County Council have indicated that the Webheath is not a particular concern in terms of accidents.</p> <p>Traffic generated from affordable housing will be included in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>PPS 3 (Housing, para 20) requires the delivery of mixed communities where there is "a variety of housing, particularly in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households". Necessary infrastructure needs to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>This is a necessary consequence of development but will be temporary. Planning Obligations can be used to minimise the amount of disruption if necessary.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a transport assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Public transport is limited in the area. An increase in buses will create traffic, noise and pollution issues for residents. The Transport Assessment allows for the increase in 'school-run' traffic. This would increase with additional houses and the schools are full/ over subscribed with just the existing population. Question how cycle lanes could be added to certain routes with many existing lanes barely suitable for 2 passing cars.</p> <p>The Assessment concludes that 600 houses can be accommodated subject to a list of provisions. Where does the money come from to pay for this work?</p> <p>Existing infrastructure very limited. 2 Schools, a post office and a general store. Parking for these facilities is very limited and causes traffic congestion. Existing schools do not have the capacity for increased pupil numbers from 600 homes. There is no chemist or doctors surgery in Webheath.</p> <p>An area that had been originally designated as Green Belt will become an eyesore, inevitably lowering the value/ perception of what has always been recognised as a good location to live.</p>	<p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Construction costs are always borne by the developers of a site. A developer will be required to contribute to transport provisions. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will detail the funding that is available for infrastructure and the contributions required of developers.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been in the Green Belt. Officers consider that Webheath ADR has no value as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>With no indication of proposed layouts/ densities of housing, examples of other developments such as Brockhill, with its housing density, twisty, small road network and ridiculous parking arrangements only highlight concerns for what might happen on the Webheath ADR. It cannot be policy to reduce the stature of an established local area by forcing unsustainable/ impractical/ environmentally unfriendly developments on it. Pressure to meet housing figures is better done by increasing the developments in areas that have already been subjected to this style of housing creation such as Brockhill and Bordesley.</p> <p>Pumping sewage uphill is unsustainable.</p> <p>Removal of large areas of land and replacing with roads, driveways etc will result in increased flooding problems.</p>	<p>Development in any area should be sympathetic to its environment. The Core Strategy will contain a policy which will seek to ensure all new development is delivered to high quality design standards irrespective of its location.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete a Level 2 SFRA.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Many protected species will be destroyed.</p> <p>PDCS stated that the Webheath ADR was unsuitable for future development. RBC should have returned it back to Green Belt.</p> <p>Environmental impact of the development of Webheath ADR will be damaging from all perspectives. Alternative locations must be used to protect the environment in the long term.</p>	<p>will assess the impact of development on the flooding and outline mitigation measures if necessary.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2' (which informed the PDCS), however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. Officers consider that Webheath ADR has no value as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location, the study by WYG did not attempt to demonstrate these exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for potential development within Redditch Borough. The only major environmental concern is the requirement for a pumping mechanism for sewerage which is less sustainable than traditional gravity fed system however additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p>	<p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>None</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
282 NOYCE	<p>Objection to development of Webheath ADR. As promised, RBC should return Webheath ADR to Green Belt in accordance with WYG2 Report.</p> <p>Inadequate transport infrastructure. Local infrastructure is inadequate.</p> <p>Not sustainable to pump sewage uphill.</p> <p>Flash flooding will increase.</p>	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. There was no promise from Redditch Borough Council, the previous edition of the emerging Core Strategy (Preferred Options) consulted upon Webheath being designated as Green Belt based upon the conclusions of the WYG2 report; the findings of which have been dismissed. The WYG2 report made no attempts to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances that are necessary to alter a Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess the transport implications of potential development at Webheath.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of development on flooding and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Should Webheath be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2 for Redditch.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Protected species will be destroyed.</p> <p>Support building at Bordesley Park, Abbey Stadium and Brockhill ADR</p>	<p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have already been granted planning permission.</p>	<p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>283 WARWICKSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST</p>	<p>Ecological Data Provision: Trust outlines the necessity of using up-to-date ecological and environmental information to inform strategic site selection from the outset. Without this information, it is questioned how truly sustainable growth can be delivered with inadequate supporting ecological information to indicate the environmental benefits or constraints of each growth option. The LPA will need to demonstrate that decisions on strategic site selection are the most appropriate considered against the reasonable alternatives (PPS12 para 4.36). This cannot be achieved if the environmental constraints and opportunities of each growth option have not been available to inform which option is likely to be the most appropriate</p>	<p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development. At the time of consultation on the growth options this information was not available, however public and stakeholder comments as well as detailed ecological information have always been intended to feed into the decision making process on strategic sites.</p>	<p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>alternative.</p> <p>Designated wildlife sites and/or protected species have the capacity to shape development and influence overall developable areas of strategic sites. Identifying the ecological assets of each growth option is essential to convey confidence that the strategic site can deliver the required development.</p> <p>WWT Recommends that Warwickshire Biological Records Centre is contacted to obtain species records and habitat data from the Habitat Biodiversity Audit. WWT would welcome the opportunity to further comment on any data obtained through this search.</p> <p>Site Specific Comments: Support Worcs WT comments regarding the need to maximise opportunities to contribute towards delivering green infrastructure and protect/ buffer key ecological assets within all proposed development parcels. WWT advises an integrated approach to GI provision, ensuring that local GI plans and objectives are considered and incorporated from both Warks and Worcs perspective.</p> <p>Ravensbank ADR and Winyates Triangle:</p>	<p>Noted. Wildlife designations will be taken in to account when making decisions on the preferred option, and detail of the ecological assets of each strategic site selected will be provided and evidence in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Should any sites be progressed in the Stratford/Warwickshire area then Warwickshire biological records can be fed into data gathering for the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. Opportunities to maximise GI provision will be an integral part of strategic site planning.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to Winyates Green</p>	<p>To complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Do not progress Winyates Green</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Concerns regarding the proximity of Ravensbank Drive SWS to Ravensbank ADR and Winyates Triangle and the potential ecological implications that may arise as a result of access requirements. Strongly contest the loss or otherwise of a county designated SWS and recommend that opportunities be explored with SoADC to ensure a safe access and egress route can be accommodated elsewhere within the development parcel. Further information will be required to inform the decision on this site.</p>	<p>Triangle the need for development in this location was set by the RSS Phase 2 Revision Panel Report. A detailed ecological survey has been undertaken on the Winyates Green Triangle site which does indicate that there are constraints to development. A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has also been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. The combined issues suggest that employment development on the Winyates Green Triangle site would be unviable and not deliverable; therefore Officers recommend that this site is not progressed any further in the Core Strategy for Redditch. Officers will liaise with Stratford District to discuss progress on this matter.</p>	<p>Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>
<p>284 BARTON WILMORE obo BARRATT STRATEGIC & TAYLOR WIMPEY</p>	<p>Welcome the inclusion of Webheath ADR in the list of preferred option sites for consideration.</p> <p>In line with PPS3 and PPS12 requirements to demonstrate that sites are suitable, available and deliverable, site boundary has been revised to reflect land ownership/control and is capable of delivering approximately 350 dwellings. Revised master plan will be submitted to demonstrate the delivery of 350 dwellings. Consider the remainder of the ADR is suitable for development and the master</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Noted. The SHLAA will recognise the ability of the developer to bring forward 350 dwellings in the short term and the remaining capacity in the long term.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Amend next SHLAA update with details on the Webheath ADR provided by the developer.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>plan will allow for the remainder of the ADR to come forward at a later date.</p> <p>Technical work is being updated and will be submitted in due course.</p> <p><u>Distribution of Development:</u> - Support the policy in that it confirms there will be no phasing of strategic sites. In respect of the Webheath ADR, we can confirm that 350 dwellings can be delivered at an early stage in the plan process.</p> <p>- Further detail should be provided on what 'other processes' are. This does not give sufficient security as to how this would be addressed and as a result there is a question about whether the Core Strategy is deliverable, should one of the strategic sites fail to deliver.</p> <p><u>Webheath ADR:</u> - Suggest that the final sentence of the 'site location and description' is misleading in that the site is not 'covered' by an Area TPO. This suggests the site is completely covered by trees and would not be suitable for development. Suggest alternative</p>	<p>Officers will receive any new evidence before the next consultation.</p> <p>Phasing of some sites may be required. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. The need for phasing will be dependent on the types of locations put forward.</p> <p>Strategic sites will only be included in Core Strategies where the Councils have certainty of their deliverability. It is therefore unlikely that a strategic site would fail to deliver. However there are processes available to stimulate delivery on a site such as Supplementary Planning Documents, reviews of Development Plan Documents or Compulsory Purchase.</p> <p>The entire Webheath ADR is covered by the Borough of Redditch Tree Preservation Order No.72 however this does not affect all trees on the site. Should the Webheath ADR be progressed as a development site, future descriptions</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Revise reasoned justification to Development Strategy Policy to include details of the planning processes available to help deliver sites.</p> <p>Should the Webheath ADR be progressed as a development site, descriptions of Webheath ADR will make clear that the area TPO only affects some trees on the site.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>wording to the effect that there is an Area TPO covering some trees on the site.</p> <p>- Previously submitted that the 2009 SA was flawed in respect of the conclusions reached on the Webheath ADR. The WMRSS Phase 2 panel report concluded that the Council's conclusions in respect of the landscape and visual impact on the ADR's sites did not appear to be justified given the previous conclusions of the Green Belt Study. In this respect, we have previously submitted to the Council a detailed Landscape and Visual Appraisal relating to development of the Webheath ADR. In addition, Severn Trent Water confirmed at the examination that drainage capacity was not a 'show stopper' to development and could in fact be accommodated through modelling and appropriate contributions.</p> <p>Following comments relate to the 'negative aspects of potential development' identified in the consultation paper. <u>Poor accessibility to community facilities / Accessibility to public transport, the town centre and main employment sites is poor:</u> - An Accessibility Strategy has been</p>	<p>of the site can make this clear in Strategic Site policy.</p> <p>The SA was refreshed for the purposes of this joint consultation to assess the sustainability effects of the changes to aspects of Redditch's Core Strategy. Officers acknowledge that the WMRSS Phase 2 panel report specifically dismissed conclusions in respect of landscape and visual impact on the ADRs. The remit of the WYG 2 Report was not to provide the justification for exceptional circumstances to make alterations to the Green Belt boundary; this is to be done at a local level, although the landscape and visual conclusion of WYG2 remains valid evidence. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Noted. In comparison to other larger potential development sites in Redditch, access to employment, public transport, town centre and community facilities from the Webheath ADR is poorer and the SA reflects this. Officers welcome the suggestion that enhanced footpath</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>developed which concludes that the site is relatively close to the town centre and the proximity of other key destinations, along with good footpath, cycleway and public transport links would support this development to develop sustainable travel patterns.</p> <p>- It is proposed that an integral part of the proposals for this site will include enhanced footpath linkages and the provision of public transport which would serve both existing and future residents. It is therefore anticipated that as a result of development on this site, improved accessibility to local services and facilities would result.</p> <p><u>Maybe less preferable than other locations due to location in relation to services and Town Centre and impact on the relative environment surrounding the site:</u></p> <p>- Assumed that 'impact on the relative environment' is in reference to the potential visual impact of the development? A comprehensive landscape and visual appraisal has been carried out by the Cooper Partnership on behalf of Taylor Wimpey and Barratt Strategic. Proposals would retain most of the site vegetation and trees and would take place within that part of the Landscape Character Type overlooked by the urban edge of Redditch and as such this change is not judged significant. The landscape and visual impact assessment demonstrates that the site will only be visible from locations within 1.5km, with occasional glimpses from Hanbury, 6km south west. The landscape and visual</p>	<p>linkages and public transport could help with the issue of sustainable travel patterns especially for the existing community.</p> <p>In comparison with other larger potential development sites in Redditch, access to the Town Centre is poorer from the Webheath ADR. The visual impact of development will, to some extent, be noticeable, which is inevitable given the nature of the site and the topography in Redditch's South West Green Belt. The reference to the environmental impacts of the site does refer principally to the landscape and visual effects of development in a site with prominent view to and from the site. Officers consider that the landscape character type is not the determining factor of a sites potential for development, the possible visual containment of sites is more relevant.</p> <p>Officers query the conclusion of the Landscape and Visual Assessment that <i>'there would be no long term landscape</i></p>	<p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	assessment concludes that the site is suitable for development and that there would be no long term landscape or visual impacts as a result of the proposed development. Development would cause no significant impact on landscape character and as with any sites being considered there would be moderately significant long term impacts on the landform and on tranquillity.	<i>and visual impacts</i> '. It is considered that development of a landscape that is currently Principal Timber Farmland will inevitably cause a permanent change.	
287 HUGHES	<p>Objects to development in Webheath: - development would seriously damage this beautiful conservation area</p> <p>- lack of suitable infrastructure - insufficient local amenities</p> <p>- local schools are already over-subscribed, which already causes traffic problems</p> <p>- would very much like to see this land returned to Green Belt status</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Webheath is not a conservation area. There are two designated conservation areas in Redditch Borough – in the town centre and Feckenham.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>None</p>
288	7000 houses is excessive and	The housing target consulted upon for	None

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
DAVIES	<p>disproportionate to the size of Redditch. The <u>need</u> for extra housing on such a large scale has not been proved. In future populations may decline, making large scale development unnecessary. Land should be preserved to provide for future food production.</p> <p>Our countryside should be treated as a precious and irreplaceable resource for aesthetic, recreational and health reasons.</p>	<p>Redditch was based on the projected needs for the Borough, which are well evidenced. It is not realistic to assume that the population will reduce to the extent where no extra housing will be required. Food production can take place on land without any intervention from the planning system or preservation of land.</p> <p>Although greenfield land will be required to be able to sustain population growth, it is necessary to ensure that measures to improve recreational opportunity and health are implemented on sites or contributions towards this are sought from developers where this is relevant, which can be a benefit of development.</p>	None
289 DAVIES	<p>The vast scale of the proposed development will create a huge area of new housing to the detriment of existing residents. To build new housing on such a large scale is unsustainable, especially over such a short time period. The necessity for building and increasing the town's population by at least 20% must be thoroughly investigated.</p> <p>What evidence is there that the population will continue to rise?</p> <p>In 50 years time many of these new homes could be redundant</p>	<p>The development targets consulted upon for Redditch Borough were based on projected need and past trends of population growth. Development targets cover the period up until 2026, so development would not happen over a short time period.</p> <p>The population predictions for Redditch are based upon the latest projections from the Office of National Statistics.</p> <p>The 7000 houses consulted upon were to meet Redditch's locally generated need, so it is likely that they will be occupied, however it is accepted that in this timeframe other areas of Redditch may</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	Britain imports a high proportion of its food. How can future food supplies be guaranteed if farm land is no longer available?	have redevelopment opportunities. The possible development sites within Redditch are not agricultural sites, neither is the soil of a good quality. The size of the sites is not likely to have any effects on food production.	None.
291 PORTMAN	<p>Webheath ADR unsuitable for residential development :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - should be changed back to Green Belt - lanes are not designed for traffic - there are no pavements - additional traffic from new homes will cause chaos - local infrastructure is inadequate for such a large no. of extra people - WMRSS target of 7000 is unrealistic and should be recalculated - there are much better suited sites which have infrastructure in place that RBC could utilise 	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development.</p> <p>The housing target consulted upon for Redditch this is based on the projected need of the Borough and 400 was to be delivered within Redditch.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
293 LEE	Object to option Webheath/Foxlydiate -This area in Brockhill is bordered by Parklands Close and Diary Lane and is used as a recreational area	The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the	Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- The land itself suffers from flooding</p> <p>- the land sustains birds and wildlife</p> <p>- Road connections along Brockhill Drive to Bromsgrove and to Birmingham are getting congested and traffic improvements will require major expenditure as a result of this development.</p> <p>- Redditch's population has increased from 30,000 to 75,000 – why is Redditch being subjected to this and not an area closer to Bromsgrove which hasn't received it's fair quota, even though it has a far larger area land available and has access to the M5 and main railway</p>	<p>strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of any potential development and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of development. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The development targets for Redditch Borough are based on projected need. Bromsgrove District also has development targets to accommodate elsewhere in the district. One of the reasons why the Regional Spatial Strategy set lower targets in some areas like Bromsgrove is because of the issue of people migrating from the West Midlands conurbation to Bromsgrove linked with an aim to try and reduce this migration. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to</p>	<p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.	
294 COOMBS	<p>With regard to the need for 7000 new homes in and around Redditch, given that Webheath residents were told during 'Local Plan No. 3' that population growth is on the decline, this number is too high.</p> <p>As this is a mandatory requirement dictated by the RSS. More thought is required on the location and logistics of delivering this absurd number, 7000 properties, to satisfy an unelected body.</p> <p>Support for building on brownfield sites, local infill, further development on Brockhill ADR (support further road and service infrastructure to service extra housing however there are issues with drainage) and development at Bordesley Green Belt (next to the A441 and B4101, providing access to local amenities and the town centre).</p>	<p>Between 1991 and 2001 the population of Redditch grew at a slower rate than had been projected but did not decline. Population projections predict that the population will increase up until 2026.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>There should be residential dwellings added to the proposal for the new Abbey Stadium complex. Maybe residential apartments to maximise the land available.</p> <p>Build on the Pitcher Oak Golf Course (could accommodate 100+ dwellings).</p> <p>Have reservations against development at A435 Corridor ADR as it is next to the A435 trunk road which has inherent problems.</p> <p>Have reservations for development at the Brockhill Green Belt. The Brockhill ADR could be extended into the Bromsgrove Authority Green Belt area however this again will require an extension to the current road and services infrastructure and may exacerbate the already identified flooding issue within Brockhill.</p>	<p>Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium have recently been approved by the Council's planning committee.</p> <p>Pitcher Oak Golf Course is designated Open Space and a designated Special Wildlife Site (SWS). Current planning policy prohibits development on such sites unless there are no reasonable alternatives and the reasons for development clearly outweigh the value of the open space/SWS. This has not been demonstrated for this site; therefore Pitcher Oak Golf Course will be maintained as open space/SWS.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Should the site be progressed as a development site, the A435 ADR access will be required from Redditch roads at Far Moor Lane and Claybrook Drive, thus minimising negative effects associated with accessing directly on to the A435.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Against development at Webheath ADR because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local road infrastructure - Existing road infrastructure (Foxlydiate, Pumphouse Lane, Church Rd, Heathfield Rd, Blackstitch, Green Lane and Crumpfield Lane) would all need to be upgraded to accommodate approximately 1400 vehicles (two per household) - Results of Local Plan No.3 recommend that this ADR should revert to Green Belt - Sewerage and waste water would need to be pumped out of the area - Local schools would need to be expanded to accommodate the 	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Local Plan No.3 did not recommend the ADR be designated as Green Belt; it recommended that it be designated as ADR, with potential for development after the previous plan period. Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements will be considered in the Webheath</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>influx of approximately 700 school age children (1 child per household)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With 700+ houses and associated new road and paving infrastructure there is increased risk of flooding down towards Norgrove House, Ellcotesbrook (<i>officers assume Elcocks brook</i>) and Feckenham as the Webheath ADR has a water course which concentrates all run-off water from the existing housing at the top of Webheath - Building of houses in the proposed Foxlydiate Green Belt would also affect Webheath traffic and schooling - Flora and fauna will be destroyed - If 3000 homes are needed to be 	<p>development.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site-specific flood risk assessment be conducted to assess potential flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding issues are an important consideration but may not necessarily prohibit development. The ADR has an estimated capacity of around 600 dwellings not more than 700 dwellings.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary</p>	<p>Complete Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>built in the Bromsgrove authority area then the proposed build in Foxlydiate to the west of the A448 has inadequate road and services infrastructure and again would need sewage pumped from the area. Currs Lane and Foxlydiate Lane would require substantial upgrade to accommodate the extra traffic as would all roads around Webheath.</p> <p>Who will build the updates for the road infrastructure – will this be centrally funded or will Worcestershire County Council need to ask all residents to pay via increased rates.</p> <p>Although Redditch requires more housing, being dictated to by an unelected body is out of order. Redditch Borough Council should decide where and what is required and elicit the support of the local electorate.</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council will break its own promise to be cleaner and greener by building on Green Belt land.</p>	<p>development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. All of the options would require necessary infrastructure to be in place to enable development.</p> <p>Depending on the infrastructure needed it will usually be funded by the developer but there are other sources of funding for major infrastructure if it is required.</p> <p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The Core Strategy endeavours to maintain the levels of designated open space within Redditch Borough in accordance with the Open Space Needs Assessment (2009). The opportunities to access better quality green infrastructure will be investigated and can be included within new development areas. The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development</p>	<p>to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets	
295 SOUTHWORTH 296 SOUTHWORTH	<p>Support for development adjacent to A448, the Bromsgrove Highway. This area has good road access and would necessitate improvement in public transport. Object to the two options either side of the A441 that is east or west of the Birmingham Road. The A441 is already inadequate when local commuter traffic is heavy and despite some improvements to flood drainage in the Abbey Stadium area problems still arise in adverse weather conditions and further mass building in the surrounding area would exacerbate these.</p> <p>It would bring Redditch and Bromsgrove demographically closer and there is no obvious boundary to potential further development. This strategy would provide a much needed mix of housing, shops and schools sufficiently close to Redditch and Bromsgrove Town Centres.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>There is no need or requirement to bring the two towns demographically closer although efforts are always made to maintain a significant Green Belt gap between the settlements. All of the suggested options were closer to Redditch town centre and as the development is to meet Redditch's needs, proximity to Bromsgrove town centre is not a consideration.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p>
297 LANE	<p>Concerns over the amount of development that is proposed for Redditch up to 2026, but accept it is inevitable with a growing population. To continue as we are it is not sustainable in the long term and people's quality of life will go down, this problem is not in just Redditch.</p> <p>Area around Pumphouse Lane in Webheath</p>	<p>The development targets consulted upon for Redditch Borough were based on projected needs.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>should not have anymore development as the character of old hedgerows and oaks would be lost. There is important wildlife around here with breeding spotted Flylatchers (a rapidly declining bird nationally) and white-letter Hairstreak Butterfly. Development should not exceed too far towards Hewell Park/ Lake as this is another important wildlife area.</p> <p>Careful consideration should be given to developing brownfield sites as these can be better for wildlife than Green Belt and can also be turned into valuable resources for people such as parks or local nature reserves. This needs to be considered in future development.</p>	<p>within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. Opportunities to access better quality green infrastructure will be investigated and can be included within new development areas.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete an analysis of available ecological information for the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>None</p>
298 SMITH	<p>Object to 600 new houses in Webheath, bordering Pumphouse Lane and Crumpfields Lane. Reasons for objecting are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the feeder roads to the new development area i.e. Foxlydiate Lane, Heathfield Rd and Blackstitch Lane are not suitable. Foxlydiate Lane is too narrow for the volume of traffic it carries at present. Additional traffic would make it extremely dangerous. The footpath along the lane is not continuous – it is necessary to cross the road three times to walk the length of the lane. The lane is currently used as a ‘rat run’ by HGVs and people driving too quickly. The lane is unsuitable for HGVs. An extra 1200 new cars 	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment for Redditch.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>using Foxlydiate Lane increasing the danger to residents and pedestrians. Heathfield Rd is equally narrow, due to parked cars and being a residential road and is unsuitable. Blackstitch Lane, although wider is also residential. Additional traffic on any of these roads is dangerous and not viable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The designation of Webheath ADR should be changed back to Green Belt . It should not be built upon as was recommended by consultants White Young Green in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy Document. - There are no services in the Webheath area to provide for a large number of new residents. There is no public transport, GPs or medical services. Local schools may not be able to meet the needs of children living in the proposed new housing. There is only one shop in the area, which may or may not survive, depending on national plans for sub-post offices. - Building in this area would mean a loss of amenity for the people of Redditch. There are so few green and accessible rural areas in Redditch that this would be a real loss. 	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. It was not within the remit of the WYG study to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances why there should be Green Belt alterations.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>Any new development will be required to provide open space in accordance with the Open Space Needs Assessment (2009). Opportunities to access better quality green infrastructure will be investigated and can be included within</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- The land is low lying and building houses there is not environmentally friendly. Sewage would have to be pumped uphill. The water table would change and that together with run-off from the 600 new driveways would increase the risk of flooding in the area. Countryside would be destroyed and habitats for wildlife would be lost</p> <p>The target of 7,000 houses for Redditch is too high and should not be accepted, which are not needed for the existing population, which is not growing.</p>	<p>new development areas.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site-specific flood risk assessment be conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development and outline mitigation measures where necessary. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development. It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements will be considered for the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>The housing targets consulted upon for Redditch were based on the projected need of the Borough. The need is based upon the latest population projections, which indicate that the population of Redditch is growing. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to</p>	<p>Complete Level 2 SFRA. Complete an analysis of available ecological information. Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>There are not jobs in the area for the people who would live in the proposed houses, who are likely to commute. Redditch needs starter homes and social housing for its existing population and the next generation of Redditch people. These houses should be built where there is existing infrastructure or where this can be part of the development, near public transport and other services.</p> <p>Brockhill can be developed further. Development of older gas works is good and should guide the improvement of other parts of the Town Centre (Smallwood Health Centre should be demolished and the area used for small affordable housing).</p>	<p>debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The housing provided will be a variety of tenure and price in accordance with the requirements of PPS 3 (Housing). Accompanying employment land will also need to be provided to ensure economic growth and jobs are provided in Redditch. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Smallwood Health Centre is part of a larger site that has been identified for mixed use redevelopment (as documented in the Church Road, Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document 2007)</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
299 O'CONNELL	<p>Option west of the A441: 3000 houses in this area would greatly increase road traffic on an already heavily used road. Not clear whether a dual carriageway would ease or exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>Option east of the A441: Would involve encroachment into Green Belt . Increased road traffic would necessitate widening the B4101 and elimination of the bends leading up to Icknield Street plus improvement of the drainage.</p> <p>Option adjacent to the A448: This area is neither prone to flooding nor designated as an area of natural beauty. Existing A449 dual carriageway permits development of an enhanced local road network and access to facilities in Redditch, Bromsgrove, Birmingham and Worcester. The number of houses could be increased beyond 3,000 in due course without major infrastructure upgrade.</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
300 PHILLIPS	<p>Appreciate that Redditch will have a need for more housing but it seems totally unreasonable for the bulk to be built on the north and west sides of the town.</p> <p>Assume that Bromsgrove has its own</p>	<p>A study into the future growth implications of Redditch (WYG1) examined all areas around the urban area of Redditch and found that development to the north and/or west of the town would be the most sustainable. There are other environmental, transport and delivery constraints to development in the South and East of Redditch, which make delivery of large-scale development impossible.</p> <p>The 3000 houses on the Redditch</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>housing target and it seems if Redditch 'accepts' 3000 houses on its boundary, it is taking on significant obligations and costs, whereas it only assists Bromsgrove in reaching its targets.</p> <p>Traffic: Brockhill Drive and Windsor Road have seen increasing traffic and further development along this corridor will make the traffic worse.</p> <p>Flooding: Flooding is a serious problem on the River Arrow where it passes under Birmingham Road and on the Batchley Brook. Recent drainage work at Windsor Road/Birmingham Road junction has not improved the situation. Development of Brockhill ADR and Green Belt in Redditch and Bromsgrove in this area will exacerbate surface water runoff, flooding Batchley and Riverside.</p> <p>Wildlife: Development of options adjacent to the A448 and west of the A441 could affect Brockhill Wood.</p> <p>Visibility:</p>	<p>boundary in Bromsgrove Green Belt were to meet the needs of Redditch. Bromsgrove District has a separate housing target to be met elsewhere in the District. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development and outline mitigation measures where necessary. Flooding is an issue to consider but with suitable measures in place to mitigate the risk, it may not be a constraint to development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy, which will identify any constraints to potential development.</p> <p>All of Redditch's ADR are visible from the</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete the SFRA Level 2.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Redditch has enough highly visible development already; future development should avoid spoiling the views we have.</p> <p>Would accept limited development in Brockhill ADR and Brockhill Green Belt (in Redditch) but oppose Bromsgrove Green Belt areas. Greater consideration should be taken into the Bromsgrove Green Belt area west of the A448 and linking to the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the south-west of Redditch and the east of the A435 in Stratford District.</p>	<p>existing town and it is inevitable that there will be views two and from one or some of the sites because of the nature of Redditch's topography. Sensitive treatment of these sites will be required to ensure good quality views to and from the sites are created and some of this can be informed by the Redditch Green Infrastructure Strategy</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>A study into the future growth implications of Redditch (WYG1) examined all areas around the urban area of Redditch and found that development to the north and/or west of the town would be the most sustainable. There are other environmental, transport and delivery constraints to development in the South and East of Redditch, which make delivery of large-scale development impossible.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None.</p>
301	Aware that there are other options in	An objective of the WMRSS (3.9 para d)	Further consultation on Core

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
WILLETS	<p>Bromsgrove District available to provide housing not in the Green Belt. Option west of the A441 is an area of great beauty.</p> <p>Why the over-riding desire to join up Redditch and Birmingham? Not needed.</p>	<p>was “to retain the Green Belt but to allow an adjustment of boundaries where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated either to support urban regeneration or to allow for the most sustainable form of development to deliver the specific housing proposals referred to in the sub regional implications of the strategy”. In addition paragraph 3.65 “with limited development capacity within the Town itself this will require extensions to the urban area including provision in adjoining districts with implications for Green Belt”. Bromsgrove District has separate development targets that will be achieved in other locations. The Redditch related development consulted upon is to serve Redditch's needs to be provided adjacent to Redditch's boundary. However, the delivery of cross boundary development is now uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>There is no desire to join up Redditch and Birmingham. Efforts will be made to maintain significant Green Belt gaps between Redditch and Bromsgrove/ Birmingham in the selection of strategic sites to meet Redditch development targets.</p>	<p>Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Ensure that maintenance of Green Belt gaps between Redditch and surrounding settlements is a consideration in Strategic Site selection.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>There are numerous other areas in the Redditch area that could be progressed for this development. Why not these and/or brownfield sites?</p> <p>Are any people already resident in the area in favour?</p> <p>Not happy with the consultation process, people have not had the opportunity to meet with the people making the decision.</p>	<p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough including brownfield sites and some greenfield sites because of a lack of available brownfield sites.</p> <p>There have been representations in support of development options received during this consultation period including from existing residents.</p> <p>There were a number of drop-in sessions during the consultation period that were well attended by residents. Newspaper and website notices advertised that the planning officers at Redditch would be available during office hours to talk about the consultation and residents did take this opportunity. Members of the Council are always accessible to members of the public.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
302 HALL	<p>Previous plan dismiss Norgrove and Foxlydiate as development locations (reasons provided). It was considered that improvements were needed to road, sewerage and education, none of these have materialised.</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
303 HOWIE	<p>Object to Bordesley proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building 3000 houses by the Birmingham Rd would ruin Bordesley and the surrounding area - Birmingham Road is a very busy Road and this many houses would considerably add to this. - The land would be far better used for farming to help feed the growing population 	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an issue with flooding in this area - There are more suitable sites for housing 		
304 HAYWARD	<p>Object to Webheath ADR proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - infrastructure is already under stress with recent housing development at the NW end of Church Rd. Before further development is contemplated there should be upgrade to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ease 'traffic congestion in Heathfield Rd b) bring the SE end of Church Rd up to the same standard as its NW end in terms of a carriageway enhancement and pavement provision to ensure pedestrian safety - Green Belt status should be restored to as consultants consider Webheath ADR unsuitable for future development - RBC has a progressive record of Brownfield sites e.g. railway land, derelict factories and sites and garden development. Piecemeal projects of this sort put less strain on the infrastructure than the proposed mass housing scheme for Webheath 	<p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough. However, cumulatively, development of all of these sites will mean that new infrastructure will be needed. The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
305 HARRISON	<p>Webheath ADR should be returned to Green Belt to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maintain the character of our village - to protect flora and fauna - to protect the safety of country lanes 	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The qualities of the type mentioned by the respondent when</p>	<p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- Building a large housing estate will ruin this lovely area</p> <p>- we do not have the infrastructure in the village to take any more inhabitants</p>	<p>assessed on any piece of land do not fall within the purposes of including land in Green Belt , in accordance with PPG2 Green Belt s.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>307 J. SMITH MP</p>	<p>Object to these plans being developed by both RBC and BDC – plans have little in common apart from a political pact to merge senior management functions and now policies</p> <p>Object to Webheath ADR development: - in recent months, since the two Conservative Councils started collaborating the Bordesley site (which is on Bromsgrove land and has a large capacity) has been dropped as an option and Webheath ADR has come back to the fore. Support for Bordesley option as Labour colleagues on RBC have also raised concerns over Webheath option. Both Bordesley and Ravensbank developments (though on Bromsgrove land) will look like they are an integral part of Redditch. Both should become part of Redditch for clarity and fairness in terms of to which council</p>	<p>The Councils were required to work together to resolve the cross-boundary planning issues, regardless of the joint management functions. The Core Strategies will continue to be separate for Bromsgrove and Redditch.</p> <p>The residential and employment development targets for Redditch Borough were split: 4000 dwellings within the Borough and 3000 dwellings in Bromsgrove District adjacent to the Redditch Borough boundary. The Webheath ADR site is within Redditch which, should this site be progressed for development, would be to meet Redditch's needs within the Borough. The cross-boundary option in Bordesley is not an alternative to Webheath because it was an option to meet the cross-boundary development requirements that would also be needed to meet Redditch's needs.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>residents pay their Council Tax.</p> <p>Object to development on Webheath ADR: - restricted road infrastructure and upgrading the infrastructure to serve new development</p> <p>- local schools, new doctor's services and shops are at capacity</p> <p>- difficulty removing foul water from buildings on the development</p> <p>- the site is hilly</p>	<p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Council tax is not a matter for the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p> <p>Topography is a consideration but not necessarily a constraint to potential</p>	<p>To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Should the relevant sites be progressed for development, investigate the potential to incorporate high sustainability measures of delivering a suitable sewerage system for relevant strategic sites.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- the site is distant from the town centre making trips to many services unfriendly to the environment and more difficult for those without cars</p> <p>- Webheath ADR does not support the maximum use of Brownfield development for sustainable and affordable housing.</p> <p>- We must get the balance of housing provision right. Housing mix should reflect our local communities. Redditch needs 234 affordable homes built per year – only 53 were built last year. Wish to see a higher proportion of affordable and rented housing than some other Worcester towns.</p> <p>- amenities must be right – we need better sporting facilities – especially swimming</p> <p>- bus routes should be supported to any new significant developments</p> <p>- hospitals and schools must be able to deal</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge this is a disadvantage to the site. The transport assessment will make recommendations regarding provisions for more sustainable modes of transport should this site be progressed for development.</p> <p>The SHLAA and ELR identify all potential sites for development within Redditch Borough and a shortage of brownfield sites means that some greenfield development will be inevitable. Affordable housing could be provided on the Webheath ADR should this site be progressed for development.</p> <p>The type, size and tenure of housing required is set out in the Borough's Housing Needs Assessment.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will need to be in place to enable any development. Proposals for the redevelopment of the Abbey Stadium, inclusive of a new swimming pool facility have recently been granted planning permission.</p> <p>New bus routes should be supported where appropriate.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in</p>	<p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>with the increase in population and our roads with the traffic</p> <p>- environment must be protected from new developments and opportunities must be taken to insist on environmentally friendly specifications for housing stock.</p> <p>- would like to see better provision for car parking on new developments</p> <p>- would like to see disabled access adaptations built in as new</p> <p>- the area around Redditch Train Station is an eye sore and an embarrassment – the area adjacent to the station has potential to be redeveloped</p> <p>- any planning restrictions on these sites should be lifted</p>	<p>place to enable any development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to development. The Core Strategy for Redditch will ensure that new development in the Borough is built to high environmental standards by ensuring that it is in line with the national requirements for the Code for Sustainable Homes.</p> <p>Car parking provision will need to be provided in line with the Council's adopted car parking standards.</p> <p>The Core Strategy for Redditch will require that new developments (over 5 dwellings) meet the Building for Life Standards. One of the criteria of the Building for Life Scheme is to consider whether "internal spaces and layout allow for adaptation, conversion or extension".</p> <p>The Edward Street site near the train station is a Strategic Site within the Redditch Core Strategy which is planned for redevelopment.</p>	<p>Delivery Plan. To complete the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
<p>308 CENTRO</p>	<p>No preference towards any of the proposed schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - important to have strong correlations between objectives of proposed schemes and WMRSS especially policies T1-T12, the Regional Transport Strategy and the West Midlands Local Transport Plan - proposals should be implemented and well served by high quality public transport services. High quality public transport can contribute to climate change emissions; promote accessible developments and sustainable regeneration. - CENTRO are happy to assist with any cross boundary issues - Redditch falls within the West Midlands 'journey to work' area - so residents of any new development must have access to regional services and wider employment and education opportunities - Cross boundary issues should be given further consideration – rail station has been earmarked for improved rail services. Network Rail is committed to increase the frequency of train services which will increase the capacity of the Cross City Line and cope with new housing developments in the area. 	<p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Councils appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. It is envisaged that the transport evidence used in the preparation of the Phase Two revision of the RSS will be relied upon in evidencing Core Strategy policies and objectives.</p> <p>Noted. Officers will engage with Centro as appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. Redditch has high levels of accessibility and the location of its train station and accessibility to it is very good. It is agreed that the proximity to the town centre and transport links is a key determinant in strategic site selection.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. Officers are aware of the railway improvements.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>
<p>309 LUMLEY/ REDDITCH COUNTY</p>	<p>Disagree with the RSS and think that local councils should decide where and how many new houses should be built in their</p>	<p>In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Councils</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
CONSERVATIVES	<p>area. 7000 houses is not correct. If these houses were built, very strong concerns that they would not be occupied by Redditch residents.</p> <p>Webheath ADR: extremely concerned about infrastructure issues and the cost of preparing the land for development. Long standing issues of flooding that have not been addressed.</p> <p>Brockhill has a problem already where there are no local facilities of schools.</p>	<p>appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>The use of the ADRs and Green Belt within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development in any location. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development and outline mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any potential development.</p>	<p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. A Level 1 SFRA has been completed. To complete Level 2 SFRA.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
310 MELLEY	<p>Objects to development at Webheath ADR: Some roads are already congested, which would get worse with more residents. The two first schools in Webheath are already over subscribed are at the recommended maximum size. Where will children from new houses go to school?</p>	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. To complete the Transport Assessment. To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Previous investigations into the suitability of the area have said that major improvements would be needed to the water and sewage services but this seems to have disappeared as a problem now, how can this be?</p>	<p>place to enable any potential development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement these system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites. Severn Trent Water has indicated that there is financial provision for necessary works in their financial programmes.</p>	<p>Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p>
<p>311 WHITE</p>	<p>Object to the need to build 7000 new homes in and around Redditch up to 2026</p> <p>- Green Belt and open space land should be preserved</p> <p>- New houses should be affordable, social housing and not be 4 and 5 bedroom houses which encourages people from out of town to move here</p>	<p>The development targets consulted upon for Redditch Borough were based on projected need. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p> <p>Given the shortfall of brownfield sites for development in Redditch it is inevitable that some greenfield land will be developed in this plan period.</p> <p>All large developments are required to provide an element of affordable housing. The type, size and tenure required of these properties are set out in the Housing Needs Assessment.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>- So much land for employment should not be used</p> <p>- Factory and office units are lying empty everywhere – why build more?</p> <p>- These proposals would change Redditch forever and are unnecessary. These plans should be refused.</p>	<p>It is necessary to have employment land to ensure a balance between housing and employment and that Redditch achieves its aims for economic prosperity.</p> <p>Where employment units are currently vacant, it is the Council's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes. The employment required will aim to meet the needs of prospective employers.</p> <p>Development in any area is required to meet the demand and needs for the changing population.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
312 WHITE	<p>Do not believe Redditch needs 7000 houses. Birth rate is not increasing in Redditch apart from the immigrant population.</p> <p>Need social housing for families on the waiting list.</p> <p>Many houses are standing empty in Redditch.</p> <p>Not prepared to see Green Belt land and other green spaces in Redditch be developed. Wildlife and their habitats have</p>	<p>The development targets consulted upon for Redditch were based on projected local need. The latest population projections evidence that Redditch's population is increasing but that this is related to natural growth and not in-migration.</p> <p>Developments will be required to provide an element of affordable housing in accordance with the appropriate Housing Needs Assessment.</p> <p>There are a limited number of empty homes in Redditch which could contribute towards meeting development targets.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Complete an ecological assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>already been reduced. Redditch has seen a great deal of development since the 1960's on green spaces.</p> <p>Surely all empty offices and industrial units could and should be occupied instead.</p> <p>There are empty shops in the Kingfisher centre, by the old market, and other parts of the town centre and on Mount Pleasant. No more shops are required to be built.</p>	<p>which will identify any constraints to development. Given Redditch's capacity constraints it is inevitable that some land on greenfield sites is developed as there are not enough brownfield sites within the Borough.</p> <p>Where employment units are currently vacant, it is the Council's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes.</p> <p>There are a minimal number of empty retail units both in and outside the Kingfisher Centre. The growth in population in Redditch's catchment area is projected to create a high demand for new retail and this needs to be provided o enable regeneration in Redditch Town Centre.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
313 FRIENDS OF THE EARTH	<p>Questions how we mitigate the long term locking-in of the high carbon nature of any new housing?</p> <p>There should be a greater intensity of land that has already been developed (higher densities and building houses on 3 levels).</p>	<p>The Core Strategy will seek to ensure that the effects of new housing in particular the amount of carbon emitted from new dwellings is significantly reduced. This will be achieved by ensuring that new housing is built to the nationally required standard of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Code requires new dwellings to reduce the amount of carbon emitted in the construction and running of a new home. It is anticipated that by 2016 all new housing will be zero-carbon.</p> <p>Within Redditch, development will be at differing densities in order to achieve the types of housing required for the Borough.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Car ownership should be reduced; the dependence on the car should be designed out.</p> <p>Space around housing should be better used for food growing, on a communal level or on an occupier owned level, growing food on and around housing.</p> <p>Who are we building housing for? Where are we in terms of affordability of the housing? Where is the social dividend? What are the real needs of the communities (rather than perceived needs)? Will the housing be run by Registered Social Landlords?</p> <p>Best practice cases should be used as examples.</p> <p>Need to link together land use, transport and other infrastructure. Design out the need for people to be moving around being car dependant.</p> <p>Housing that is low carbon, zero carbon and generative power should be achieved to</p>	<p>In some instances higher densities will not reflect the nature of the character of the surrounding area and it is not recommended to increase density where this is the case.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will promote modal shift and reduction of car use but car ownership cannot be controlled through the planning system.</p> <p>The Core Strategy does not prohibit growing food around housing.</p> <p>Large housing developments will be required to provide an element of affordable housing which is usually managed by a Registered Social Landlord. In terms of the services and facilities required, these will need to be provided to enable any development to happen.</p> <p>Although each individual site is different, there is always scope to consider incorporating best practice ideas into development proposals.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will promote modal shift and reduction of car use. Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development.</p> <p>The Core Strategy for Redditch will ensure that new development in the</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>None</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	ensure economic environmental sustainability.	Borough is built to high environmental standards by ensuring that new development is in line with the national requirements for the Code for Sustainable Homes, this includes the aim for residential dwellings to be zero carbon by 2016.	
314 SAMBROOK	<p>Object to new housing in Webheath because WYG reported within the Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation (page 6) that Webheath ADR is unsuitable for future development, Webheath ADR must be changed to Green Belt land as promised by Redditch Borough Council.</p> <p>The infrastructure will not sustain further housing, the road system cannot cope. There are lanes and not roads and no pavement.</p>	<p>The WYG report was a piece of evidence commissioned by Bromsgrove, Redditch and Stratford on Avon Councils, Worcestershire County Council, and the West Midlands Regional Assembly. The Preferred Draft Core Strategy is a separate document and a draft stage in Redditch's Core Strategy process. The WMRSS Phase II Revision Examination in Public considered the recommendations of the WYG study 'Future growth implications of Redditch Stage 2', however the Inspectors Panel Report (September 2009) did not accept these recommendations. Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable any development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. To complete the Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Pumping sewerage uphill is not friendly to the environment or sustainable.</p> <p>Flash flooding will decrease protected species i.e. newts, bats and orchids.</p> <p>The RSS target of 7,000 houses is too high and the jobs market in Redditch is one of the highest in the midlands. Building such a large amount of properties would add unnecessary pressure to the jobs market.</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>It will be a requirement of the Developer to consider the sewerage system required, and subsequently to implement the system. Officers acknowledge that a pumping mechanism is less sustainable and additional sustainability requirements can be implemented to compensate for this on relevant sites.</p> <p>An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site specific flood risk assessment is conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will also outline mitigation measures.</p> <p>The housing target for Redditch presented for consultation was based on the projected needs of the Borough. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth.</p>	<p>Should the Webheath ADR be promoted for development, officers Should Webheath ADR be pursued as a development area, consider additional sustainability requirements necessary.</p> <p>Complete an analysis of available ecological information. To complete the SFRA Level 2</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
		<p>The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this. There is also a target for the provision of employment land which also needs to be allocated to ensure a balance between housing and employment.</p>	
<p>315 WAG DVD</p>	<p>Strong opposition to the development of Webheath ADR as it is currently open fields, with wildlife, green fields, and nature and countryside views. There are many transport reasons against development of Webheath ADR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - roads cannot cope, more traffic will lead to a 'rat run' for commuters, dangerous drivers, 500 extra vehicles caused by housing development in Great Hockings Lane and Pump House Lane - Accidents on Middle Piece Drive - narrow footpaths on Crumpfields Lane - Blackstitch Lane cannot cope due to parking, 'rat run' for commuters', parking for parents to walk children to Webheath first school - Heathfield Road is a bottleneck with hazardous parking, reversing on pavements and clogged roads due to Post Office, Shops and Village Hall - Church Road is a narrow County Road with no parking - Foxlydiate Lane is busy with dips and bends, there is a safety issue 	<p>The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets. An analysis of available ecological information will be carried out as part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy which will identify any constraints to potential development. A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR. Where members of the public deem an area to be unsafe they should contact the Worcestershire County Council Collision Safety Investigation Team directly. However the County Council have indicated that the Webheath is not a particular concern in terms of accidents.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered. Complete an analysis of available ecological information. To complete the Transport Assessment.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>due to obstacles, no pavements and cars parked near junctions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crumpfields Lane 30mph speed limit is not adhered to, lorries turn and overtake and there are no footpaths 		
<p>318 WEBHEATH NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUP MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>WYG Report recommended that Webheath ADR should not be developed and should be returned to Green Belt.</p> <p>Concerns about whether existing road network in Webheath could cope with increased traffic. WYG Report states that existing road infrastructure would require 'significant upgrade'. Specific concern about Foxlydiate Lane which seems too narrow to cope with traffic</p> <p>Concerns that supportive infrastructure will not delivered due to financial constraints</p> <p>Concerns over additional risks of flooding at Norgrove Court as a result of further residential development.</p>	<p>Webheath ADR has never been designated as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in this location. The use of the ADRs within Redditch and other sites for development will be consulted upon in the Core Strategy alongside the potential development targets.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment will be completed which will assess traffic implications of potential development on the Webheath ADR.</p> <p>Necessary infrastructure will have to be in place to enable development. Depending on the infrastructure needed it will usually be funded by the developer but there are other sources of funding for major infrastructure if it is required.</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 has recommended that a site-specific flood risk assessment be conducted to assess flood risk to the site. Development at Webheath ADR would</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>To complete a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>To complete an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Complete Level 2 SFRA</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	Joint Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Does Redditch Borough Council have any influence over where Bromsgrove District Council allocates land to develop housing for Redditch?</p> <p>Should growth demand be reviewed in light of the economic downturn?</p>	<p>satisfy the Sequential Test within Planning Policy Statement 25 'Development and Flood Risk'. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 will assess the impact of potential development and outline mitigation measures where necessary.</p> <p>The delivery of cross boundary development is uncertain given emerging changes to the planning system and the revocation of the RSS. However, location of any cross-boundary development would be decided through joint working between the two authorities.</p> <p>The housing target for Redditch presented for consultation was based on the projected needs of the Borough. It should be noted that the plan period runs up to 2026, therefore this takes into account peaks and troughs in the market. In light of the revocation of the RSS announced on 6th July 2010 there is now the opportunity to debate the Borough and District's appropriate level of growth. The Councils therefore will look to re-consult on their respective Core Strategies and the level of development to be delivered and the strategic locations for this.</p>	<p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p> <p>Further consultation on Core Strategies and level of development to be delivered.</p>

The following representations relate to the Winyates Green Triangle site. This site was not presented for the purposes of this consultation; however Stratford on Avon District Council was consulting on its Draft Core Strategy at the same time. A small number of representations were received by RBC regarding the site; these representations were forwarded to Stratford on Avon District Council officers but are summarised here for information.

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	RBC Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
319 SMITH	<p>The reasons for not allowing residential development years ago must still be relevant, i.e. loss of habitat for wild animals/birds; destruction of ancient hedgerows; traffic on to Far Moor Lane. Roads will not cope with the additional traffic.</p> <p>How will industrial development meet the employment needs of Redditch? Vacant units all over Redditch and at Ravensbank.</p>	<p>A Transportation Study for the Winyates Green Triangle site has been undertaken which evidences that access to the site is difficult and expensive. An ecological Assessment is also being carried out which indicates that there are a number of constraints to development. Therefore delivery of development on this site is likely to be unviable.</p> <p>Where employment units are currently vacant it is RBC's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes. There is an identified need to plan for further economic growth for the Borough of Redditch.</p>	<p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p> <p>None</p>
320 CPRE	<p>The Special Wildlife Site designation to the west of the site should be extended in to the triangle. The triangle must remain open space.</p> <p>The ADR at Ravensbank would be a better location for a Diversification Park. Far Moor Lane is not suitable for HGVs. An environmental survey should be completed as there have been vole sightings.</p> <p>As an ADR (to correspond with the A435 ADR) it would allow scope for the suitability</p>	<p>It is not within the remit of the Core Strategy to designate Special Wildlife Sites. An ecological assessment is being carried out which indicates that there are a number of constraints to development.</p> <p>The need for development in this location was identified by the RSS Phase 2 Revision Panel Report and was considered necessary in addition to development at Ravensbank ADR. Transport and Ecological Studies that have now been undertaken indicate that delivery of development on this site is likely to be unviable.</p> <p>It is not the normal purpose of an ADR to safeguard land for the use as a Nature</p>	<p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p> <p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p> <p>None</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	RBC Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>of development of any part of the site to be assessed at some future date, e.g. the Triangle as a Nature Reserve, the allotments to be kept, the Holding Ponds enhanced and the Ridge and Furrow Reserve site also to be Open Space. CPRE support the retention of the Tree Belt along the A435. The A435 corridor lends itself to being a linear park</p> <p>There are empty industrial premises in Redditch, brownfield sites must be used first.</p> <p>The three residential districts in this area do not have access to a park or Public Open Space.</p>	<p>Reserve or Park. The normal purpose on ADR designation is to safeguard land for future development.</p> <p>Where employment units are currently vacant it is RBC's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes. There is an identified need to plan for further economic growth for the Borough of Redditch.</p> <p>Winyates Green Triangle is adjacent to Winyates Ward which does have a deficit in provision of open space in comparison to the Borough standard. However, the Open Space Needs Assessment identifies that there is unrestricted access to a number of parks and play areas in the ward.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
321 MCNERLIN	<p>Would ideally like it to be left free of development but if it has to be developed would prefer residential development. The site would be ideal for starter or housing association dwellings for young people. Would not like to see industrial units as Redditch has dozens of vacant units. Retail units in this area would have an impact on the residential area through increased traffic on already inadequate roads.</p>	<p>The need for employment development in this location was identified by the RSS Phase 2 Revision Panel Report and was considered necessary in addition to development at Ravensbank ADR. Transport and Ecological Studies that have now been undertaken indicate that delivery of development on this site is likely to be unviable. Where employment units are currently vacant it is RBC's aspiration that they are</p>	<p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>

Appendix A

Respondent No./Name	Summary of comments	RBC Officer response	Proposed action arising from the comment
	<p>Any development on the triangle would have a negative on the value of homes.</p>	<p>redeveloped for employment purposes. There is an identified need to plan for further economic growth for the Borough of Redditch.</p> <p>The value of homes is not a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>322 FARQUHAR</p>	<p>Neither Far Moor Lane nor the Coventry Highway is suitable for access roads without major road works. Far Moor Lane is already dangerous and tailbacks occur at peak times.</p> <p>Prior to cutting the fields were a haven for wildlife. Aggressive cutting of the fields should be halted.</p> <p>Hedgerows are used by nesting species; it would be disastrous to the wildlife if they were cut down for access.</p> <p>It would be inappropriate to develop a green field site when there are many vacant factories and offices in Redditch.</p> <p>There is poor public transport provision in the area and bus stops are inaccessible.</p> <p>The site would be well suited to a wildlife reserve with the re-introduction of pedestrian access.</p>	<p>The need for development in this location was identified by the RSS Phase 2 Revision Panel Report and was considered necessary in addition to development at Ravensbank ADR.</p> <p>Transport and Ecological Studies that have now been undertaken indicate that delivery of development on this site is likely to be unviable.</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council cannot control the way in which the fields are maintained (i.e. the way in which they are cut or accessed) as the land is not within the Council's ownership.</p> <p>Where employment units are currently vacant it is RBC's aspiration that they are redeveloped for employment purposes.</p> <p>There is an identified need to plan for further economic growth for the Borough of Redditch.</p>	<p>Do not progress Winyates Green Triangle as a Strategic Site.</p>