All Comments on the Pre- Submission Birmingham Plan 2031

To View Full Details of Comments Received, make a note of the Comment Reference Number (bp??) and Insert that Online

Comment Ref.	Full Name (private individual name not included)	Organisation Details	Agent Name	Agent Organisation	What is your comment? /Do you consider that the City Council has complied with the duty to co-operate in preparing the Plan? /Do you consider that the Plan is legally compliant?	What changes (if any) do you think should be made to the Plan to address your concerns?	Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?	Policy	Policy Ref.
bp4					In conservation areas where the front elevation has some merit; either a grade 1 or 11 or some other desirable building; The Council should insist on keeping the front elevation in tact; and allowing only building of any new tower either just behind the existing or at the rear. This keeps the symmetry of the street. Giving the developer the new space he needs to maximize his investment and the street scene some protection. This then keeps the street as it was so satisfying any conservation groups. The new tower can be any height if it is behind the front of the building. Higher towers always look better when they are some way behind the pavement. This then turns the building into a desirable office fit for purpose in todays climate. The old Library is a fantastic building if only it were on a site of its own and not so close to The Council buildings.	We need more areas for industry and commerce. It is all very well building houses but where are the spaces for new high tech industries to go. They want nice areas to build their new offices. There are too many derelict sub standard building along the canals. These should be swept away and the spaces opened up for nice new developments. Where is Jaguar to build their new factory. It shoul;d be made a priority to find a decent large space for this. This will in turn attract the other manufactures which we desperately need. We have lost so much. There is a desperate need for more open spaces near the city centre. The view from the roof of the new library is not very inspiring.	No	About Birmingham	
bp8					Birmingham is the largest local authority in Europe. It covers over one million citizens. With the projected increase in citizens, Birmingham's local government will have twice as many citizens as the next largest local government in the UK, Leeds.	It is my view, that as part of the plan an addition consideration must be democratic accountability. At well over one million citizens Birmingham would be too big for a single local governing authority. The ability for a citizen to hold the authority to account will be too small. A simple proposal would be to split the authority in a similar way to other large cities like London or Manchester.	Yes	About Birmingham	

bp18	Centro have recently advised me that New Street Station is totally full & cannot cope with any more trains. Therefore all future residential development will need to focus on bus travel or be served by the tram or rail to Snow Hill/Moor Street. It seems madness that the current development of New Street did not allow for additional capacity. Bus route capacity should be a major influence on the location of future residential development. many of the major roads into the city are grossly congested in peak hours, particularly A38/A5127 from Sutton, A456 from Quinton A38 from Longbridge & A435 from Kings Heath.	Major improvement to road & rail network before any major house building. Would be better to infill gradually on the many brownfield sites that I have seen in all areas of the city.	No	About Birmingham
bp126	How does the building of house to house another 150,00 people help overcrowding? What consideration if any has been given to the needs to current residents? What options have been considered and what was the selection process for the solution in this paper	Provision of details including cost benefit analysis to support the proposed plan	Yes	About Birmingham
bp245	It still remains unclear how the proposed development will support the continued regeneration of Birmingham and address high levels of unemployment in areas such as Hodge Hill. Why doesn't the development of brown field sites provide housing and business opportunities? This would prevent the need for the spreading of urban development.	A more cohesive plan that clearly justifies the development of green belt land over brown field site will reduce the competition for resources and secure the future of the city.	No	About Birmingham

bp331	I realize there is a responsibility on the council to provide these additional homes to accommodate the 150,000 people adding to an already over-crowded island (someone really should address this) but I am concerned about squandering valuable farm land (I disagree with the assertion that it is of low grade as any farmland has the potential to feed). I would like to be reassured that the potential for inner city redevelopment has fully been explored, and I'm thinking about, as an example, the area around Bradford Street. I realize that it is not very attractive at the moment and return on investment is much lower on brownfield sites than greenfield, but it could be made attractive to the city workforce and single people to live there. The housing density could also be higher than green field sites because of the differing market sector. It is the council's responsibility to make it so. Birmingham could end up a doughnut if the council doesn't act against it.	Reassurance that inner city housing will be improved and increase in preference to sacrificing green belt areas.	Yes	About Birmingham
bp590	The plan is based on a prediction that Birmingham's population will grow by 150,000 over the period of the plan. However, population projections are notoriously unreliable, being hugely influenced by factors that cannot be foreseen at the time they are made, and are therefore little more than an educated guess. It is inappropriate to make fixed plans based on little more than guesswork.	The plan should be made more flexible, particularly in respect of areas such as green belt development. Such proposals should be excluded from the plan, and only revisited based on actual changes to population, not projections.	Yes	About Birmingham

bp717	The Office of National Statistics does not predict population growth beyond 2021. The words "expected to grow" is too loose and should be more carefully defined.. I fully support the innovative and brave new architecture that is appearing in Birmingham. There seems to be no discussion on the regeneration of new brown field sites by the end of life of houses built in between 1920 and 1930's These houses will be passing 100 years old in 2021 20 2031. Not only will the construction be suspect but they will be fundamentally not fit for purpose in terms energy conservation and social requirements. There are vast estates that will need to be re-built all round Birmingham to lower the overall carbon footprint and increase the density of housing by better planning with providing better sustainable communities	The plan needs to reviewed to taker a closer examination of population growth. There seems no account being made of the high decline in population caused by the baby boomers dying between 2021 and 2031. There is no indication in the planning document that there will be need to re-build large areas of Birmingham's suburbs. The Centre of Birmingham needs to attract more homes built on existing Brownfield and reclaimed office and industrial units but we also need to encourage a Modern Workshop of the World approach to encourage low and high tech small business. The plan does not seem to have taken on the future trends of 3D printing for localised low volume production and the drive for hand crafted products. We need a much more innovative approach to the future of Birmingham the plan seems to be long on promises but short on solid initiatives.	Yes	About Birmingham
bp725	I agree that quality of the natural environment should be conserved. The plan however is deeply flawed in then going on to discuss building on the green belt which this is simply not necessary to satisfy the governments requirements for minimum housing numbers. If the natural environment is to be conserved then let us conserve it and not go bakck on the basic principle urely because it can raise money through sale and because it can be presented as an easier option to developers than building on brownfield sites.	The disadvantaged communities in the inner city areas mentioned in this section live with myriads of small brownfield sites, take Villa/Soho Road, Hockley Hill for example, many of which could be redeveloped to improve workspace and living space in those communities. The fact that these are not nice large clean empty sites and so are more complex should not deter the Council from promoting them to developers. Indeed, it is nearly always right from a sustainability point of view to improve and consolidate what you already have rather than scrapping it and starting again.	No	About Birmingham

bp775	Sutton Coldfield and inparticular Walmely are very over populated already. School's are full with long waiting lists, Doctors Surgery's cannot cope with the demand. Parking and even driving through Walmley and the surrounding areas is gridlocked, especially during school run and rush hour traffic. Good Hope Hospital is almost inaccessible due to the limited parking facilities. There are already a few new developments in Walmley which has caused massive amounts of disruption to the roads. Green belt should be left as it is.	There are many brown belt sites throughout Birmingham where affordable housing can be acheived with little disruption to local facilities. i understand that the cost of purchasing the land from private investers will have aqn impact on budgets, however, green belt cannot be replaced. With the amount of flooding recently and enviornment agencies advising that due to the amount of buildings with block paved driveways and little drainage has had a significant impact on the area.	No	About Birmingham
bp823	Birmingham can be justifyable proud of the reputation it has for the percentage of open space it has within its boundaries. In any future plan, these spaces, parks, nature reserves, golf courses, playing fields, allotments etc. should and can remain as 'green lungs' for present and future citizens to enjoy. The same parameters apply to the open spaces designated as 'green belt', which only in the most exceptional of circumstances should be eroded. These circumstances are not yet with us for many reasons. Firstly, population increase projections within the city have been overstated and the current publicised projections, in terms of numbers, and therefore housing needs, cannot be substantiated. Secondly, the number of vacant proprties within the city could, if occupied, go some way to alleviating the need for wholesale building on 'green' spaces. Thirdly, the amount of 'brownfield' land within the city could, if developed, primarily for housing, solve the city's housing needs for many years to come, without the need to erode any 'green' sites.	Closer examination of the redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites. Many of these, often former industrial sites, cover vast areas which are currently derelict and are desperately in need of regeneration.. Some of these sites are large enough to be developed as complete communities. One only has to fly over the city into Birmingham Airport to see how much 'brownfield' space there is which is in desperate need of redevelopment. In the wider field of the West Midlands conurbation, there are many more derelict sites which need to be redeveloped. Consultation should be taking place with the adjacent local authorities so that planning decisions are based and made on a conurbation-wide basis and not just by one authority within the conurbation.	No	About Birmingham

bp916	In this introduction, Birmingham is described as having 'desirable leafy suburbs', lots of green spaces, and being voted most attractive UK city for quality of life in 2012. The addition of 150 000 homes will surely alter these suburbs forever, particularly Sutton Coldfield, where currently, in a few minutes, you can be driving or walking past open fields. If the plans go ahead to build on the Green belt, these suburbs will become even more overcrowded, and considerable less leafy and green. If I wanted to live in an overcrowded city I would move to London. You say Birmingham is one of the most connected cities in the UK, but it is also one of the most polluted and congested, with the impact that has on people's lives and health. The addition of more housing will compound this problem. Finally, the issue of joblessness is mentioned, amongst the existing population. How are we to find jobs for 150 000 million more people? Not to mention providing schools, hospitals, doctors and other facilities, which are already stretched to breaking point. At the same time as you are considering catering for this increased population, our local libraries and swimming pools are being closed down.	We should not expect overcrowded large cities to accommodate even more people. Instead we should be building several new towns in counties with low population, or develop existing smaller towns, and improve the infrastructure and links between them. Also these figures that show an ever-rising population should be scrutinised and challenged - how accurate are they? Finally, if more homes have to be built, then apply pressure to building conglomerates to get on and build on the plots they already own, also start regulating private landlords so letting properties don't stand empty due to extortionate rents being demanded, and look again for brownfield sites to develop.	No	About Birmingham

bp940	Birmingham has a large number of problems. Its average income is well below regional and national levels, its unemployment levels are higher, graduate retention is low as are the numebr of higher paid professional and management jobs. The numebr of proffesional and managerial jobs in th ecity centre suggests that there is a high level of in commuting amongst this group. It has been particualry hit by the current recesion. While the numbers of premises used for retail is above average the level of employment in this sector is below. Health statistics are poor educatinal attiainemnt is poor. There is a high proportion of existing residents whose aspiration is to move out of Birmingham. Rather than identify and adress these issues they are either ignored or the policies are to repeat the same stance that has been adopted over recent decades during which Birminghams performance relative to core cities has lagged. Birmingham has for instance a high proportion of large firms and frims that are contolled outside of Birmingham. Yet the emphasis is on inward investment of large companies rather than growing its own. Outside of the City Centre demand and need tends to be for larger houses	Accept and identify that the city has considerable probelems. REcognise that the same old approaches will not resolve them. Undertake and use analysis of what the probelms are and the extent to which past polices have reduced, increased or left them untouched. The technical papaers show some of the eveidence of existing and long term problems but these have not been used in anaysing what needs to be done. Past experience suggests that the levles of building predicted in the plan will not happen. This evidence should be examined. Serious consideration needs to be given to how to make Birmingham more atractive as a place to live and work, for locla companies to grwo and prosper. There should be a policy requiring that where developments impact on jobs they should analyse and report on jobs lost or diverted as well as jobs created	Yes	About Birmingham

bp957	firstly how was the figure of 150,00 more poeople to be homed by 2031 projected? i don't see how this many people can be shoe horned into the already overcrowded immediate suburbs of Birmingham and Sutton Coldfield/ Walmley as the infrastructure is strained already. if Birmingham is renouned for it's green and leafy areas then why is the plan intent on substituting this greenery with homes? the plan aims to make 'high quality and affordable homes' to 'provide access to services and jobs' but that would be much better acheived by converting brown field sites and accomodating families in existing homes that are currently standing empty within the city. compacting more people into an overcrowded struggling area such as Walmley where roads are highly congested, school waiting lists are long and you can't get a drs. appointment when you are actually poorly is not an acceptable answer to the housing problem. in the long term (which i thought was what we were planning towards) this won't work.	look again at the re development of brown field sites. i am aware that it will be more expensive to buy land from land owners than carving up the greenbelt but it would be less wastefull to use land to it's full potential and more sustainable. i know from my job that there are a large number of homes standing empty within the city that could be used to house families but are not being occupied and empty houses attract crime, 2 birds with 1 stone could be acheived by putting pressure on landowners, homeowners, landlords to fill their properties. perhaps a financial incentive/scheme?	No	About Birmingham

bp1005			Birmingham has significant long running problems, which are not recognised in the introiduction or the plan. It has higher than national and regional average unemployment, It has lower average incomes, poor health and educational attainment. There are major issues over graduate retention. It was particulary hard hit by the recent recession. Surveys have shown that high proportions of the population of inner city areas wish to move out of those areas. While the outer suburbs are seen as a step up their preferenece is to move out of the city altogether. previous targets for house building and other forms of development have not been met. Birmingham has a high proportion of large companies and ones that are owned controlled frorm outside region. These are more likly to leave in the face of economic problems. Yet there is no acknowlegement of these issuse or attempts to address them. Instead we have the continuation of the same polices that over previous decades hae seen Birmingham lag behind other core cities and these problems get worse. While the regeneration of the City Centre has been sucesful this has seen a very large concentration of the resources and there is little indication that its benefits have spread	Identify and anayse the problems, Asses the effectivness of past polices. Learn from the succeses and failures and respond appropriatly. Introduce a policy that requires developments that impact on jobs to assess the jobs lost and replaced as well as jobs created. promote the growth of small businesses and this meens more than just indepoendent retailers. Empasise retention and growth of indigenous businesse and maximising the returns to social investment as well as maximising the impact on social inclusion of developments Put greater emphaisis on positive development outside of the city centre. Create more neighbourhoods that are attractive to those who can choose where to live. having minimum densities across the City of 40 per hectare partricualy given that market demand tends to emphasise largeer house with gardens is at best unlikley to support this.	Yes	About Birmingham
bp1008			The predicted population growth is inacurate. The present government has reduced immigration and will continue to do so. In Sutton Coldfield,four Oaks and Walmley the infrastructure is already at full capacity. With plans for more housing on Green Belt land , traffic will be gridlocked. Already there is not enough parking facilities at local rail stations.	Use more up to date figures for expected population growth. Look at developing all brownfield sites in Birmingham and The Black Country BEFORE building on Green Belt Land. There are many sites in inner city Birmingham that could be used and made more attractive by housing development.	No	About Birmingham
bp1036	Ms Helen Cleaver	Secretary Wythall Residents Association	We would stress that Birmingham City Council should identify and develop sites within its own boundaries before expanding into the Green Belt of Wythall. We would not accept homes for Birmingham in Wythall while vacant sites exist and empty flats, such as those above the Aldi supermarket at Maypole, remain unoccupied, many years after their construction.	As above, ensure all existing available sites within Birmingham have been used.	No	About Birmingham

bp1050	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Welcome the commitment to conserve and enhance the natural enviroment to provide facilities for people. Trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can significantly support this in contributing to economically active and investment attractive landscapes which provide a range of services for people: cleaner air, reduced flood risk, sense of well-being, community cohesion, cooler places (reducing heat island) and wood for fuel and construction.			About Birmingham
bp1189			The precept that an increase in population of 150,000 will take place by 2031 is not proven. If it were to happen it would not be sustainable since a corresponding increase in all infrastructure is not so provided and such an increase will increase the carbon footprint of the City notwithstanding any mitigation. The proposal is therefore not sustainable. The City and central government should be working to ENSURE that such an increase does not occur.	Work on different precept	Yes	About Birmingham
bp1200			look inward to where the unemployment black spots are . and re develop close to those areas to help the local population rather than looking to develop on green belt land . bring work to the unemployed and under developed areas instead of creation new inner city ghettos.	take the more difficult option to look inward at development needs rather than the perceived easy option of developing on green belt.	No	About Birmingham
bp1210			The precept that an increase in population of 150,000 will take place by 2031 is not proven. If it were to happen a corresponding increase in all infrastructure is not so provided in the proposal. The proposal is therefore not sustainable. The City and central government should be working to ENSURE that such an increase does not occur.	Work on a different precept. Seek alternative options	Yes	About Birmingham

bp1237	section 2.18 identified the need to create local jobs for local people - building a new industrial area on Green Belt, approximately 8miles from the areas of joblessness is worthless. Transport infrastructure is not able to provide such transport for journeys - major grid lock occurs every morning - jobs need to be built centrally in Bham and the Black Country - look at the Winson Green area, there are huge areas of land available to redevelop and unused factory units. Such a plan is taking the easy option of building on green belt as opposed to brownfield. Birmingham CC have well documented financial problems and the selling off such land is a short sighted way of raising funds to tackle their poor management of equal status pay claims. There will be no objective review of such a planning strategy as Birmingham CC have too much financial gain and need to make from the project.	Build on brownfield sites and consider redeveloping all empty shops into houses and flats. Reuse the thousands of empty homes currently in Birmingham. Industry needs investment where unemployment is i.e. central Birmingham as specified in the report. Therefore build on the brownfield sites - there are plenty to see and find, on the Handsworth border with West Bromwich.	No	About Birmingham
bp1249	Item 2.8 "In 2012, Birmingham was ranked as the most attractive UK regional City for quality of life."Who was this comment made by? Making statements like this without reference to the source document/organistation shows a poor approach to basing statements (let alone judgements) on a sound evidence base. The specific statement also overrates Birmingham as a city (and we have no evidence to say that this was not something determined by Birmingham City Council itself) thereby minimising the efforts the council needs to maintain or improve the quality of life of Birmingham's residents (e.g. by removing Green Belt protection from key land). Item 2.16 - Golf Courses are not notably "green". Although comprising large areas of grass these require large amounts of fertiliser and other chemicals to maintain them, leading to adverse ecological impacts as water runs off them into natural aquafers. Worldwide many areas are being ruined by golf courses being built upon agricultural, forested, or otherwise undeveloped land. Item 2.18, 2nd bullet point - "Birmingham’s population is expected to grow by 150,000." By who? What calculations have been made, what assumptions have been	Re item 2.8 - Rewrite the document, ensuring that correct references are given to any such statement. Re item 2.16 - Rewrite, removing reference to golf courses. Re item 2.18, 2nd bullet point - Rewrite the document, ensuring that correct references are given to any such statement. Re item 2.18, 10th bullet point - Significantly revise the plan removing any element where the natural environment is not conserved (e.g. retain the Green Belt protection on all such existing land. * * *

bp1355	This process is difficult to follow and understand to the layperson. Green belt agricultural land should not be sacrificed to house future population growth when this is the easiest option and most profitable for builders, all other options should be considered, brown field sites, empty house etc	Consider all options such as brown field and existing empty properties.	No	About Birmingham
bp1369	The BDP is unsound for the following reaons. (1) Birmingham has predicted a population increase of 150,000 by 2031. The Office of National Statistics will only predict population increases to 2021. This poses the question how did BCC come to the figure of 150,000? (2) Where are the results of the discussions with neighbouring authorities. We need to know which authorities have been approached and the outcomes. (3) 'There are a number of disadvantaged communities in Birmingham.....'. 'Worklessness is a significant issue... There is a need to create local jobs for local people.' Surely it would be desirable to improve these areas by building and developing existing houses and provide the employment in the same area.	(1) Changing economic and social conditions would suggest a regular assess and review opportunity should be built into the plan. We know houses need to be built but it is essential to monitor and review developments on a regular basis. (2) Provide details of those authorities that are un/willing to co-operate. It is not enough to say joint working will be required. Surely this should have been done before the plan was written. (NPPF Core Planning Principles '...respond positively to wider opportunities for growth) (3) The plan should first and foremost show total commitment to all disadvantaged communities identified as AAPs to ensure the most needy Birmingham citizens are able to benefit from the aspirations of the BDP plan with sustainability in mind.	No	About Birmingham

bp1434	The creation of the Birmingham Plan 2031 is not consistent with planning policy. The heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is about " a collective enterprise "; a planning process which is supposed to include people and communities. Paragraph 1 of the NPPF states that " it provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities."There is no evidence or reference that the Birmingham Plan 2031 was produced by both "local people and their accountable councils". The plan was created by an accountable council only. Two further points are : 2.18 - Bullet point 3. This bullet points indicates that the BCC have yet to fulfill the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. 2.18 - Bullet point 6. The plan is not positively prepared as the council are clearly stating in this bullet point that they have yet to determine objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.	The Birmingham plan rendered unsound as its preparation has not been consistent with planning policy. Any local plans to involve local people and communities as per the guidelines of the planning policy. The Duty to cooperate - this is commented on by myself in section 13,Duty to co-operate/Legal compliance. Objectively assessed development and Infrastructure requirements comment - this is commented upon by myself in Section 4, Planning for growth.	Yes	About Birmingham
bp1458	..."identifying appropriate sites to accommodate and deliver the long term levels of growth needed within the existing built up area"... ..."The quality of the natural environment will need to be conserved and enhanced to provide facilities for people and connected networks to support wildlife"... Does not mean that we have to build on land designated as green belt. The proposals actually offer the opposite of what the statements above would suggest.	I do not agree with building on green belt land. If we are to protect the natural environment and preserve it for future generations then this development should be stopped.	No	About Birmingham

bp1482	The description given of the city is a mix of fact, based on current knowledge of the area and detailed evidence such as age of property, employment statistics and existing infrastructure. The other parts of the document are merely speculations or predictions which may or may not occur. I would draw your attention to the building of Chelmsley Wood and suggest that lessons need to be learned from that large scale housing project. Predictions have not proved accurate that were made at the time - many schools for example have now closed due to lack of pupil numbers. People who relocated could not find work locally and had to travel some distance to find work. This increased costs to each family and there was a lack of an adequate transport structure to aid them getting to work. Costs of housing proved prohibitive and many people experienced debt and ensuing social problems.	Develop more brownfield sites closer to existing areas of employment and construct more low cost homes to enable young people to start their working lives without a spiral of debt. Ensure that transport and educational development goes hand in hand with the redevelopment of these areas so that there are sufficient local facilities and transport links for those who live in the area - not leave this in the hands of the developers	No	About Birmingham
bp1498	It is ironic that this encomium to Birmingham majors on its "leafy suburbs" and green areas whilst the plan that follows proposes vandalism to a sizeable area of its surviving green belt - provided for by the foresight of a more thoughtful post war labour government.	Abandon this lazy short term proposal to cheat our children and grandchildren of the legacy bequeathed them by our more visionary parents.	No	About Birmingham
bp1505	1.The City Council has a major challenge in that there are many former industrial buildings across the whole of City which are vacant or poorly used and for which there is no prospect of them re-used for industry or commerce. They and their sites have to be found some alternative use. If your population forecasts are correct, that use must be housing. Your challenges do not address this critical issue. The use of brownfield sites must play a much greater part in your thinking and only after every brownfield site is used should you contemplate the use of greenfield sites for housing. 2.The City is not a green city: all the comparative evidence is that Birmingham thinks its green but other core cities are much more progressive. Its not just about dedicated reserves but the wider city environment. How can a city council that has no budget for tree planting call itself green?	On 1, draft a new challenge about vigorously tackling derelict or under-used industrial building/warehouses by changing their use to housing instead of looking to the green belt for housing growth. On 2, tone down the propaganda about being green and incorporate a challenge to weave trees and natural features into the existing cityscape.	Yes	About Birmingham

bp1506	Sutton Coldfield and in particular Walmley are very over populated already. Schools are full with long waiting lists; Doctors Surgery's cannot cope with the demand. Parking and even driving through Walmley and the surrounding areas is grid locked, especially during school run and rush hour traffic. Good Hope Hospital is almost inaccessible due to the limited parking facilities. There are already a few new developments in Walmley, which has caused massive amounts of disruption to the roads. Green belt should be left as it is.	There are many brown belt sites throughout Birmingham where affordable housing can be achieved with little disruption to local facilities. I understand that the cost of purchasing the land from private investors will have an impact on budgets, however, green belt cannot be replaced. With the amount of flooding recently and environment agencies advising that due to the amount of buildings with block paved driveways and little drainage has had a significant impact on the area.	No	About Birmingham
bp1520	Protection of the environment should be the uppermost consideration when considering the future needs of Birmingham. This includes any green and green belt areas.	Protection of the natural environment should come well before any planned growth.	No	About Birmingham
bp1542	The Plan makes no reference to Sutton Coldfield's historic identity and character which will be destroyed by development on this scale. The Green Belt to the North and East of Sutton is a precious part of that identity. Infrastructure cannot cope with the Plan as proposed. Roads, GPs surgeries and schools will all be inadequate. Take railways, for instance: the Cross-City rail line from Foar Oaks / Lichfield to B'ham New Street is currently completely overloaded at peak hours. There is as yet no concrete proposal to reopen the Sutton Park rail line through Walmley, the plan simply says vaguely that 'proposals to enhance the rail, network will be supported' with no indication as to where funding will come from. This line closed to passengers in the 1960s, so massive investment will be needed.	New housing should be on brownfield sites only. The 12,000 empty houses in Birmingham should first be occupied. No Green belt land of any sort should be sacrificed.	No	About Birmingham

bp1575	2.16 You state the city is one of the greenest - so why destroy that image by building on green field sites in the Walmley area when there are so many brown field sites and empty houses desperate in need of re-development. 2.18 You discuss the need for retail growth and in the plans there is a proposed new retail park - the retail parks already in existence eg Princess Alice Park, Ravenscroft, The Fort all have empty units as well as Sutton Coldfield Town Centre. These retail parks are destroying local businesses. If you look at Boldmere High Street for example - no more local shops it is full of takeaways. 2.18 The infrastructure is already at capacity. Yes there is a fantastic motorway network but once off the motorways all the roads are jam packed at rush hour with heavy queues of traffic. The railway stations are at capacity. There is no train station in Walmley - the nearest stations are Sutton, Wylde Green and Chester Road. The car parking at these stations is woefully inadequate resulting in cars parking down side streets making it difficult to pass and especially dangerous to pedestrians and children. 2.18 The health facilities and schools are already struggling with the current population. I had to wait 10 weeks for a		About Birmingham
bp1605	Creation of new homes to date has been counterproductive: housing has been provided for those who have no intention of contributing to the economy and too many buy to let landlords have made rents unaffordable and destroyed communities. The "disadvantaged communities" in Birmingham - we need leadership to resolve this issue. Pubic transport in Birmingham is rubbish; the idea of cycling/walking being reasonable alternatives is RIDICULOUS. Outrageous sums of money are being thrown at people to encourage them to buy bicycles they will never use. Retail in Birmingham is not viable because rents are too high to attract the sort of independent retailers who are the future of this industry: I can shop online from chains and not have to deal with surly teenage shop assistants. Birmingham City Council is not looking after its architectural heritage.	Yes	About Birmingham

bp1609	The report states the workless ness is a significant issue but that unemployment is a significant issue but that unemployment is below the national average. Irrespective of the apparent contradiction of that statement, where is the logic of allowing the population of Birmingham to increase by 150,000. Should we not be taking action to manage the population and as seek to increase to accommodate an increasing population if it is necessary to do so? What action is being taken to manage the population rather than just allow it to expand? There are even acknowledgements in the narrative that accept that the infrastructure in Birmingham cannot take it - so why are we allowing that to happen?	The plan should be reconsidered to examine how people can be housed and located closer to the areas where they will be employed and to existing facilities to avoid placing significant additional population in areas which will place much greater string on infrastructure that is already saturated due to previous population expansion with limited if any investment.	No	About Birmingham
bp1629	Sutton Coldfield and in particular Walmley are very over populated already. Schools are full with long waiting lists!!!! Doctors Surgery's cannot cope with the demand. We can never get an appointment either!!!! Parking and even driving through Walmley and the surrounding areas is grid locked, especially during school run and rush hour traffic!!!!!!!! Good Hope Hospital is almost inaccessible due to the limited parking facilities. There are already a few new developments in Walmley, which has caused massive amounts of disruption to the roads. Green belt should be left as it is.	There are many brown belt sites throughout Birmingham where affordable housing can be achieved with little disruption to local facilities. I understand that the cost of purchasing the land from private investors will have an impact on budgets, however, green belt cannot be replaced. With the amount of flooding recently and environment agencies advising that due to the amount of buildings with block paved driveways and little drainage has had a significant impact on the area.	No	About Birmingham
bp1641	From your description above 2.1-2.17, Birmingham sounds like a very attractive city; it has many green areas and spaces and much natural environment and biodiversity that must be preserved for the current and future generations to enjoy and enhance their lives. How will the proposals to build 6,000 homes and industrial developments help secure this ideal?	Do not build on the Green Belt until all other areas have been explored including areas surrounding Birmingham. Reconsider the use of green Belt for industrial development i.e. providing job/employment. it would be more sensible and sustainable to create jobs where they are needed - in or near to more disadvantaged communities. Consider more housing in the inner city and central areas. The current use of refurbishing former industrial installations into very desirable housing units would seem to be a better way forward than building on Green areas which will then be lost for ever.	No	About Birmingham

bp1694	A plan full of contradictions with a very lazy approach of building on Green belt land before all brown field sites are exhausted first as it is easier and cheaper! If it is to be believed may I remind you that the coalition Government stated in March 2012 that it attaches great importance to the green belt and that it will seek to maintain existing levels of protection. Also the Green belt is not just there for its beauty but more importantly for our wider environment, providing us with the trees and undeveloped land which stops neighbouring towns and cities from joining up preventing urban sprawl helping reduce the effect of the heat generated by our big cities by improving air quality acting as a vital contribution to climate change. What thought has gone into the lives of people who already live in Birmingham and suffer the air pollution, traffic congestion, full trains, lack of health facilities and future local Library and Leisure Centre closures? How does building more houses for the projected extra 150,000 more people help reduce the impact of climate change or the overcrowding of our City?Aren't you just going to add to the levels of pollution and overcrowd more of the suburbs? Isn't building more	Whilst I appreciate you are under pressure to provide a suitable 20 year plan I believe building on Green belt land is not the answer. It's not going to happen but a serious re-think into how we are going to look after the City's residents who already live here would be a good start and only then should a plan be put together for any predicted future population rises.	No	About Birmingham

bp1696	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton	It should be acknowledged that most new developments will not be able to meet all the objectives of this Plan, nor address each of the challenges listed in the introduction. However, it is not necessary for every development to be exemplary and to meet every objective. Was is needed is a balanced and pragmatic approach that above all encourages development, renewal and investment within the urban area of the City. The primary objective should be to ensure that every development does what it is intended to do and does it well. Any development should then go as far as it can to make a positive contribution towards meeting the aims and objectives of the Plan, but it should not be held back if it cannot address every aim. Development must happen in Birmingham; new homes, jobs, services and infrastructure are all needed if the City is to progress and provide improved social welfare, economic growth and prosperity. If each development makes its own positive contributions, be it through exemplary design, providing important services, enhanced sustainability etc., then collectively the challenges facing the City will begin to be addressed. The Plan must not set out so many		Yes	About Birmingham
bp1711				It is disturbing when the government are trying to reduce immigration and yet the evidence with which you have apparently based your figures has apparently been linked with the impact of immigration in mind. Surely this should be borne in mind and figures re-calculated. Who is to say that these homes will not be built and then stand idly empty?!! What a waste of our beautiful green belt land. I feel that brown felid sites should be more widely scrutinised. I believe that one of the biggest brownfields sites that could have been used is to be the hotly contested HS2 terminal. The HS2 proposal will also rip through the countryside and not doubt also affect our green belt land and natural wildlife. Insufficient evidence to convince me that you have considered all options	re consider all brownfield sites	No	About Birmingham

bp1715	It is disturbing when he government are trying to reduce immigration and yet the evidence with which you have apparently based you figures has apparently been linked with the impact of immigration in mind. Surely this should be born in mind and figures re-calculated. Who is to say that these homes we be built and then stand idly empty!!. What a waste of our beautiful green belt land that would be. I believe one of the biggest brownfield sites that could have been used is in fact being earmarked for the HS2 terminal - another thing we didn't want either and if this goes ahead, this will also rip through our green belt and disrupt the countryside and have a huge impact on wildlife. I did not hear from your representatives at the meetings I attended and from the information I have read, sufficient evidence to convince me that all brownfield sites have been considered within this scheme.	re consider all brownfield sites properly.	No	About Birmingham
bp1855	There is already a limited number of school places, especially for Primary schools in the area. This plan does not include guarantee that more schools will be built before the homes are built.	The plan would need to guarantee enough primary and secondary schools built even before the homes have been built.	No	About Birmingham
bp1884	This is test Message to see if the Consultation Website is still open to accept comments after 12.00 03/03/2014			About Birmingham

bp1889	The Plan paints a rosy picture of Birmingham as an attractive place to live and work. And it is, and it isn't. My understanding is that Birmingham doesn't score well on a number of economic, innovation and educational indicators. There's no mention of this in The Plan. It's better to face reality rather than puff up the city's position. The answer to the problems is, according to The Plan, "…but if the City is to achieve its ambitions and prosper it will need to take a positive, proactive and plan-led approach to address the challenges that the coming years will pose…" And the first challenge to address is: "The City will need to play its part in reducing the impact of climate change and be prepared to adapt to its consequences so it can continue to prosper socially, environmentally and economically". Comment: "….reducing the impact of climate change…" is not, and should not be, the city's first priority. It's a complete distraction from far more urgent tasks. The priority of the city council should be the economic advancement and regeneration of Birmingham and the West Midlands. The Introduction is too full of promises and hopes (to "secure" this or "create" that, but very little if anything on how	The priority has to be economic development by private sector, entrepreneurial, innovative companies. Not long-winded planning documents that somehow (almost as if by magic) "jobs and services" will be 'created'. There's no obvious input from the private sector from which prosperity, growth and jobs will come. The Plan is bound to fail if the main focus is not on private sector lead economic development. Please put most of your energy and focus here.	Yes	About Birmingham

bp1890			The Plan paints a rosy picture of Birmingham as an attractive place to live and work. And it is, and it isn't. My understanding is that Birmingham doesn't score well on a number of economic, business, innovation and educational indicators. There's no mention of this in The Plan. It's better to face reality rather than puff up the city's position, as if there weren't really difficult problems to face and deal with. The answer to the problems (not explicitly mentioned), so that the City will prosper, "…it will need to take a positive, proactive and plan-led approach to address the challenges that the coming years will pose…" And the first challenge to address is: "The City will need to play its part in reducing the impact of climate change and be prepared to adapt to its consequences so it can continue to prosper socially, environmentally and economically." This is not and should not be the City's first priority. The climate is always changing, and there is little real, meaningful, evidence that it will change dramatically in the next two decades, such that Birmingham has to spend precious planning and other resources. Even the United Nation's IPCC doesn't suggest that extreme weather events are likely, despite the	1. The Plan should spell out the positive aspects of Birmingham, but it should also be clear about the challenges. 2. Having been honest with the people of Birmingham, the Plan need to be far more action-and-evidence oriented. If The Plan lists an objective, it should spell out how this is going to be attained, and cite evidence that the actions are likely to achieve the objective. For instance, what past Birmingham plans have delivered or what other cities have found worked. 3. Perhaps you felt duty/government(?) bound to mention climate change, but please don't put this as the first issue to 'deal' with. It certainly isn't, and should be removed (if possible) or downgraded as a City challenge. There are far more immediate practical challenges. 4. Others have mentioned the use of large areas of brown-field land left after major companies or industries have closed. Like other commentators, it would make sense to use this sites for new development of businesses and housing. Mixed development, including appropriate space for shopping development, makes for a	Yes	About Birmingham
bp5196	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	About Birmingham
bp5402			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		About Birmingham
bp5596	Ms Rebecca Mayman	Wyre Forest District Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		About Birmingham
bp5684	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		About Birmingham
bp5771	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		About Birmingham

bp249	To plan to encroach on a large proportion of the remaining 15% of the Cities Green Belt, is a contradiction of the Plans own vision under section 3 of the plan. I refer in particular to 3.1 where the plan mentions a green city (green should not be just about recycling). 3.2 Residents experiencing a high quality of life. 3.4 Maintaining Historical environment. How exactly do the existing proposals of this plan intend to achieve these aims, by building on green fields, and obliterating the spectacular approach to two of the cities most impressive historical landmarks, I refer to Peddimore Hall and Langley Hall, which are both Grade II Listed.	I suggest that the city makes better use of the empty homes that still blight our city, they amount to 12,000 and some are actually Council owned. It is totally unacceptable that the city should still have a large number of properties and derelict sites owned by them and that they have not prioritised, before considering green belt land within this plan.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp266	As we have found with the road system in the UK, however many miles of motorway we build, it is never enough. I feel the same will apply with house building,but, the world we know is very near the time when changes will begin to become increasingly apparent i.e. the current mood in the UK regarding immigration, and the awareness of a modern nation that we cannot continue to allow ourselves the luxury of just breeding indiscriminately, We are all aware that a country, any country, can sense that we may be approaching the point of being full up! China, a vast country, has already experimented with controlled population growth, not successfully yet, but it will come. If some form of population control should come about, we may find that within a generation, all of these homes we are building now will be empty!	The government is pursuing a policy of encouraging the building of affordable, and first-time buyer friendly housing. The proposed area in question is prime virgin land, next to some of the most desirable post codes in the city, it goes without saying that no developer is going to build first-time buyers homes, it will all be luxury 4 to 5 bedroom style homes, and some established quality housing will become blighted by a factory estate. Finally, may I add my concerns to the long list of concerns already established, namely, no good transport links are planned, so, a large increase in traffic to an already overloaded local network of roads, with an increase of heavy goods traffic onto roads not designed for that purpose. The pressure on local health services, Good Hope hospital springs to mind first. The already oversubscribed Sutton schools. Finally, may I be permitted to say that this whole business will almost certainly come back to haunt Birmingham City Council for many years to come, no knighthoods for this one lads, you are shooting yourselves in the foot !!!!	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp576	It's all very well coming up with objectives, but you need to consider the repercussions of taking the easy route in terms of promoting and allowing the building of new housing on green belt land. There is absolutely no mention of additional services or facilities for the existing homes in the area, Good Hope hospital is already creaking at the seams and there has been much in the press about closures of departments and so forth. How can this hospital ever hope to accommodate the needs of 1000's more families? General services and amenities in Sutton Coldfield are being cut - the recent closure of the registry office, magistrates courts, downgrading of services at the library etc are just some of the many cuts Birmingham Council is making in the area. There is no way the town or surrounding areas can support the level of housing you are proposing, nor industrial sites.	You need to review the existing 1000's of derelict homes in existing areas of Birmingham, in all areas. These, along with brownfield sites - residue from the many previous manufacturing/office/industrial sites that are now closed, empty and derelict - MUST be considered first. It makes far more sense to spread the "load" of 6000 homes and an additional industrial site across areas where there is already space to accommodate this and infrastructure in place that can be improved rather than completely installed - as would be required with these proposals.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp659	I have been informed that the Plan has used inward immigration figures from 2004. These figures were overestimated by some 10,000; therefore there is no need to use green belt land in Sutton Coldfield for the foreseeable future. Building in greenbelt land MUST be an absolute last resort. Once it is gone, it has gone forever, and the brownfield derelict spaces will still be there!	Use the empty housing and brownfield sites first, then let's see how many more homes need to be built.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp666	Green belt should be left alone , build first on all brown sites re use all empty homes and factory sites. Walmley cannot support more homes, the roads cannot take more cars . It is already a miracle no child has been killed on walmley ash rd or Anton drive by parents blocking the roads on both sides trying to drop off or pick up their children.there are enough industrial buildings around us already and plenty of employment for the people living here . Build them were people have high unemployment rather than break up their community by forcing people to move here away from their families and friends to get work.	Build elsewhere. Where it is actually needed, and where it would improve the overall look of birmingham, as currently a lot of areas are an eyesore and would benefit from new houses to breath life into them and improve the value of other properties around them.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp685	BCC is in financial trouble due to their overspending, vanity projects, etc. They are trying to claw back money by selling their assets, with no consideration (or consultation) with the people who live in Birmingham. They plan to build on Green Belt land because it is easier and more financially rewarding for them, not the communities involved. They are taking an easy option, without any real explanation of who will pay for the necessary building of roads, schools, hospital/Healthcare facilities. The consultation process is flawed with inconsistencies and out of date statistics. The Housing at (GA5) Sutton Coldfield/ Langley Urban Extension is unsustainable and unnecessary, yet the BCC Is happy to blight the lives of the thousands of people who live in that area.	They should consult with other West Midlands Councils; Lichfield, Bromsgrove, etc, to formulate a plan to regenerate unused urban areas.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp694	I have already objected previously (elsewhere in the plan) on a number of statements made in the Birmingham City Council Development plan and in particular the Section relating to Vision, objectives and stategy and so i will not be repeating myself again. However I would like to know what form of consultation has taken place with local residents living in an area where parts of the proposed plan will impact directly. I live in Walmley, where its planned to build 6000 residential properties and a retail park on Green Belt land and should this take place there will be a massive increase in population, transport, pollution and carbon footprint, leading to addional Hospitals, Schools, GP surgeries and Infastructure having to be built. Taking my brief summary above into account, will you please let me know how the local population(Walmley and Sutton Coldfield Residents) were consulted on the plan proposed, because I was only recently informed by a local resident . Due to the extent of the work planned in Walmley and its impact on local residents the consultation should have been more open and transparent, with all Walmley and Sutton coldfield residents informed by letter to their individual homes. I	Abandon the works proposed in the plan until until proper consultation has taken place and all local residents are fully informed about what works are propsed for their area and the impact it will have on them. Explain how local communities were involved the shared vision referred to in the plan and how they responded. Ensure that all Brownfield Sites are fully developed before any development takes place on green field sites	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp718	The vision is not sound in term of dealing with the reality of what makes Birmingham a great city it relies on the outdated view that building offices in the city centre is the solution to creating vibrant culture. Offices are important but a significant feature of Birmingham is the combination of houses and work places small industrial units. Provided the environment is clean and wholesome there is nothing wrong with people living close to places of work . This solves transport, sustainability and social stability issues.	The plan needs to take the position of sustainability in inner city locations where work and housing is juxtaposed. A high variation of smaller work places reduces the liability on large employers and cements sustainability by providing multiple paces of work.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp726	Birmingham needs to work a lot harder on this plan to be called a green City. Building some eco-homes on green belt is not the answer. This is just another example of talking it but not doing it. For example, we have a waste compactor at our Bham city centre office so as to produce the minimal amount of non-recyclable waste and minimise transport required to pick it up by the Bham Council. Our paper/cardboard is all shredded and then recycled by a commercial company at our cost and all of the food waste is binned separately and recycled in my compost bin at home. We are trying hard to be a green office - not just talking it but actually doing it in practice. All we need from Bham Council collection is for one pre-paid bag of rubbish to be picked up from us every 3 weeks (for an office of 12 people). Unfortunately, the Council are refusing to continue to collect further advance-paid rubbish bags because we are using up bags which we bought last year. The council will not allow to use these this year and advised us that they wanted us to put out one bag of rubbish every week so that we pay for a new year's worth of bags every year without fail. This little example encapsulates what the Council are	I challenge you to really make this a green city. Start with what you already have and improve it. Examine your waste, environmental and transport issues with integrity and authenticity. Dont just pay lipservice to the idea of a green city. Turn off all the wasted lights illuminating bits of the city all through the night which are totally unnecessary. Keep the street lighting on for safety but stop lighting up the planet squandering energy whilst hypocritically telling us all to be careful at home. Don't build on a green belt when you havent improved existing housing stock sufficiently and improved/used all the brownfield sites. It's not OK to use up the green belt just because they will be eco-homes- it's just more convenient for you. Support public transport and make it cheap, safe and easy to travel this way instead of in cars. Where is our Oyster card so that we can swipe and use buses/trains with ease. How much energy does the new distracting electronic bill board at the end of the expressway cost to keep going night and day???? Green city? No. But you have a marvellous opportunity to make a difference and	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp735			I now understand why there are so few comments on this website. This consultation process is very difficult for people to understand how to access and leave comments. I think most will give up. You need a better way of getting comments if you really want a proper consulation. We should not keep building on green belt sites. Over the years we slowly use more and more green belt and will end up with one large concrete area like London whereby Birmingham, Sutton Colfield, Lichfield and Tamworth all become one large populated area with no green belt seperating our towns. Building more and more houses is not the solution. We need to control population growth / immigration. We should develop all brown field sites first. The area around Four Oaks / Sutton Coldfield and Walmley is already over developed without destroying more green belt with even more houses. Rush hour is a nightmare in the area since the roads cannot cope. The local hospital "Good Hope" also struggles to cope.		No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp804	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	"The choice and affordability of housing will be meeting the needs of all". Elsewhere we are told that "There is a mismatch between the existing supply of affordable housing and the location of demand", so building right out on the edge of the city, where developers will no doubt be looking to build so-called executive houses to ensure a good return on their investment, will not help the residents of deprived inner city areas who are looking for affordable housing and employment within reasonable reach.	The focus of attention should be on brownfield sites within the urban area.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp805			The Green Bent should not be built on at all. It was left to us to preserve the countryside - we cannot just keep taking a bit here and there - we'll never get it back and Birmingham hardly has any green space The plan for Education and Health is not sustainable - in Sutton Coldfield the amenities are already full to capacity and traffic is dreadful - Sutton and Walmely is full. You'll kill the golden goose of the city if you carry on	Thousands of homes and offices are empty and there are many brown-field sites - they must be considered first before Green Belt The consultation needs to be much wider and deeper - relying on people going a a few libraries and reading the report on-line is not enough.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp917	I think these objectives could be achieved without sacrificing our Green belt land. if that goes ahead, people will not want to live here any more.	I think a more intensive development of the city centre might be possible, and in conjunction with the development of new towns in adjacent counties. I think the council should challenge the government over this intensive development of our suburbs and green belt. We should think again about building good quality flats in the city centre, as they do in France, all with security and intercom systems, and maybe have areas of allotments or roof gardens for flat dwellers as they do in Germany. This would maximise use of any brownfield sites in the city, and certainly a lot of young people would find this housing option attractive. All roofs in the city centre should be green roofs, and stores should be encouraged to have rooftop gardens. All firms above a certain size should have to take on apprentices, and there should be more emphasis on technical courses in colleges to address skills shortages. Companies specialising in green technology should be encouraged, thus providing jobs at the same time as promoting research and promotion of green products. If more affordable solar panels could be produced, I	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1004	there is little to sugest that these aspirations will be met. They have little conection to the issues facing Birmingham and the policies being proposed.	Some realism	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1007	The planned housing development east Webster Way in Area D is monstrous. I bought my house near Webster Way in Walmley adjacent to green belt land as I was informed this land was secured farmland and have enjoyed the peace and view of the open countryside ever since. The views towards the Belfrey are most pleasing. I am very worried that should the plan go ahead it will do nothing to enhance the lives of the present population of Walmley and will in fact reduce our house prices. Already there is a house up for sale in my road which is not being sold due to the Birmingham plans and I fear that the adjacent properties will become devalued and unsellable. Your plans are causing anxiety and alarm. I agree with Princess Anne that massive social housing developments should be a thing of the past. The face of Sutton Coldfield will be forever be damaged by a similar scale Falcon Lodge development on what should be sacred green belt land. The plans are a complete blight on the landscape. Already the traffic problems on the surrounding roads are acute and the traffic problems will become more severe and change the village character of Walmley forever. It will become a mini town with no fast	Large scale housing development on green belt land should not be considered as it spoils the character of the area forever and does nothing to improve the lives of the existing people affected by this massive change. We are blighted by years of construction noise with a plan which ultimately does not provide quality house building as befits Sutton Coldfield but yet another estate with all the problems that will undoubtedly unfold.The plan should be totally scrapped as was the case previously. There must be green belt retained east Webster Way to ensure a green buffer zone between the Calder Drive estate and any new housing development. Birmingham prides itself on a green city where is the plan for any parkland east Webster Way?	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1024	I think this consultation website has been deliberately designed to be difficult and time-consuming to use. The plans have not been published properly, so that many Sutton residents are unaware of this consultation, or have found out very recently via newspaper articles (not placed by BCC). It feels as if we are being discouraged from commenting. Also the plan is too large to be considered in the time frame of the consultation period. The effects of the development on the local community would be significant and this has not been addressed. The infrastructure cannot cope as it is, without adding extra households, and there is no specific information about how improvements to the local infrastructure would be funded.	We should see full information on how BCC has engaged with local hospitals, schools, community groups, etc. and what the responses were. There should be a mailshot / leaflet drop to all households in Sutton Coldfield to inform them of the plans. We should also see a detailed explanation behind the perceived need for a further 80,000 homes, when the rate of immigration is falling. We need proper commitments from the developers and BCC that they will improve the infrastructure before any additional houses are built.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1051	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the vision and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to making Birmingham and enterprising, innovative and green city, by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) whilst enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity.			The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1071			How can the Birmingham City Council refer to a shared vision in its development plan when it obvious that residents were not involved in the plan and had no say it its contents, which when taking into account the contents of the plan and in particular elements of the plan which will impact negatively on a large number of residents is unfair and not acceptable.	Abandon all proposed works planned until local residents in Birmingham are fully involved with producing an amended plan and have an active role in agreeing to its contents.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1182			The infrastructure in and around Sutton Coldfield is already at breaking point and the introduction of more housing on green belt land will cause complete gridlock and put all public services, particularly those of Good Hope Hospital, under even more pressure.	Concentrate on developing brown field sites and acquiring neglected empty properties in and around the city (by compulsory purchase if necessary).	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1183			The plans Vision does not seem to be implemented in the Plan. For example you mention 3.1 the vision for a green city. Green should mean free from pollution, the opportunity to walk in open spaces. How can that vision be achieved if you intend to build on what little Green Belt that the City has left. In 3.2 your vision is for a high quality of life. Your plan will almost ruin my quality of life and all of those who live in the area, if you take away what little Green Belt that is left and hide Peddimore and Langley Halls behind a mass of housing.	Use the empty houses, unused factory and office space , urban wasteland and brownfield sites. In this area alone we have several possible sites, some of which are owned by the council.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1191	In 2.1 and 2.11 you boast of being well connected with extensive bus and suburban rail services and a metro line. As someone who has travelled the world I would advise you to visit many European cities, notably in Germany. Only when you have seen the network and service levels of public transport in Frankfurt, Dusseldorf and Dresden will you understand just how pathetic and disintegrated our regional service is in comparison. The cycle provision is improving but totally inadequate. Cycling anywhere near a major route is hazardous (use bus lanes - risable!) and canal paths are not kept clear such that punctures are frequent. Google maps advises me to walk to Water Orton (2 miles 38 minutes) to get by public transport to Central Birmingham. It will take 30 minutes longer to get to Curzon St than the HS2 will take to London! (In day time only - no night services) The distance by road is 9 miles.	Integrate public transport regionally	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1212	In 2.1 and 2.11 you boast of being well connected with extensive bus and suburban rail services and a metro line. I would advise you to visit many European cities, notably in Germany. Only when you have seen the network and service levels of public transport in Frankfurt, Dusseldorf and Dresden will you understand just how pathetic and disintegrated our regional service is in comparison. The cycle provision is improving but totally inadequate. Cycling anywhere near a major route is hazardous (use bus lanes - risable!) and canal paths are not kept clear such that punctures are frequent. Google maps advises me to walk to Water Orton (2miles 38 minutes) to get by public transport to Central Birmingham. It will take 30 minutes longer to get to Curzon St than the HS2 will take to London! (In day time only - no night services) The distance by road is 9 miles.	Wake up to reality. Work with Government and adjacent authorities to change your plans accordingly.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1250	Whilst this is all very well and good (and extremely funny to read) this is so much divorced from the current reality as to be meaningless. If it was not for the inclusion of the name "Birmingham" in the text it would not be readily apparent that this actually referred to the city. Instead it could be taken from any other city or town in the UK.	The plan needs to be revised so that more realisitc goals need to be set. The vision should make some refence to the qualities that Birmingham already has which can be built on. The vision statement needs to be written so that it is clear it refers to Birmingham and has not been stolen from some other place (and not simply by including the name Birmingham in it). * * *

bp1370	I wish to register my objection it the proposal to build a housing estate in walmley. My family, parents and sister all live in Sutton Coldfield and use the already busy facilities of roads, shops, schools and particularly hospitals. My husband runs a local driving school and finds the roads really busy already. Our concerns are that houses should be built on brownfield sites not greenfield site and the sutton infrastructure cannot cope with the number of residents now. My elderly parents struggle to get a gp appointment now and good hope waiting list will increase. The council should reconsider and seek brownfield sites, with developments on a smaller sites where the social infrastructure can support.	Change site to brownfield sites and grant smaller number if developments to share strain on local facilities.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1371	Birmingham is a great city. We should all be proud of the way the City centre has developed over the last twenty years. It makes sense to provide housing in the centre to accommodate office workers and other city centre workers eliminating the need for travelling in and out of the city at peak times. City housing will allow some people to walk or cycle from home to work cutting down on CO2 emissions and promoting healthy lifestyles. My concern is for people who work in the city but live in the suburbs. Sustainable transport is the biggest issue here. there is not enough detail in the plan to make a realistic comment on its viability and sustainability. One incident can bring the road network to a standstill. The plan is unsound because it doesn't give the detail to comment on and that is not acceptable.	The plan must identify the improvements in the infrastructure that enable commuters to travel to and from work with the minimum delay. The plan states 'Upgrades have already been identified to corridors connecting the site with Sutton Coldfield, Birmingham City Centre and the adjoining area.' How can comments be made when there is no detail to this very important element of the plan? (Policy GA5) It is simply not good enough to make vague promises without solid proof of process and planning.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1436	The plan does not strike a balance between what it is trying to achieve and what it can realistically achieve.	The Birmingham plan rendered unsound. A plan presented which strikes a balance between what it can realistically achieve based on a current economic climate in England and Wales that is not yet balanced and sustainable and therefore projections for growth should be tempered by realism	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1447	I have lived in Walmley all my life, I think building houses in the area would benefit young families to be able to buy a house in a nice area. Many families would love to live in Sutton Coldfield which has many benefits living in a nice area 1 of which would enable there children to go to a 'Sutton school'. At the moment the houses in Walmley are not affordable for young families and with this plan of houses will help out with this issue. The land does not get used for anything and never has it is a waste of land as far as I am concerned in 40 years of living in the area the land has not benefitted myself or my family at all!!! I think it is a good idea as long as the amenities are also built which is raising concerns with other but looking at the plan there does not seem to be any concerns whatsoever! Get building I would like a brand new house myself and would like to stay in the area so I for one am very happy!!!	none	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1460	..."We will plan to ensure Birmingham's residents will be experiencing a high quality of life, living within attractive and well designed sustainable neighbourhoods. "... Once again, how can a proposal to build on green belt land agree with the above statement? All that this development will do is put an intolerable pressure on existing infrastructure: hospitals, schools, roads etc.. and create an environment that does not deliver a high quality of life.	It should be stopped now.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1504	Generally the plan documents and consultation process is Not easy to work with. I am very concerned that people could be disadvantaged In their response either by accessibility/connectivity issues or dissuaded from responding due to the complexity. Much of the plan uses language which requires an assumed level of planning knowledge and therefore is not in simple plain language or terms which make it easier to understand. Birmingham City Council Planners should work with the Local communities affected by the Development Plan to create a joined up view for an agreed environment in which the residents would wish to continue Living and provides facilities and Infrastructure which are of a type and availability that will be appropriate for their use and that of their family's future generations. This is a fundamental requirement under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), see Para. 69. It is not made clear within the Plan how various policies have been drawn up. In particular Policies GA5 & 6 do not provide a clear statement that shows prior engagement with the Impacted communities and their representatives. I would like to see the BCC	Simplify the language and terms used in the Plan. Provide better access to the documentation and methods for engaging in the consultation. Engage directly with the communities affected by the changes outlined in the Plan and seek their views and agreement. Carry out a proper Transport & Infrastructure needs and sizing analysis for the existing communities and provide supportable Models or projections to support the 2013 Plan.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1507	These are worthy goals. But they need to be reworked with a sense of reality. Currently, and we are lead to believe for the next 5 years public expenditure cuts are closing and will continue to close local neighbourhood facilities, not make them sustainable. Similarly the current cultural offer in the city is under threat by reduced grants to the major cultural bodies. This will not be made up by philanthropic giving. So to have such an over-blown vision in such an adverse resource situation is unrealistic.	Redraft the visions with more realistic goals in light of current and future expenditure forecasts.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1521	Sustainable neighbourhoods can only be achieved if green spaces are protected.	The council should not focus on planned growth, but on preserving what we already have.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1578	3.1 "By 2031 Birmingham will be renowned as an enterprising, innovative and green City" your definition of green is interesting as you certainly arent looking at Green Belt land as this is what you plan to build on. I was under the impression some of this land was of special interest so how on earth can it be destroyed to build houses - whats "green" about that.	Use brown field land - there is plenty of land that falls under this cateogry - why destory green belt land that cannot be recovered.		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1595	The creation of the plan should have been a “collective enterprise”. The planning policy states “….planning has tended to exclude, rather than to include, people and communities. In part, this has been a result of targets being imposed, and decisions taken, by bodies remote from them “ BCC have not translated this into practice. People have been put off from getting involved. The plan is considered “…elaborate and forbidding – the preserve of specialists, rather than people in communities.” The plan presented is not allowing the public, communities and organisations enough influence over decisions “that make a big difference to their lives”.	A plan to be presented which is consistent with planning policy and to be a collective enterprise and not one which is the preserve of specialists.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1608	There is an awful lot of empty office space in Birmingham. Stating your vision and achieving it are not one and the same.			The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1623	Evidence suggests that there is no need for more offices in the city centre. Perhaps a more innovative approach would be to seek ways of locating people in the city centre in affordable accommodation. Our transport infrastructure was not designed to get the volumes of people into the city centre that it is being experienced today let alone in 2031. So the logic must be that you locate people close to their place of work. How is this being considered/evaluated? We should also be examining the impact of the internet on retail. If has already been significant and yet the council seems to be content to proceed on the basis that more retail space is needed. This is surely ill informed thinking?	Undertake a detailed review of the need for more office and retail space and and an analysis of the priorities. If we are going to have to find accommodation for another 150k people then let's be certain that they have places to live, an infrastructure that supports all citizens and sustainable jobs and not a load of empty offices and retail units that are unoccupied. In summary review the need for offices and retail outlets and be innovative in creating housing that can co-exist with work.		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1642	This is all very laudable and sounds wonderful but it bears no relation to what is happening now let alone by 2031! This vision makes no reference as to how it is to be achieved. How many residents will have seen these proposals in order to comment on them? The whole plan is woolly and verbose. I have seen the plan in the local library but not as an advertisement on say local buses or trains. This is a reliable way to engage residents interests which has not been used.	Add some realism, say what is to be done and a realistic timescale and costing. This would make it easier to comment on. Make the whole process easier and less time consuming for all to comment on. This plan must be made more user friendly if you are to get ordinary residents of Birmingham to comment on it and should have been better promoted across the city.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1681	If the vision for the city is seriously to make it Green, then building on Green Belt appears contradictory in the extreme.	If the real aim is to keep the City Green then the way to do this is to leave the Green Belt untouched.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1686	The proposal to build on any Green Belt land is contradictory to the overall strategy and vision of the plan. It is also contradictory to the NPPF - building on the Green Belt is not justified and the 'soundness' of any such plan cannot be justified. The ultimate cost of losing the Green Belt would far outweigh any gain. The plan does not define Development in a positive way - to develop is to progress and change for the better, to improve. This does not improve Sutton Coldfield, thus it does not improve Birmingham of which Sutton is a part. It is indeed to the detriment of the future prosperity of Sutton Coldfield and Birmingham. The plan needs to focus on improvement and regeneration of areas that need improving, not spoil good things. The proposal to build on the Green Belt is destructive, not constructive. The Green Belt is to be retained and protected - it is to be respected and regarded with gratitude.	Remove any proposals to build on Green Belt land. Focus clearly on regeneration, brownfield sites and vacant properties - to produce buildings and infrastructure that are planned with care and creativity.		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1698	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton	To achieve these objectives the City will need to support new development and be open minded to change. The strategy must also consider how development is going to be used and how that development will stimulate the need for the investment in and delivery of new/enhanced infrastructure. The current strategy contains a large SUE east of Walmley. This is some distance from Central Birmingham, the focus for economic and commercial development. How will these areas be linked, if through new infrastructure then this is only likely to be delivered after a critical number of new homes have been provided. Therefore, things like car parking provision in the City Centre needs to be increased in the interim to help balance growth and ensure the different objectives of the Plan work together and do not create conflict. Even though the need for the car parking may be short term (i.e. reduce once transportation improvements are delivered), there are likely to be other development within the City Centre that would then benefit, such as new office buildings. For example, throughout the Plan there are references to the levels of housing growth, the level of new retail and office space to be delivered in the City Centre,	The Plan needs some form on infrastructure delivery programme or scheme to support the development objectives. This should show what is likely to be needed to support development and the general spatial location of the new/upgraded facilities. This will help to demonstrate that the Plan is robust, credible and deliverable. It will also ensure that any phased delivery of wider development sites make adequate provision for infrastructure/services and/or future infrastructure/service connections.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1706				I don't think it will help in achieving my quality of life, Birmingham being a green City or meeting the needs of all by sustainable transport choices as the only transport available will be by car and lots of them.	Whilst I agree that the City centre is becoming a more desirable destination more could still be done in transforming empty buildings and run down parts of the City before any mention of destroying our Countryside.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1713				3.3 - If the green belt is ripped up there will be little diversity or bio diversity left for inner city dwellers to visit and learn about the countryside or for those living in green belt area to enjoy the quality of life they live in that area for.	re consider the options to look further afield and link in with other city councils to spread the sprawl further afield. We do not have to have all these people flocking to Birmingham that predominantly immigration is responsible for (and not all legal may I add). There is no more room. leave the green belt alone.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1788	A consultation which includes 70 evidence documents, 13 supporting documents and a plan which is 213 pages long (It has also been noted that documents are being uploaded “after” consultation start) then the process is not weighted in favour of the consultee. It is also noted that not all residents have in fact had access to all the information in order to make an informed decision. There have been two consultation portal links - one that included the evidence base and one that did not.	A plan presented which is not the preserve of specialists. One that is more realistic that includes and does not exclude the community. Dialogue to occur to allay concerns over the accessibility of the consultation.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1797	Policy TP10 The proposal to attack Green Belt land is not justified anywhere in this planning policy document. In its own words development on Green Belt land should only be undertaken under exceptional circumstances. There is no case to say that this destruction is justified. Indeed once this national policy is broken at the local level that in itself will justify further encroachment onto the Green Belt in the future. There is considerable brown field land throughought the West Midlands area, whilst this may be more expensive for developers it does not justify the destruction of open space and wild life habitat. Indeed often brown field sites are nearer already available infrastructure, when new land is covered by development unless the infrastructure is put in place for schools, community facilities and crucially transport links such development is a social faliure. The area earmarked in the structure plan is very poorly served by existing road and public transport facilities; the housing already in the Walmley area is already a source of over crowding for the existing road network. These proposals could only add considerably to that problem and nowhere does the document tackle these fundamental environmental and	Remove the threat to Green Belt and rethink the strategy on brown field sites.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1808	The Sustainability Appraisal document states that it has been issued for consultation alongside the BDP. Is this a document we are being consulted on, but how and what are we commenting on? The SA document itself is incomplete therefore but states " Final 10th October 2013" however on page "x" it states very differently requiring consultees to comment; with no date for consultation end. The document is incomplete.	To allay my concerns dialogue to occur with the BCC Director of Planning to understand what appears to be an issue for the consultees; that documents are incomplete or have not been made aware to the public domain that they are in consultation alongside the BDP.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1849	I totally agree with other comments expressed concerning the vacuous aspirations expressed for the plan and the lack of real consultation regarding the impact the plan will have on people's everyday lives, communities, facilities and infrastructure. Fundamentally there is a failure to recognise that uncontrolled immigration is the root cause of a perceived need to build more houses. Green belt should be protected as a heritage for current and future generations to enjoy. The proposal to build on green belt land at Peddimore is a rape of the countryside that will blight Sutton Coldfield and Walmley. How will Good Hope hospital cope with such a proposed influx?	Achieve real and meaningful consultation. Only use brown field sites for any proposed development. Protect green belt land and let current and future generations enjoy it for the quality of life that it bestows.?	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1850	I fail to see how Birmingham will be renowned as a green city if you are removing the Green Belt. Once one area is built on others will be an easy target.	You should not build on the Green belt. This stops the city becoming joined up with others and creating an urban sprawl, as can be seen with Walsall and Sandwell and Wolverhampton.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1859	This consultation form is a joke!! takes ages to fill in and lots of my neighbour's haven't been made aware of plans to build on our greenbelt land. I only found out by chance. The use of data from 2007 is very misleading, we don't need to build on protected land. Green belt land is protected and should remain untouched, brown belt land and all the empty houses should be addressed first, which should also clean up the city, as the empty homes are often unsightly.	Address the 12,000 empty homes first before you start even considering building on protected land unnecessarily!!!	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp1877	Greenbelt land has always been protected for important reasons. Whatever reasons the developers use to build on this precious land does not even come close to justifying destroying its beauty.	Tackle the problems of the 72,000+ empty homes in the UK first before building new homes, this will address there housing issues.	No	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp1891					3.1 “Enterprising” does mean innovation. This will come mainly from the private sector, so The Plan needs to be entrepreneur-friendly. It’s not clear that The Plan has even thought about, still less talked to entrepreneurs and start-ups that might grow. 3.2 “Sustainable” is a slippery mother-hood-and-apple-pie word. For those concerned with the ‘environment’ it means fewer cars, less use of fossil fuel, more bicycles, more walking etc. Some of this is fine, as long as it doesn’t clash with the needs of private entrepreneurial businesses. 3.3 The “needs of local people” will be fulfilled by having a growing, varied, dynamic economy supported by a similarly dynamic education and training sector. I am not convinced that this can be planned, but certainly the City can be made attractive to start-up and other businesses, but finding out and providing what they need and want. The Plan contains no evidence that the private sector has been consulted. 3.4 Again, like “sustainable”, “resilient” and “adaptive” are positive buzz words but what do they really mean? If they mean endless rules and regulations and more costs for new businesses, none of the long wish list in The Plan will happen. The Plan needs to work with the	Birmingham should aim to be entrepreneur and business start-up friendly by directly and relentlessly finding out what they want. Other issues such as “sustainability” should only count if they are what people and businesses want. For instance, energy saving measures maybe fine, but extra rules and regulations telling potential new businesses what they can or can’t do, should be scrapped. Birmingham needs to be very (very) business-friendly and anything in The Plan which may negatively affect this, should be got rid of, straight away.	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp2365	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp2751	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp2821	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5403					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5487	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5492		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp5582		Dickens Heath Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5588		Cheswick Green Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5600	Ms Rebecca Mayman	Wyre Forest District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5746	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5773	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5813		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5829		c/o Turley (Harvest Partnership)	Ms Susie Rolls	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5890	Councillor Caroline Wood	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5921	Councillor David Smith	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5943	Councillor Janet Eagland	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5950	C Jeff Sheriff	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5951	Mr Matthew Griffin	Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy) Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5960	Councillor Martyn Tittley	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031

bp5969	Councillor Susan Woodward	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp5975	Councillor Terry Finn	Staffordshire County Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Vision - Birmingham in 2031
bp17			I have 2 comments: 1) Re bus travel in Birmingham, I previously submitted an idea over 10 years ago, that I feel is still relevant, which is to build either a central bus station or 4 satellite ones to north, south, east and west of the city with a constant shuttle service between them, rather than have the random bus stops that exist at present. This would give passengers a safe environment to wait for their bus, with facilities such as toilets, cafe, tourist information and possibly shops accessible. It would make it easier to change from one service to another, especially for visitors to the city who do not know where to find the various bus stops. As at present, bus lanes would ensure the free flow of buses to these bus stations. West Bromwich and Shrewsbury are both examples of this facility. 2) The plans to enhance the city are impressive, but it would be a shame if new developments were spoilt by vandalism or other anti-social behaviour. It is important to teach good citizenship to children in schools and also to adults through poster campaigns etc so that everyone benefits from the improved city.		No	Objectives
bp19			To continue with the wildlife support, do not build in the green belt, concentrate on brownfield sites.	Identify inefficiently used council sites. I have worked in many schools in the city and some have plenty of land. There are also various educational "units" with few pupils on very large sites. These should be sold for development by the City. These displaced units should be relocated to mainstream school sites with an overall saving of money for the City & reuse of existing brownfield land.	No	Objectives

bp88	if you wish to hlp this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, in Sutton there is land at the back of the town, running by the train line, it has been deretict for years, the old Lucas factory in Mere Green, the shops that are empty and decaying in Mere Green another eyesore - use this land plus the thousands of other sites across the city. We need green spaces to breathe.			Objectives
bp127	How will the overcrowding of the Minworth area of Sutton Coldfield "develop Birmingham as a City of sustainable neighbourhoods that are safe, diverse and inclusive with locally distinctive character"	Show the all the assessment carried out including infractruture needs, current capacity and usage toghther with future needs assessment toghther with the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans	Yes	Objectives
bp275	To provide high quality connections throughout the City and with other places including encouraging the increased use of public transport, walking and cycling. - you have chosen an area in Walmley/ Minworth for 600 homes an area that is under subscribed by public transport and whilst people enjoy walking and cycling you are looking to take away our green belt where we do this.	BCC and its consultants should look at all of the brownfield sites which are derelict or disused and use these areas for development first once you take away our green belt you cant put it back	No	Objectives

bp541	Having only reached 3.2 I am beginning to have concerns about the lack of transparency in this development plan. The objectives above are obviously contradictory especially with regards human development and non-human development. If this contradiction is not to be taken seriously as an objective in itself then where is the accountability, where is the transparency and where is the good governance. Who exactly is making the decision that human development should over-ride non-human development? In which of the supporting documents which informs this plan is this decision being made? As such this plan is already proving to be a manifesto for human growth at the cost of non-human habitats, biodiversity and ecological connectivity. In this case, what actually is the point of using up precious resources to consult when somewhere the decisions have already been made. As such this document is already proving itself to be a manifesto for destruction with no true sustainability measures built into it whatsoever. Without ecosystem services, without biodiversity and without ecological connectivity there is no true sustainability. If there is to be more human development then flatten much of	An objective specifically outlining that human and non-human development are contradictory and for every development proposed a vote by the community affected with take place to determine the degree of human and non-human development, conservation and enhancement.	Yes	Objectives
bp591	The inclusion of green belt development within the plan is inconsistent with the stated objective of conserving Birmingham's natural environment.	Proposals for green belt development should be excluded from the plan.	Yes	Objectives
bp687	Better health and well-being will not come in an area that is over crowded and unpleasant to live in.	Infrastructure has to be provided first before any further development as the road network, hospital and schools can barely cope with the situation as it is now.	No	Objectives

bp719			The plan is high on promises and exudes the words that are required to tick politically and environmentally correct boxes. But it is contradictory and illogical. It promises biodiversity and green uplands but in reality it cynically attempts to destroy precious green belt for quick financial gain by land owners developers and the city. If the Birmingham City Planners is honestly trying to reduce transport issues, drive sustainability and re-enfranchise areas where there is a lack of decent home homes and employment, then work and homes must be built on Brown Field site first. Not only because it delays the destruction of Green Belt until there is absolutely no alternative, but more importantly it is because it is between the inner ring and outer ring where Birmingham people need homes and employment now.	Industry and service companies should be encouraged to come closer to the centre of Birmingham where there are areas that need good decent housing within the existing community. Sustainability has three meanings economic social and environmental. Social sustainability is achieved by ensuring work, leisure, schooling and housing are integrated. Economic sustainability is ensured by attracting employers and encouraging innovation. Environmental sustainability is delivered by reducing CO2 emissions and reduced burning of hydrocarbon. Integrated communities use less fuel through community heating schemes, better insulated and controlled housing, radically reduced transport.emmisions The plan needs to state positively its strategy to deliver these objectives.	Yes	Objectives
bp727			Sustainable city, minimising carbon footprint, provision of new and existing leisure facilities, link to good quality public open space? Yes all laudable but you are not doing it. Typical examples; new housing developments built and approved all the time without forcing developers to include cycle paths and links to adjoining estates/roads so that it is easy to walk to shops open spaces etc. encouraging a low carbon footprint. Typical example, is that you let developers build walls around estates and add anticlimb paint? You do this to stop people taking short cuts to walk out from their home to the bus/train/shops. This is completely inverted logic. Simple to improve your thinking but not being carried out.	Please seriously improve the public transport system. Make it easier for occasional bus users by having card payment systems so we arent faced with You Have To Have the Right Money or You Cant Get on.	No	Objectives
bp806	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	Building on the Green Belt, ie covering fields in hard surfaces, will do nothing to minimise the city's carbon footprint. The tired cliché word "sustainable" does not apply to destroying many hectares of open land, including good-quality Grade C farm land.	The Plan should focus on brownfield sites first and foremost.	No	Objectives

bp831	To suggest that you are 'protecting and enhancing the City's heritage and historic environments' and 'conserving Birmingham's natural environments, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish' by building on green belt and destroying that heritage and natural environment forever is laughable	Utilise the vacant plots in the city which are an eyesore and develop these sympathetically within the urban environment		Objectives
bp918	It is very difficult to see how these objectives can be achieved by building many more homes and destroying our beautiful Green belt. In any other county, this Green belt would be designated an area of 'outstanding natural beauty', but because it is in Birmingham, it is just viewed as potential building land. The main attraction of living in Birmingham for me is its compact size and easy accessibility to its different areas. Also the ease of accessing the countryside around. The Birmingham you envisage in the future, is not a place I would want to live in any more. How on earth the council is to finance all these grand plans when we are having to cut back on everything at the moment remains a mystery to me.	I am positive there are enough brownfield sites that could be developed, particularly if spacious flats were built, with roof terraces and gardens.	No	Objectives
bp1003	Too narrow and concentrated on suporting what people who do not live or work in Birmigham are thought to want from the City	Add objectives Build a resiliant local economy based on the growth of a multiplicty of localy developing firms. Seek to maximise the return to the City of Birmingham from developments. Address the isseus of poverty, exclusion, poor health and educational achivement. Create neighbourhoods andconserve neighbourhoods in which people choose to live in a susatianable manner	Yes	Objectives
bp1016	To encourage better health and well-being and conserve natural environments. If this is your objective there should not be any plans to build on the Green Belt.	Look at all brownfield sites in Birmingham and surroundings. There are many places that would be improved by attractive housing.	No	Objectives

bp1032			If it is the intention from BCC to promote sustainable development, why not starting building on all brownfield sites before considering the Green Belt ? Areas are available that are already close to local services and infrastructure. Developing on Green Belt is cheaper than developing brownfield sites suggesting that this is being proposed for financial reasons but the effect will be that the city will stop regenerating while we lose more and more of our countryside - a wholly unsustainable approach.	Population growth figures are very volatile so all brownfield sites need to be developed first and then the situation regarding outstanding need for new houses can be properly assessed. Building on Green Belt should only be considered when there is no other alternative.	No	Objectives
bp1052	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the objectives and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to sustainable neighbourhoods (attractive places that foster social cohesion), a prosperous and more sustainable city through economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect), enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Objectives
bp1193			Is in not strange that an enterprising innovative and Green City finds it necessary to build on the Green Belt? The alternatives have not been properly investigated.	Seek alternatives with adjacent authorities. Re-evaluate the needs	Yes	Objectives
bp1238			oHow can a plan objective of conserving the natural environment be viable when the plan wants to build on acres of Green Belt. Green Belt is there to prevent Urban Sprawl. By building on Green Belt, there is a reduction of the " good quality public open space" supposedly being encouraged? A reduced carbon footprint seems to make little logical sense when there are no insisted upon development of public transport (e.g. railways). This should be an essential pre-requisite, as thousands of new homes will hugely increase traffic chaos around the A38 corridor.	Leave the Green Belt until all Brownfield and other land is build upon. Move Hs2 terminal and allocate that land to industrial units. Insist that major public transport is built into the plan BEFORE any other options of building are put into place.	No	Objectives

bp1251	I support the idea of "To conserve Birmingham’s natural environments, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish." But the plan is seeking to destroy some of Birmingham’s natural environments by removing Green Belt protection some land.	Prevent any removal of Green Belt protection within the plan. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible that further points will become apparent between now and any examination in	Yes	Objectives
bp1273	Ref TP10/GA5 Peddimore is a natural environment in Birmingham - why isn't that being conserved as a priority? Building on Green Belt at peddimore is not conserving environment as stated above. Building new industrial units without transport infrastructure, when there are other sites already out there, is not minising carbon footprints.	A plan that actually meets its aims. i.e. to preserve natural environment means not building on Green Belt. Go to Brownfield sites first - develop shopping units that lie empty.	No	Objectives
bp1438	If a plan has been produced which is the " preserve of specialists " one which has not been produced by both "local people and their accountable councils"; If it its vision does not strike a balance between what it is trying to achieve and what it can realistically achieve then it stands that the objectives are not realistic. My comments within the plan also indicate that it is also not consistent with planning policy.	The plan be withdrawn until the Birmingham Plan presents a plan which is not " the preserve of specialists "; one which is reflective of both local people and their accountable council; a plan that is tempered with realism; the plan is created as per the requirements of the planning policy, NPPF. A plan based on accurate and up to date data; one that is based on planning for growth which is balanced and sustainable.	Yes	Objectives

bp1459	So how can building on green belt land deliver on the above objectives? How can this proposal "conserve Birmingham's natural environment, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish"? These proposals actually destroy it. What happens in another 30 years once the population has increased yet again? Do we build on the remainder of the green belt?	This is an appalling, ill thought out development and it should be stopped now.	No	Objectives
bp1508	It ought to be an objective to find a sustainable solution to the vast numbers of derelict or under-used buildings in the city - make an emphasis on brownfield regeneration a specific objective. It is the key to a more prosperous and sustainable future.	As above, incorporate a new objective.	Yes	Objectives
bp1522	The statistics forecasting significant growth in the city's population do not seem to be particularly reliable. In a limited geographical location it is impossible to plan for continuing growth without affecting the quality of green and green belt spaces within it.	The council should not place growth of both population and economy before preserving good quality of life for the current inhabitants of Birmingham.	No	Objectives
bp1574	TP37 GA5 GA6 The carbon footprint is going to increase. In Walmley through the Village and along Springfield Road the traffic is non-stop in the morning and evening. It gets gridlocked already without more traffic. We have two senior schools off Springfield Road so the school run is massive. As for transport, we have already just lost a bus service on this road. We have a listed building at the top of our fields and some beautiful trees, how can you protect and enhance these.	Don't fill Walmley up with more traffic.		Objectives
bp1582	I do not agree that this proposal will minimise the carbon footprint of the city. The plan is to create a large development at almost the geographically furthest point from Birmingham city centre. Thus this plan will probably produce the greatest carbon footprint due to the long journeys into the city centre by many future inhabitants.	The scheme should be significantly scaled down, and sites closer to the centre of Birmingham (the existing undeveloped brownfield sites) should be used instead.	No	Objectives

bp1585	"To conserve Birmingham’s natural environments, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish" I am a total loss how you can be claiming that this is an objective when your plan is to descimate green belt land. These seem to be empty words to make the proposal sound good as I cannot see how the plan will achieve this. You keep discussing infrastructure should be in place but from what I can determine in the plan this is not going to be looked at until all the properties have been sold. How much chaos will be caused before that is completed. I hardly think this will support the better health and well being objective - surely it will just cause commuters additional stress, add time to thier already long journies and have a negative impact on work life balance - non of which support better health and wellbeing.	Firstly if the need is for new housing look at existing options of refurbishing run down areas with boarded up properties or look at brown field areas where you can achieve the conservation objective.		Objectives
bp1610	There is absolutely no doubt that we need improved connections throughout the city and beyond. The leisure facilities in the inner city are not up to scratch. What is happening to the peace park? Students are destroying communities - they should be obliged to live on campus.			Objectives
bp1685	How do we 'Conserve Birmingham's natural environment' as you suggest is your aim by building on green belt land? If we build on Green Belt we remove large swathes of countryside. This removes an area of the natural countryside which people will no longer be able to view and enjoy. It also makes flooding more likely by removing land that currently absorbs this water and turns it into a concrete area that exacerbates flooding.	If the aim of the plan is conserve the natural environment this should be done without building on Green Belt land.	No	Objectives
bp1709	Conserving Birmingham's natural environments, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish, protect and enhance the City's heritage and historic environments..... really? more like destroying all of these things.	I can't believe you really think this plan is going to conserve Birmingham's natural environment, unbelievable!	No	Objectives

bp1714	Birmingham City Council needs to appreciate that not everyone is going to fit. With the development of new homes on green belt - where will it end???	Conurbation - The building of a new town with it's own infrastructure (hospital, schools, shopping centre etc)and rail links is what really needs to be considered and in liaison with neighbouring borough councils and further afield. There are areas throughout the country that are desperate to create jobs and housing. Link in with these councils.	No	Objectives
bp1837	Undertaking development upon the Greenbelt will not in any way 'conserve Birmingham's natural environments, allowing biodiversity and wildlife to flourish' or 'protect and enhance the City's heritage and historical environments'. The developments proposed for the Greenbelt area are not at all justified when observing the objectives listed.	The development of derelict sites within the city needs to be addressed prior to development upon Green Belt land.	No	Objectives
bp1863	I refer to the Birmingham Core Strategy 2026 Consultation Draft point 7.6 - Key Objectives and I quote : The Key Objective for North and West Birmingham; . To protect the important areas of Green Belt which border the area including Sutton Park. This comment is key to the whole fiasco that you are proposing. You made it quite clear in the Core Strategy that you did not want or need to build on the Green Belt by virtue of the very statement above. What has changed I ask myself? Well I'll tell you what has changed, the Council has listened to the comments of the 'housebuilders'. I have read the Pegasus Planning document where they tell you that you should consider using Green Belt. The only reason they are saying this is because it equates to a massive profit for their housebuilder clients. They are very quick to suggest you remove empty properties from your calculations that are being brought into use as they are not new build. What difference does it make if they are new build or old? Absolutely none. An additional property is just that - a solution to a problem. The same with windfall properties - suggesting you remove 5000 from your numbers? Why? They are just as speculative as your predictions for	Remove all references to building on Green Belt from this Plan. Make use of all brownfield sites in the City before any further consideration be made to building on Green Belt. Are you considering regenerating the area around Digbeth? This should be included as a major opportunity for regenerating at high density close to the City.	No	Objectives

bp1864					We are not minimising our carbon footprint if the pollution rate soars in the area due to a minimum of 10,000 new cars, our road infrastructure will not be able to cope, because it doesn't already!! The traffic at the moment during peak times is really bad, imagine 10,000 more cars, will take us forever to get out of our own neighbourhood!! Also building on green belt land is not helping our carbon footprint, its destroying valuable land which helps drainage, which will cause a lot of flooding in the area if our green belt land is gone. would benefit our carbon footprint if all the empty houses were sorted first.	Sort out the 12,000 plus empty houses, don't build on protected greenbelt land, not justified.		Objectives
bp2366	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives
bp2537	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives
bp2828	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives
bp5197	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives
bp5405	Chris Crean	Friends of the Earth			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives
bp5489	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives
bp5495		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Objectives
bp5583		Dickens Heath Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Objectives
bp5589		Cheswick Green Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Objectives
bp5601					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Objectives

bp5607		Tesco Stores Limited	Ms Jennie Baker	Senior Planner Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5747	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5775	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5814		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5830		c/o Turley (Harvest Partnership)	Ms Susie Rolls	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5893	Councillor Caroline Wood	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5926	Councillor David Smith	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5945	Councillor Janet Eagland	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5953	C Jeff Sheriff	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5954	Mr Matthew Griffin	Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy) Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5962	Councillor Martyn Tittley	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5970	Councillor Susan Woodward	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5976	Councillor Terry Finn	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp5996		Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin	Partner Deloitte LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Objectives
bp20					i notice large tracts of the city have no rail or tram lines planned in....isnt this an oversight??	e.g plan and build a tram line from centre to say harborne, bartley green then to northfield and onto longbridge linking up with rail staion/bus hub?	The Strategy

bp21			Cento have recently told me that they have no plans for the 2 proposed railway stations that you show near Sutton Coldfield & Walmley. They also say that the line from Water Orton to New Street is fully occupied, & New Street is also full. They quoted a figure of at least £250 million per station. Has the City Council asked Centro about their proposals? Who will pay? Could use money from HS2 if that was cancelled.	No development in green belt at Sutton until after new stations & rail link is provided. The only 2 main roads into Birmingham (A38 & A5127) are already grossly overloaded.	No	The Strategy
bp46			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	The Strategy
bp62			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp89			if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, in Sutton there is land at the back of the town, running by the train line, it has been deretict for years, the old Lucas factory in Mere Green, the shops that are empty and decaying in Mere Green another eyesore - use this land plus the thousands of other sites across the city. We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country	as above		The Strategy
bp276			As the comments before state I do not believe that you have exhausted all brownfield development sites the old LDV site Palletways on the Tyburn road the Cincinatti site Kingsbury road etc you are looking to develop an area that is lush and green and can not be replaced once it is gone the roads in that area are a nightmare for congestion already the public transport at best is sparce and on some days I even struggle to get out of my own road .	Other locations such as derelict buildings and brownfield sites need to be chosen	No	The Strategy
bp313	Cllr Phillip Parkin	Birmingham City Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp427	Mrs Diane Weir	Assistant Clerk Castle Bromwich Parish Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp433			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy

bp538	It is a cheap trick to use green belt land to build more houses. Look closely at the examples in Holland on sustainable housing and see how they integrate houses and shops back to back in small tracts of land in cities. It is not necessary to build on green belt land to achieve your goal. Try harder and work more creatively on this. Be the defender of the green belt.	Look at the example I mentioned in Holland. Try Culembourg. Build high density but attractive homes on brownfield sites in between commercial and industrial so that living and working space are close together. There are lots of these plots around Birmingham which could be developed to great effect and massively improve quality of life for people in disadvanted areas at the same time. Look around Soho Road, Villa Road, Hockley Hill.	No	The Strategy
bp545	Who has made the decision that growth is a requirement to satisfy the needs of Birmingham citizens. This political manifesto has arrived at decisions which are completely contradictory to the ideals of sustainability which in the first instance have to be ecological and environmental in nature otherwise the basis for continued human sustainability is eroded. This manifesto for growth fails to identify the real reasons why poverty exists in this city, one of which being the huge underutilisation of disused brownfield sites in the city. If this so-called plan is to guide future planning then why isnt stagnant evergy in the system being forced to move in order to flow around the system. The false assumption that poverty is caused by a lack of growth is an incredibly destructive assumption to make. Whats more, to implement this is guided assumption as a core basis for this plan is not to create sustainabilty but to promote further unsustainability. The actual reason for poverty is underutilised capital in the system which leads to stagnancy which is not only felt on an economic level but also social since as we intuitively know, abandoned or disused cpaital assets have a negative psychological effect. Therefore if	To replace the growth agenda with an agenda that promotes the utilisation of disused capital assets in the city and the maximisation of resource efficiency gains through better transportation networks, better recycling and waste systems and better localised energy production systems. So rather than a 'growth' agenda, I feel the plan should have as its core motivation a 'utility' agenda.	Yes	The Strategy

bp592	No justification is provided for the target of 40 dwellings per hectare. A higher target could eliminate the need for green belt development. Lower population densities increase the need for travel, which is fundamentally unsustainable and contrary to the stated objectives of the plan. The strategy of the plan is to accommodate as much of the city's housing needs as possible within the city boundary. There is no reason for this objective to form part of the strategy, as it unnecessarily constrains the options for meeting Birmingham's housing need, reduces flexibility and is inconsistent with the duty to cooperate.	Increase the target number of dwellings per hectare. This will improve sustainability by reducing the need to travel and ensuring people can live within walking distance of infrastructure and services. The objective to meet as much as possible of the city's housing requirement within the city boundary should be removed from the plan.	Yes	The Strategy
bp668	I strongly support the reopening of the railway line from town to Moseley and Kings Heath. This should be accompanied by the downgrading of the A435 as a major arterial route for lorries. Moseley is an international centre for quality of life and tourism and access should be increased at the same time as the parking and road traffic congestion are modified. It should be noted that Taxis or private car are currently the only ways of direct connection of Moseley with Birmingham Airport.	The A435 should not be marked as an arterial route. Much work and evidence as to the efficacy of this proposal has been carried out as part of the Moseley Plan which is supported by the Balsall Health and Moseley Forum of which I am a committee member and other conservation and regeneration bodies in the South of Birmingham.	Yes	The Strategy
bp723	The Maps in Q04 are misleading they show the Langley SUE (proposed site of building 6000 houses as separate to the Green Belt). The proposed Langley SUE is definitely on existing protected Green Belt.	The Map should be changed to show Langley SUE is on existing Green Belt. All Maps in the BDP should be re examined and verified by an independent inspecting authority I would suggest Ordinance Survey. Also every proposed change should have before and after Map or Plan.	Yes	The Strategy

bp799			I understand that the decision to build on Peddimore has been made as a compromise between the need to retain as much of the greenbelt as possible and the need to provide additional houses and services to the Birmingham area. I agree with the plan as it stands and object in the strongest terms against any plan to further increase the amount of greenbelt that is released for development. No sound fiscal, social or environmental case has been made for the release of greenbelt in zones A and B. Given the continued economic climate, long-term fiscal forecasts and all party support for further deficit reduction and reduced public sector expenditure through to 2020, further expansion of greenbelt development (particularly in zones A and B) cannot be justified on value for money grounds given the significantly higher development costs when compared to those incurred in developing brownfield sites. In the tight fiscal environment Birmingham Council clearly does not have the long term capital and resource budgets to accommodate the necessary expenditure on service provision (roads, rail, public services and amenities) when at the moment they can't even afford to provide bin bags!!	None to the current plan. But the plan should not be expanded further to release greenbelt outside Peddimore.	No	The Strategy
bp802	Mr Michael Barker	Assistant Director: Planning Specialist Telford & Wrekin Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp919			My first comment is how hard it is to make any sense out of these proposals, I think a much simplified version in the form of a leaflet should have been delivered to every household. I am an honours graduate, and I am still struggling to take in all this information. However, I find these proposals very generalised, the only concrete detail seeming to be areas outlined for building on. I would still dispute the need to build on the Peddimore site in our Green belt.	Instead of using the Peddimore site, surely other sites could be found within the city centre. The usefulness of the HS2 is still debatable, that is a large tract of city centre land that could be put to better use. Use the HS2 money to build new towns and link with road and rail links, thus promoting local travel and reducing long distance travel, which we shouldn't be encouraging at all.	No	The Strategy

bp962	Looking at the map provided it is clear a core development is in the north west of the city along the A38 Aston Expressway and the adjacent mainline railway. I have no issue with this as Aston is one of the key industrial and service areas. However it should be balanced by a wider dispersion across the city. I very rough estimate puts 80-90%% of the core development in 5-10% of the City Boundaries. This does not correlate with the BDP objectives of spreading the sustainable growth throughout the deprived communities of Birmingham.	There are areas of Birmingham where significantly deprived areas have been ignored. The building of sustainable homes, work places and community facilities must be spread into these areas i.e. south and south west. The Langley SUE is putting huge strain on to the already overloaded transport infra-structure. There is no significant degree of unemployment in Sutton Coldfield compared with deprived areas. By building 6000 houses in the Langley SUE will add approximately 15,000 people to Sutton Coldfield district and approximately 9000 cars and vans. This will not only cause very high traffic congestion (there are no funds available for rail investment). But most importantly as the route into Birmingham crosses the M6 it will cause a huge increase in the Carbon Foot Print through domestic, transport and industrial CO2 release. It is completely against the vision of the BDP.	Yes	The Strategy
bp993	See previous comments on the conflict between the polices and the aims - particulalry in relatin to creating a resiliant local economy and neighbourhoods were people choose to live given the emphaiss on large scale inward investment and high density housing. There are also a significant number of SPDs most of whihc get no mention in this document. It should be clear whihc if any of those are to remain in force	Recognise the conflicts and build in policies to support, protect and prommote local bussiness and neighbourhoods of choice. Be clear about exisitng SPDs and their status	No	The Strategy
bp1017	Sutton Coldfield already faces challenges with traffic conjestion, full trains even from 7am each day and schools that are full, not withstanding a very stretched hospital. It is inconceivable to think that Sutton and it's amenities that are vital for family everyday life can possibly cope with the introduction of so many more houses and associated family requirements. Development of brown field sites in wider area of Birmingham would be a better option. This would allow for development and regeneration in some deprived inner city areas.	I believe that brown field sites should be developed before removing green belt. Once this is lost it can't be regained and Birmingham will continue to grow into a sprawling metropolis that offers no green space for our youngsters to enjoy.	No	The Strategy

bp1054	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the strategy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to supporting significant but sustainable growth (3.6), reducing the city's carbon footprint and providing resilient landscapes, reducing energy use and promoting renewable energy (3.8) as part of the wider green infrastructure network (3.9). Supporting the economy by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) - (3.11-3.20), enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) - (3.21-3.27) whilst supporting biodiversity and enhancing the city's connectivity (3.28-3.37)		The Strategy
bp1145	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The document states “The canal network will continue to be promoted as a vital asset for the City supporting movement, environmental and biodiversity quality and as the setting for development.” Canal & River Trust welcome the promotion of the canal network within the strategy for Birmingham. Canal & River Trust agree that the canal network is a vital asset for the City. The canal network is a multifunctional community asset. The multi-functional roles, include: an agent of or catalyst for regeneration; a contributor to water supply and transfer, drainage and flood management; a tourism, cultural, sport, leisure and recreation resource; a heritage landscape, open space and ecological resource; sustainable modes of transport; and routes for telecommunications; supporting climate change, carbon reduction and sustainability. The Canals within Birmingham include: Birmingham and Fazeley Canal; Birmingham and Warwick Junction Canal; Digbeth Branch; Grand Union Canal; Hockley Port Branch; Icknield Port Loop; Ladywood Arm; New Main Line Canal; North Stratford Canal; Old Main Line Canal; Oozells Street Loop; Soho Loop; Tame Valley Canal; Worcester and Birmingham Canal; Rotton Park	No	The Strategy

bp1194	It should not be an objective to make provision for such a rapid increase in population but too seek to limit that (by investigating alternatives if necessary and this does not appear to have been done) Conserving Birmingham's natural environments is incongruent with building on the green belt. Inadequate improvement in the infrastructure is planned ie; trams/trains/new roads/underground - let alone hospitals, schools and public services already under strain. Thus the proposal is NOT SUSTAINABLE	Evaluate a plan commensurate with a sustainable increase in infrastructure.	Yes	The Strategy
bp1197	This is an inconsistent strategy built on wrong precepts. It is not necessary to build on Green belt. For example there are an estimated 10,00 empty homes in Birmingham and brownfield sites that could accommodate the stated required (but not proven) increase in homes. Of course it is cheaper to build on greenfield sites - which has nothing to do with sustainability. The increased need for land particularly for retail is questionable given rapidly changing habits. With regards to flooding, in recent bad weather I have seen water flowing across Webster Way on one side and the Kingsbury Road on the other - with water spouting up from drains in Curdworth. Extensive building the Green Belt at Langley and Peddimore will increase flooding risk	Change the precepts. Re-evaluate needs. Consult adjacent authorities.	Yes	The Strategy

bp1252	Item 3.6 "To meet Birmingham’s future needs and achieve the vision we will need to provide for significant new growth in the most sustainable way, ensuring that the development of new homes is matched by the provision of opportunities for new employment, accessible local services and a high quality environment." The development of new homes also should be linked to the actual demand for new homes - something that is not proven. Item 3.8 "The City’s future growth will be pursued in the most sustainable way reducing the City’s carbon footprint and creating resilient and adaptive environments. " The plan does not seek to carry out developments in the most sustainable way, nor in a manner to reduce the City's carbon footprint, as it will destroy agricultural land with the removal of Green Belts protection. Item 3.12 "A continuous supply of land and full range of premises will be made available for all forms of employment development, including for the growth and modernisation of existing companies, the establishment of new businesses and to attract investment from both within the UK and internationally."The city has only a limited amount of land available and	Re item 3.6 - full and up to date information needs to be provided on the population growth estimates, matching them to outstanding housing developments that have been planned but yet to be completed. Re item 3.8 - full and up to date information needs to be provided on the population growth estimates, matching them to outstanding housing developments that have been planned but yet to be completed. The deficit should then be compared against available brownfield land. The future housing development should then aim to fit the defined population within the available land. Re tem 3.12 - a more realistic approach to land management within the city needs to be adopted, ensuring that the available brownfield land is used efficiently and sustainably. Re item 3.13 supporting evidence should be provided to justify this statement - if it is at all justifiable. * * *

bp1258	item 3.21 "For sustainable neighbourhoods to flourish they will be supported by high quality local infrastructure and services". The propsed new infrastructuire to suppoer the major development on Green Belt is limited (improving a few junctions, adding a bus lane) and hardly "high quality". Item 3.22 "High standards of design in new residential areas will be expected " this will be a departure from the standard approach which is to allow developers to cram as much on to a site as possible. For example, new developments are allowed to have minimal parking space with the excuse that this promotes travel other than via private car, whereas in reality this leads to roads being cluttered up with cars which are unable to fit in too small garages and overflow from small driveways. Item 3.24 "Brownfield and other available sites within the existing built-up area, including major developments such as Greater Icknield, the Southern Gateway and Longbridge, will be the priority."Whilst I welcome the proposals that brownfield land should be the priority, such a statement should not be required. The use of Green Belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances anyway. What does the council	Re item 3.21 - the planning of any new developments should actually follow the statement of purpose given in this item and should actually be provided with high quality infrastructure, not just general "off the shelf" ideas. Re item 3.22 - The planning process for new developments needs to been significantly revised to ensure that high standards of design will actually be implemented, and these need to be imposed by the council with its enforcements officers. Re item 3.24 - By retaining the exisitng green Belt protection on all lands so designated, this would ensure that brownfield land is effectively prioritised. Re item 3.26 - Proper definitions of need to given to guide policy and inform the public rather than wishy washy statements like "well served". This should not be too difficult. General point - more robust and reliable transport modelling needs to be done to ensure that the adverse impacts of any development is properly assesed and that no assumption is made of existing travellers having to change their place of residence/employment, except those living in or working at the new	Yes	The Strategy

bp1372	(1)The strategy states (Para 3.9) '...and well-maintained local public open space, forming part of a wider 'green infrastructure network' threading through the City and linking to the open countryside beyond.' Is this the same 'open countryside beyond' otherwise known as Green Belt? The same Green Belt that is ear marked for industrial development and the building of 6,000 houses? The NPPF states in its Core Planning Principles that planning should 'take account of the different roles and characters of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside....' It seems that BDP on one hand recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside but is quite happy for the land to be built upon thereby changing the character of the area and contravening the NPPF directives. (2) The strategy states (Para 3.12) ' A continuous supply of land will be made available.....for all forms of employment...' There is not a continuous supply of land. How can that be sustainable? (3) The six Economic Zones are geographically well spaced. To deliver sustainable development the NPPF states that	(1) All development, industrial and housing, should in the first instance use Brown Field sites (2) Explain how 'a continuous' supply of land will be made available. (3)The plan should adhere to the NPPF directive and integrate housing into the Economic Zones and thereby spread the housing requirements around the city rather than in one large development.	No	The Strategy
bp1396	The area has the lowest area of green belt land any ware. How can you claim to be sustainable in the planning when you would be adding approx 10000 cars in an area that is already conjested. Which ever direction you travel there are bottle necks at narrow bridges. This will be detrimental to existing residents.	Keep the agricultural green belt and build on low impact brown field sites. This may be less attractive to builders but so what. The plan should take account of the people not the developers.	No	The Strategy

bp1440	A full assessment of need is required which should pay regard to household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change and cater for the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand. Up to date data on this is missing: -The BDP is based only on ONS statistics which can only predict until 2021. - There is insufficient evidence this is the most appropriate strategy as it has yet to be considered against all reasonable alternatives. -The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. If this information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs. The pipeline for business investment is currently unknown. Until this detail is provided the most appropriate strategy for economic growth and its location is unknown. The economic growth in England is currently not yet balanced or sustainable; we have yet to see exports or	A relevant/coherent/cohesive strategy is developed one that is based on more balance and sustainable data for both housing and employment. A strategy focused where all reasonable alternatives have been considered. One that has input from the GBSLEP and looks at the wider strategic issues for growth and economic recovery. One that takes into account that overall growth in England and Wales is not yet sustainable and any plan therefore not so overly ambitious but which is tempered with caution and realism. A strategy which considers as a baseline that Birmingham is the most densely populated city in the West Midlands already and focus should be on the wider strategic issues for housing. Not only here in the West Midlands but looking at joint working with other areas outside of the West Midlands. A strategy developed based on a pipeline of investment opportunities; a strategy which has considered the skills and capability gaps and capabilities in the Birmingham. A plan and strategy which is consistent with planning policy one which is as a result of a collective enterprise, allowing the community into	Yes	The Strategy
bp1461	All that this development will achieve is to put an even greater strain on an already grossly overloaded transport infrastructure. I fail to understand how it will promote "and encourage use of public transport and non-motorised forms of transport such as cycling and walking."This proposed development will just introduce more vehicles onto the existing road infrastructure. As always happens people will not work near to where they are living. The A446 between Bassetts Pole and the M42 J9 is already grid locked every morning and every evening.	Stop development of green belt land.	No	The Strategy

bp1475	The supporting documentation contained with Peter Brett Associates Housing Targets 2011-31 Technical Paper stipulates that development within the green belt will commence in 2016. Foe ease of reference I have cut and pasted in the exact text below 2016-2021 – The target is for 2,500 dwellings per annum over this period. This will see housing delivery taking place on the land removed from the Green Belt in the north east Birmingham Housing Targets Technical Paper September 2013 12 of the city. The former Green Belt land will account for over half of the additional target during this period. The Birmingham Development Plan does not stipulate this fact, it actually stipulates that development will be prioritised in urban areas. The Plan is silent on timescales and does not support the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to preventing "urban sprawl"	Without clearly defined timescales for the release of Green Belt there will be no control or ability to ensure urban and brownfield sites are redeveloped first. By incorporating in to the main Development Plan the release of Green belt, how do the Planning Authority think they will be able to prevent Developers from targeting the green field sites??? Any future Planning Applications within Greenbelt will be inline with the main Plan therefore making applications very difficult to reject.	No	The Strategy
bp1484	There is no clear plan to develop transport or educational infrastructure for this area of development. It simply removes Green Belt land to create an increased urban sprawl that will be unaccessible and lacking in facilities - placing even greater strain on already limited resources.	Brownfield development in areas where infrastructure exists or could be reasonably expanded in smaller more manageable units of development - do not expand the footprint of the city and destroy irreplacable green field sites.	No	The Strategy

bp1499	"The removal of land from the Green Belt will provide for an additional 6,000 homes." This is almost as bad an abuse of language as the previous expression "freeing green belt". This is not "freeing" or "removal" it is despoiling of land protected to avoid exactly the urban sprawl that is being proposed in this section of the plan. Birmingham is already the second largest city in the country and its council is proposing it should spread indiscriminately across all of its constituency. Having used up all the other green belt it is proposed to develop the north east of the city where the infrastructure is already groaning at the seams for schools, hospitals, and transport. Sutton Coldfield's roads are jammed in rush hours and weekends, the suburban railway stations have inadequate parking. Whilst the selected southerly development areas around Walmley are undoubtedly the least bad choice for development, why should green belt despoilment be contemplated when obvious brown belt waste land, empty factories and boarded up houses are visible across the city.	There should be no despoiling of the green belt until existing derelict land and vacant developed sites has been reclaimed. Published research also suggests there are already 17,000 houses with full or outline planning and 12,000 empty houses in the city, these should be completed or filled before a green sod is turned for green belt building.	No	The Strategy
bp1509	The plan suggests some level of brownfield redevelopment. That should be phased so that only brownfield sites are developed first and only after they have been completed should any consideration be given to the use of greenfield sites. Developers will not want to undertake the difficult sites and will pressurise until they are permitted easier options on virgin sites. The plan must be secure against this so that the development industry understands clearly the task ahead of them.	To make amendments to the text to incorporate the above principle.	No	The Strategy

bp1523	I agree that in town centres like Sutton Coldfield there is ample space for enhanced retail outlets and offices. However, many of these are currently lying empty in and around the town centre, so there would seem to be no need to build any more. The focus should be on improving the buildings that are already there. The Red Rose Centre in Suttton Coldfield, for example, is very outdated and needs to be rebuilt to be modern and appealing. I also agree that any new homes should be built to high standards away from flood plains. I strongly disagree that any homes should be built on green belt land, particularly when statistics about future population growth are so unreliable. It is consistently shown that well being is improved by proximity to green spaces, and Birmingham has very few of these. Erosion of green belt land is irreversible and damaging to the well being of the residents of Birmingham. In addition, how can building on farmland be considered to be sustainable development?	Homes should only be built where there is already brown field land. There is no legal requirement for Birmingham to house everybody who may wish to live here in the future - land is limited.	No	The Strategy
bp1576	Fill up the brown fill sites and leave the Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield alone. There is little enough green belt around the City.			The Strategy

bp1586	The proposed development is poorly sited as regards transport links, looking at this map, the development is in an area of few main roads. How are the new inhabitants going to commute to their places of work on the current road system which is already very busy during rush-hour. As an example: The A446 (past the Belfry) is extremely difficult to join at any point past about 7am from Grove Lane (the country road from Springfield Road to the A446) due to the A446 being the main route from The A38 Burton area to the M42 and it being used by slow HGVs limited to 40mph and consequently building up queues behind them, and this with the extremely low levels of other traffic on Grove Lane. How the many hundreds of extra cars will affect this minor road through Wishaw I shudder to think. There will be huge tailbacks. The roads around this proposed development will not cope. In addition, the A38 to the city centre is one of the very few main roads through to the rest of Birmingham. Anyone who has the misfortune to use it at peak periods knows how it often comes to a standstill. How the many thousands of extra cars will add to the situation?	Again, reduce the size of the development and use other areas with better road links	No	The Strategy
bp1587	The plan appears to have many flaws and goes against the general planning policies of protecting green belt which does lead the general public to belive this is purely for political gain/financial benefits to Birmingham City Council. In Sutton there are many areas that could be used instead. The Cincinatti factory site, the old Lucas factory site in Mere Green to name 2 off the top of my head. The question has to be asked have these options being considered so that all the proposed development is not in one area and hence putting additional pressure on the roads in those areas.			The Strategy
bp1615	This plan lacks imagination.			The Strategy

bp1639	Given that the 6000 homes that you intend to develop are all in Sutton Coldfield I see nothing in the transport plan that does anything to provide transport infrastructure for that area. The proposed development is going to be adding around 12000 cars to the A38 arterial route and other very overcrowded routes around the city and beyond. This observation excludes the impact of the proposed industrial developments on vehicle volumes around this area and into the city etc.	If the Sutton Coldfield developments have to happen (and I am not convinced by the statements that they do) then there needs to be a complete re-think on the transport infrastructure to support the volume of people that will migrate to the area. It cannot cope one and will not cope in the future even with more modest population growth. Alternatively, adopt a different strategy which places people in closer proximity of their work (thereby enabling greater opportunity to promote walking and cycling and reduce reliance on public and private transport and helping the City to achieve is environmental sustainability targets and aspirations).	No	The Strategy
bp1643	We must not plan to build in an area Langley SUE /Peddimore because these areas are surrounded by already congested infrastructure. Building 6.000 more homes on the Sutton Coldfield Green Belt will make significant contribution to the already over crowded roads and rail networks. Sustainability and the environment will be compromised. Schools are already over subscribed in the Sutton area as are hospitals. How will the area cope with so many more residents. The proposal to re-open the Moseley-Kings Heath line is welcome and long over due.	Do not build on green belt. Provide a time scale and detail how funding is to be obtained to provide all the new roads and rail services. Include the plans for a new /extra hospital to cope with so many residents. Give details as to the number and range of schools proposed. Much of this will need to be constructed very early on in the proposed development. Give time scales. Then it would be a real plan that could effectively be commented on and it would engender confidence that this will actually happen to support so many more residents. Are there any plans to build on the many derelict factory sites one sees in the city; I am thinking of the one at the top of Shaftsmore Lane? Consider higher density housing and more imaginative ways or building. Are there any plans to consider increasing the rented sector? If new office space is not used as office space couldn't this be converted to housing rather than leaving it empty for years on end? Public transport will only be used over the private car if it is made more attractive and economically viable to use. I would like to see plans for this.	No	The Strategy
bp1689	3.8 - We cannot reduce the City's carbon footprint by putting concrete over green belt land.	If the purpose of the plan is to reduce the carbon footprint then building upon green belt really doesn't make any sense and should be removed from the plan.	No	The Strategy

bp1699	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton	The A453 should be identified alongside the A38 and A45 as one of the key routes through the City and as a corridor suitable for a wide range of development, particularly close to the City Centre. It is important that the delivery of development and infrastructure are well matched. Improvements to infrastructure can help to attract development and investment. The majority of the objectives rely on good transport connections and access to services and utilities.	Include the A453 as a named key route through the City. The supports the objectives set out in Policy GA1.1.	Yes	The Strategy
bp1716				This documents is not easy user friendly and is quite protracted to provide succinct comment on. I am afraid my comments may be repetitive throughout. I concur with he majority of comments already made. however, I will add my own as follows: Green belt - Why? The green belt was put there for a purpose - to avoid urban sprawl. If you build homes here, we will be verging on merging with Tamworth and the surrounding area. The green belt is also valuable farm and arable land. I shop at our local farm shop which is right on the edge of where you propose building. What would happen to this thriving business not to mention the animals and livestock. They would be out of business!! JOB LOSSES not gains and you are stating that the homes are need to create jobs. Nature - The areas on which you are proposing to build have a rich and diverse habitat. What would happen if we lost this due to concrete and steel.? We would start to loose species and our children and future generations worse off for it. The local climate would change with potential increase in fumes and pollution. The land we are talking of is valuable to walkers, runners,cyclists, horse riders and nature lovers. Exercise and learning about our environment is	Serious consideration would need to be given on building new hospital facilities and GP services. I feel you will need to consider at a minimum, 2 new primary and 1 secondary school to cope with this number Speculate to accumulate!!	No	The Strategy
bp1722				I would like to but you have not given us residents the time to comment on such an important issue.	Proper consultation	No	The Strategy

bp1791	Mr Jon Lord	City Centre Neighbourhood Forum	3.24 agree with prioritising brownfield and sites within the urban area for new housing but no detail on implementation. Without a phasing policy to accompany this objective, the default priority will be the green belt which will be favoured by developers as it is cheaper and less complex to develop. The Sutton Coldfield sustainable urban extension should only be released for development once a % of the existing brownfield urban area sites are developed to ensure urban regeneration continues particularly sites within and adjacent to the city centre. A key missing element is the need for proactive implantation policies to bring forward complex brownfield development sites. The city council's focus will need to be on working with land owners, developers and other funding and delivery agencies to assist the delivery of sites which are often contaminated and in a plethora of different ownerships. This approach will require substantial resources and commitment and a willingness to be flexible in terms if land use to be able to replicate the success of large scale planned regeneration schemes such as Park Central in locations around the city centre including The Gun Qtr, Highgate and Ladywood.	A phasing policy should be included to ensure that the Sutton Coldfield sustainable urban extension should only be released for development once a % of the existing brownfield urban area sites are developed to ensure urban regeneration continues particularly sites within and adjacent to the city centre. In addition, more proactive implantation policies to bring forward complex brownfield development sites should be set out. The city council's focus will need to be on working with land owners, developers and other funding and delivery agencies to assist the delivery of sites which are often contaminated and in a plethora of different ownerships.	No	The Strategy
bp1795	Mr Jon Lord	City Centre Neighbourhood Forum	3.10 of the plan's strategy is not deliverable i.e 'historic assets in all their form will be conserved'. Whilst the intention is laudable, the city council has shown itself to be powerless to conserve locally listed buildings within the city centre. Despite widespread opposition, buildings have been demolished and their sites have remained vacant albeit used for temporary car parking. Delivering this strategic objective would involve the city council proactively working with asset owners to ensure they have a sustainable future so to prevent them being lost. In the context of budgetary cuts to the conservation section this is considered unrealistic and as such the city council should focus on upgrading their listing to statutory status.	3.10 needs to be re-worded to reflect the reality of the council's position i.e that it is, in the main, powerless to prevent the demolition of some conservation assets. The focus should be on active management with owners and developers to ensure assets are preserved and wherever possible upgraded to statutory listed status.	No	The Strategy

bp1862	The Strategy whilst being idealistic is fundamentally flawed in that it has not been prepared with sufficient consultation with the residents of areas that will be most affected i.e. Sutton Coldfield/Walmley. All resident associations should be informed of the future development programme(s). The Council have failed to consult enough people. The Strategy is at odds with the National planning policy in that 'exceptional circumstances' have not been established enough to enable Green Belt land to be lost to deveolpment. All brownfield sites should be identified and contracted to Developers before any green belt areas are considered. The Strategy has not properly considered the effect that 6000 homes would have on the already overused road infrastructure, schools, hospitals, doctors & dental surgeries, police protection, shopping facilities and leisure facilities etc. All of these facilities would need to be in place before the houses were built. The Strategy has not disclosed how the above facilities would be funded bearing in mind the current financial plight of the Birmingham Council and their inability to resolve the underpayment of employees situation. The Strategy is flawed in	Full consultation with ALL Resident Associations should be publicised properly and be proven. A full disclosure survey and report should be commissioned to establish ALL brownfield sites that are immediately available and also what brownfield sites will become available in the future. A full disclosure survey and report should be commissioned to establish the overall effect of the loss of the green belt will have to the health of the environment and the people within it. Wildlfe, flooding, air quality, nature enjoyment and Birmingham's overall carbon footprint. A full disclosure report to calculate the extra facilities (i,e, roads, hospitals etc) should be commisioned together with a statement of funding methods for each. The Strategy should be revised to consider the correct immigration figures and reduce the new home calculations accordingly.	No	The Strategy
bp1865	We have not been promised this new road infrastructure will go ahead due to lack of fundings.	build new roads and sort our trains even before the homes are built to elevate our worries		The Strategy
bp1880	The Strategy is fundamentally flawed in that it has not been based on adequate consulation with all resident associations, medical and care groups, road and travel transport bodies. Infrastructure committments would need to be considered before houses are built to ease the current pressures on all systems. The Strategy does not detail the funding plans and does not identify the Birmingham Council's intentions in this regard. The Strategy is not based on the latest immigration figures. The Strategy is not clear on the enviromental and social impact of 6000 new homes in the Walmley area.	Allow enough time for proper consulation and surveys to take place and for full disclosure to occur. Get Birmingham Council to disclose their financial strategy for the infrastructure committments. Recalculate, using the current immigration figures, the need for new green belt housing. Base the report on full survey/report disclosures regarding environmental wildlife, air quality, flooding and contamination issues local to the area of the green belt proposed for building. Base the report on full survey/report diclosures regarding social, medical, educational, security, leisure issues and facillities that the new housing in the green belt areas will impact on.	No	The Strategy

bp1892			3.8 Renewable energy is expensive, and often intermittent. It should only be a priority if it is cost effective. The new businesses that are going to employ people and drive the City forward need cheap effective services including energy. As for “carbon reduction”, this should only be done if it can be done cost-effectively. Growth is going to come mainly from the private sector and if you price them out, Birmingham employment, and attractiveness will continue to fall, and may indeed plummet. The UN IPCC doesn’t now argue that severe weather events including excessive rain, follows from climate change. Don’t prepare for events that are unlikely to happen. Be practical and sensible. 3.10 Biodiversity is fine, if it enhances people’s experience of living in the City, but it shouldn’t take priority over the immediate needs of the people of Birmingham. For example, if some rare newt (or similar) is found to be living on brown-field land, development of that land should not be stopped. Usually (always?) such creatures are living in other places in the UK (or elsewhere). Interest groups, and that includes certain regulators, should not be allowed, or given, powers to stop economic and other developments.	3.8 The job of any Plan for Birmingham should be to contribute to the economic, educational and cultural development and growth of the city. Renewable energy and similar green initiatives should only be pursued where they are cost-effective and contribute to the main needs of The City. Only very limited time and resources should be spent on making The City “resilient” to potential weather/climate changes. Exactly what’s going to happen isn’t at all clear or certain. There’s no point spending money on changes to cope with ‘BarBQ Summers’ that don’t arrive. Or dry and colder Winters, that also don’t arrive. Make contingency plans but don’t waste time and money. 3.10 Re-arrange planning priorities so that so-called unique habitats, flora and fauna, stop economic and other development. It’s perfectly possible to have a diversity of nature and economic development. Nature, as represented by a plethora of interest groups, should not trump or stop development of the City.	Yes	The Strategy
bp2364	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp2630			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp2638	Ms Diane clarke	Town Planning Technician LNW Network Rail	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp2701	Clare Eggington	Principal Development Plans Officer Lichfield District Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp2732	Sally Maguire	Lead Advisor Natural England	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp2752	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp2829	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy

bp2882	Mr Martin Hancock	Development Director National Express Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp3122					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp3137					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp3476	Susan Green	Planning Manager - Local Plans Home Builders Federation			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp3524		PMG Investments Ltd	Mr Nigel Gough	Director - Town Planning and Development Department CP Bigwood	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp3574					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp3819		Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	The Strategy
bp4249					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp4880	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp4929					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp4979					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5021					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	The Strategy
bp5085					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5198	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5285	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Strategy
bp5323		Rubery Holdings Ltd	Mr Nigel Gough	Director - Town Planning and Development Department CP Bigwood	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5333		Mobile Operators Association	Ginny Hall	Planner Mono Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5361	Claire Jones	Heart of England NHS Foundation Trust			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5362	Mr Trevor Eames	Secretary Solihull Ratepayers Association			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5404					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy

bp5414		City and Provincial Properties Plc	Mr David Smith	Turley Associates	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5490	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5509		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Strategy
bp5565		Director Richborough Estates Ltd	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5584		Dickens Heath Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning			Yes	The Strategy
bp5590		Cheswick Green Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Strategy
bp5602	Ms Rebecca Mayman	Wyre Forest District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5608		Tesco Stores Limited	Ms Jennie Baker	Senior Planner Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5712	Mr Malcolm Ratcliff	Senior Planning Advisor Mineral Products Association			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5754	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5777	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5800	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5815		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy

bp5831		c/o Turley (Harvest Partnership)	Ms Susie Rolls	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5842		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5880	Mr Mark Parkinson	Economic Development and Planning Policy Manager Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5889	Councillor Caroline Wood	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5911	Councillor David Smith	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5939	Councillor Janet Eagland	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5952	C Jeff Sheriff	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5959	Councillor Martyn Tittley	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5968	Councillor Susan Woodward	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp5974	Councillor Terry Finn	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The Strategy
bp6009	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The Strategy

bp68	Mrs Michele Nickolds	Sutton Coldfield Rural			The local plan says Birmingham has an objectively assessed housing need of 80,000 dwellings between now and 2031 but only has capacity for 45,000 in the urban area, with 6,000 being constructed on the Sutton Coldfield green belt. It also highlights a need to build 33,000 houses outside its legal boundaries in neighbouring Local Authorities, including places like Bromsgrove, North Warwickshire, the Black Country LEP, South Worcestershire, Lichfield, Stratford and Solihull. The plan states a sub-regional housing study carried out by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP will look at issues on the broad scale and distribution of development over the next 20 years', however, this will not be available until the Spring 2014 and no substantial negotiations have occurred with neighbouring Local Authorities. This study will be finalised after Birmingham's current consultation ends. The current understanding of campaigners is that it is for an Inspector to examine the plan to determine whether it is sound or not. The inspector will consider all evidence, including a joint Sustainability Assessment and Technical Analysis required for the 33,000 houses, which is missing from the pre-submission version of the plan. However,			Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp90					if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, in Sutton there is land at the back of the town, running by the train line, it has been deretict for years, the old Lucas factory in Mere Green, the shops that are empty and decaying in Mere Green another eyesore - use this land plus the thousands of other sites across the city. We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country	as above		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp107		KFC (GB) Limited	Mr Steve Simms	Director SSA Planning Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp128			There is a lack of detail on how this has been derived	Show the all the assessment carried out to establish this future needs, current capacity and usage together with future needs assessment together with the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp129	MR ALAN CLAWLEY	Birmingham Green Party	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp291			Q05 1/ WE ARE STEWARDS OF THE GREEN BELT FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. 2/ AN OPEN DISCUSSION IS NEEDED TO TRY TO REDUCE THE POPULATION INCREASE.I.E. NO CHILD BENEFITS AFTER ONE CHILD.	Q05 1/ AN INVESTIGATION INTO LAND ALREADY PURCHASED BY BUILDING COMPANIES. 2/ AN INVESTIGATION INTO EMPTY PROPERTIES BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC. 3/ A MAP SHOWING ALL BROWN FILL SITES IN AND AROUND THE CITY	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp305			The plan is very light on details backing the assumptions, there appears to have been an automatic acceptance of ONS projections without taking other factors into consideration. The document issued on discussions with neighbouring Councils gives the impression that one question has been asked and whatever the answer there is no evidence of negotiation. The move to use the green belt for industrial and housing development appears to have been arrived at as an easy option without proper examination of brownfield sites. Within a few miles of the proposed expansion into the green belt at Sutton Coldfield lies Mere Green with its boarded up shops. This was once a vibrant village centre until is was bought by a property developers who evicted shopkeepers and promptly went into liquidation. The development has subsequently been bought and plans approved for further development. A sign stating 47% of units have been reserved has been erected for years. The people of the area have got used to shopping elsewhere so why can't this vast site be considered for housing?	There should be much more detail in the plan to back up the planning assumptions .	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp546		This section demonstrates the poor governance models that are being utilised within this plan/manifesto. This lack of democratic involvement demonstrates high levels of social unsustainability and from my viewing of the Sustainability Appraisal it was not picked up there either. It seems that a certain type of orthodoxy prevails throughout the development of this plan/manifesto which is biased towards a 'growth agenda' - something that has been arbitrarily applied and enforced without the consent of the existing Birmingham population. For example, population growth within Birmingham is a choice - who is making this decision and on whose behalf? Similarly, who is making the decision that human development is to prioritise over non-human development?	Incorporate within the plan better governance models so for example the decision to determine chosen population levels should be democratically decided not enforced by the opinion of an individual or group of individuals. Similarly incorporate better governance models to enable Birmingham citizens (or is it subjects) to choose the degree of human and non-human development to be incorporated into future planning decisions about the built and natural environment of Birmingham.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp577		Where is there mention of increasing essential services such as policing, fire, ambulance, hospitals, dental, medical centres? This is not mentioned here. I do not accept point 4.6 at all. Who has done the survey to work this out? They can't have visited any of the areas that the general public know about, because there are literally 1000's of derelict homes in deprived areas that could be demolished and rebuilt - this of course is FAR too costly for the council to consider I am sure...	Additional considerations need to be given for the services needed		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp594		The plan is based on a prediction that Birmingham's population will grow by 150,000 over the period of the plan. However, population projections are notoriously unreliable, being hugely influenced by factors that cannot be foreseen at the time they are made, and are therefore little more than an educated guess. It is inappropriate to make fixed plans based on little more than guesswork.	The plan should be made more flexible, particularly in respect of areas such as green belt development. Such proposals should be excluded from the plan, and only revisited based on actual changes to population, not projections.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp650	In earlier planing presentations and discussions more than a year ago, the predicted growth of 150 000 was questioned with recent statistics indicating that growth is likely to be significantly lower, but there is no evidence that this growth has been re-considered. Estimates of brown field sites appear under-estimated (I have recently toured the Birmingham canals and seen many old disused industrial sites which could be very attractively developed for housing) and the number of unused properties appears to be a nominal figure again very under-estimated	The predicted population growth should be re-assessed. A reduction is expected. The availabiltiy of brownfield sites should be re-assessed. An increase is expected. The number of unused properties should be re-assessed. An increase is expected.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp708	The plan states there is projected to be 80, 000 new homes needed by 2031. It seems to me that planning this far ahead using outdated information is fundamentally wrong. Even so if you insist 80,000 homes are needed but your plan only details 51,000, where are the others ? Consulting with other areas outside of Birmingham boundary does not mean that this will deliver on the shortfall. I think yoiur plan is basically flawed in this respect and should be looked at again. Proposed building on the green belt is cheap alternative to looking at regenerating slum areas of the city, these should be looked at and developed first before any green belt is disfigured. Green belt can never be replaced once it's gone it's gone, there should truely be exceptional circumstances only as per government guidelines before green belt land is used. Making it easier and cheaper for developers is not exceptional , it seems money talks here. The proposal to build on Peddimore was put forward and scrapped several years ago, has anything changed in that time ? Only an economic downturn, less businesses building and expanding. Where is the need for this , who needs it, who wants it. It seems a pie in the sky attempt to link some sort of employment to the	The proposed building on the green belt should be shelved from the plan until all other avenues have been used eg. existing brown fields sites and sites with existing planning permissions. I can see no exceptional circumstance where green belt should be used for industial use but land bordering the motorway M6/M42 would be better than on the edge of an urban area.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp716			I strongly oppose any plans to remove land from the Green Belt or to build in the Green Belt, particularly in neighbouring authority areas.	The Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl, encourage urban regeneration and prevent communities merging. Considerably more needs to be done to regenerate and reuse brownfield sites for higher density housing in sustainable locations given Birmingham has one of the lowest population densities of any major European cities and has a significant number of areas in desperate need of redevelopment. We should not be predicting and providing for growth, we should identify what can sustainably be accommodated whilst retaining quality of life. Economic growth should not be prioritised above all else. If the population growth forecasts are actually realised and can't be accommodated elsewhere in the country where populations are declining, additional housing should be located in neighbouring authorities brownfield sites in areas in need of regeneration. Destroying the valuable Green Belt in Birmingham or neighbouring authorities will not deliver an enterprising, innovative and green City that has delivered sustainable growth, it will be quite the opposite.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp807	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	Elsewhere in the Plan the stated minimum requirement for a large-scale industrial site is 60 hectares. Why is it considered necessary to take up 80 hectares at Peddimore? Is it just regarded as "easy pickings"?	We are opposed to the principle of taking land at Peddimore for an industrial site - and certainly not more than is necessary.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp920	I agree that neighbouring authorities should also have to work to accommodate increasing population. I think we should increase our manufacturing base, and make it easier for such companies to trade. We should be considering ways to limit our population growth, however, this planet can only sustain so many people, and we should not assume we can continue to increase our population at the current rates. The use of land by companies should be checked and looked at to ensure they are maximising it's usefulness.	Think about building new towns outside the immediate area. Lobby the government to reduce child benefit, introduced after the war to encourage population growth. This would seem to be no longer a priority. In my view, no benefit should be provided after the second child. At the moment, in Erdington, sites that used to provide employment and earn revenue are currently earning nothing as huge car parks - I am talking of the Jaguar Land Rover site, where our much missed Showcase Cinema was demolished. And rumour has it that the Ravenside Shopping centre will be the next to go. How can it be right that these huge areas of land are used as car parks for the staff, instead of maybe building some multistorey car parks, or providing public transport for the workers (or even transport provided by the company). Many dwellings could be built on this site, instead of using it for a huge car park, and adding to the congestion in the area. Or additional factories could be built, instead of on our Green belt land.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp967	The Office of National Statistics projects population growth only to 2021. The ONS does not "indicate" any growth for 2031 The BDP is misleading to attempt to suggest it is the ONS projections.that indicate a population growth of 150,000 by 2031. The figures below are from the BDP's own reference source the ONS and clearly show a declining growth Office of National Statistics Projections in 1000s (Rounded up) Year 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 Population 1,094 1,103 1,113 1,121 1,130 1,138 1,145 1,153 1,160 Increase 9.8 9.4 9.1 8.8 8.3 8.1 7.7 7.5 7.2 Please note this consultation tool does not allow tables or spreadsheets to be correctly aligned For correct alignment 2014 population is 1,031,00 and increase is 9,400 2021 population is 1,160,00 and increase is 7,200 The Birmingham Develop Plan is unsound. The population predictions are incorrect.	There are clearly issues with the prediction of population growth. More details need to be shown on how a figure of 150,000 was reached. The BDP shows lack of fundamental detail in population forecast.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp979	Miss Patricia Harrision	Executive Officer Wythall Parish Council	Referring to the paragraph 4.6 my Council would stress that Birmingham City Council should identify and develop sites within its own boundaries before expanding into the Green Belt of Wythall. We would not accept homes for Birmingham in Wythall whilst vacant sites exist and empty flats, such as those above the Aldi supermarket at the Maypole, remain unoccupied many years after their construction.		No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1002			Past levels of development have been significantly below planning targets. The predictions take very little account of effecttive demand. There is thus a strong liklyhood that they will not be achieved.	Monitoring and review in relation to actual build levels needs to be stronger as does phasing of potential sites.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1018			Arrangements have not been made to meet the full objectively assessed housing need	Reach binding agreement with adjacent planning authorities to secure the provsion of the objectively assessed housing need	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1029			Population growth figures quoted in the proposal are very sketchy and based on an out of date model and therefore cannot be relied upon to form the basis of an 'objectively assessed requirement'. BCC have failed to determine whether housing requirements could be successfully accommodated on either brownfield sites within Birmingham or on sites belonging to neighbouring authorities. The Duty to Cooperate is a key requirement of the Localism Act 2011 and, whilst contact has been made with other authorities to explore this option, this work has not been completed. How can BCC possibly propose a development strategy without having full information on alternative options?	BCC should rework population growth figures using current models to determine the housing requirement up to 2031.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1059	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to support growth by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) whilst enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity- provided there is adequate provision for GI to make it truly sustainable.			Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1169	The 80,000 homes need could be met part way by bringing the 72,000 Empty homes in the MIdlands into use: http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg Birmingham CC does not seem to have taken full advantage of the Goverments Empty Homes Programme.	Birmingham CC must use the Governments Empty Homes Programme first to bring the 72,000 empty homes in the midlands back into use. They can also use this programme to bring flats over shops back into use.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1199	Planning for growth in several areas indicated is neither necessary nor sustainable. Increased office space may well be not needed as more people will work from home. (Given high speed telecommunications) That will improve our carbon footprint. Significant Increase in Retail space seems crazy given the huge increases that have been made over the last 2 decades and the rapidly rising trend to internet shopping. Big retailers may argue differently. Such trends are even acknowledged in 4.10. Never ending "growth" in all directions is old fashioned thinking that enterprising and innovative Brummies do not need!	Re-evaluate needs based on current trends extrapolated forward.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1269	Item 4.4 "The Office of National Statistics (ONS) projections (2010) indicate that by 2031 Birmingham's population will rise by 150,000 and that this will mean an increase of 80,000 in the number of households."The plan seems wholly focussed on the long term horizon of 2031, with no regard to how increased population, for example, is due to increase in the intervening 17 years. By simply looking at the supposed 2031 demands, the plan implies that there is an automatic need to release Green Belt protection from land and for this to be part of the plan as soon as it is enacted. Common sense would show that population demand needs to be considered in a year by year manner, matching this to the available brownfield land for residential development. Only at the time when there is no longer any land available, and once all other options have been considered, would it then be relevant consider land that is Green Belt. Instead, the council seeks to have 14 years worth of development land available immediately. Naturally, developers will simply skim off the sites where they will make the most profit (Green Belt land) as soon as possible, well before 2031 andw whislt there are sill large	Re Item 4.4 The plan needs to be based not just upon the headline figures of 2031 demands but look how the demands and requirements build up year to year. Drastic actions need only to be taken when they are likely to occur and not on the questionable estimates for 14 years hence. A comparison needs to be made showing future year populations and housing needs to demonstrate in what year brownfield land will be used up. This can then be subject to proper review, and if adopted could be monitored year by year to check its veracity. The simple assumption that land might be needed in 2031 and hence should be made available now should be removed. * * *

bp1374	(Para 4.4)The ONS has made its population predictions to 2021. The statistics show a decline in population growth for the area. NPPF (Para 178) The Government expects joint working .....to be diligently undertaken... NPPF (Para 179) ..... ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. (Para 4.7) The City Council will seek to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities ..... The term 'will seek' indicates that this important element has not been undertaken. This renders the plan unsound.	Statistics re projected population including immigration figures need to be updated and reviewed. The plan should evidence any collaborative work with neighbouring authorities. As it stands the plan is incorrect, incomplete and therefore unsound.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1375	(Para 4.4)The ONS has made its population predictions to 2021. The statistics show a decline in population growth for the area. NPPF (Para 178) The Government expects joint working .....to be diligently undertaken... NPPF (Para 179) ..... ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans. (Para 4.7) The City Council will seek to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities ..... The term 'will seek' indicates that this important element has not been undertaken. This renders the plan unsound.	Statistics re projected population including immigration figures need to be updated and reviewed. The plan should evidence any collaborative work with neighbouring authorities. As it stands the plan is incorrect, incomplete and therefore unsound.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1397	There is no proof that there is a possible population growth of 150000. This potential growth would probably be over cross boundary areas.	Consult the adjacent councils of Solihull and Lichfield to take a share of the growth and make public how the growth of population has been calculated.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1421	Until we have up to date data then the plan cannot be considered positively prepared. The figures presented are not balanced and sustainable. It is unclear how the figures with the BDP for economic and population growth have been calibrated. If the Bank of England cannot currently make predictions on growth greater than three years (stated February 2014) it is unclear how a local city councils planning department can plan for levels of economic and population growth which takes us up to 2031 using outdated statistics. We have yet to see UK exports pick up or even business investment ; growth is not yet sustainable or that any long term predictions can be made greater than three years. The data used for growth projections within the BDP is based only on ONS. A simple layman's calculation of the foreseen population increase challenges the BCC assertion that the required housing shortage is for 80,000. Using the formula in the SHMA to calculate household projections I only arrive at a figure of 60,000. Even with weighting it does not calibrate to the foreseen need of 80,000 homes. (150,000 divided by average household of 2.51)	The plan revised to reflect that of a more pragmatic approach to the overall levels of growth. One that is balanced and sustainable. More information provided on the formula/calibration for the figures provided. Insufficient detail is present and/or they are not fully understood or consistent.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1462	And building on green belt is the right thing to do? Green belt was created to stop uncontrolled urban sprawl. What is the point of protecting land if it is just going to get built on anyway? I don't believe that all options have been explored.	Explore further the options to develop brown field sites. Green belt should be protected - that is why it was created in the first place.		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1469	Population growth predictions appear unreliable, after also reading some of the supporting papers on population growth predictions there appears numerous different "attempts" at calculating the predicted population for 2031. This Plan does not seem to have been developed on sound data.	If the fundamental data on which the Plan is questionable, the Plan should not be approved until reliable data is available.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1472	Has BCC taken into consideration the opportunities identified through their consultation with neighboring authorities (For example the DUTY TO CO-OPERATE STATEMENT dated October 2013 stipulates "Discussions with the Black Country Districts have focussed on seeking technical agreement on the potential surplus of housing capacity in the Black Country which could help meet Birmingham's needs. A figure of 3,100 has been identified." There are other Authorities will similar opportunities identified.	Reliable data should be used to support the proposals, there are significant opportunities identified which appear to have been disregarded by BCC. Such opportunities erode the argument for release of Green Belt for development.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1485	The statistics are unsound upon which to base this development. There is no evidence of large scale employment for the people who will live in the area - too much emphasis is placed on "indicative" ideas and predictions without considering reality.	The model needs to be revisited to review the predicted levels of growth and employment opportunities.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1502	Other comments and public pronouncements indicate that the ONS projections of 150,000 population growth in the city cited by this Plan are out of date, disputed, unreliable and/or misinterpreted. Committing to 51,000 houses with the last material green belt in the Council's guardianship being wrecked in the earliest years of the plan is both misguided and irresponsible. Further, even if population levels in the nation were to grow at a rate consistent with this why are we contemplating the housing necessary being built as Victorian urban sprawl of the type the post war labour government long ago recognised had blighted our landscape? The Planners are guilty of not taking their responsibilities of consulting with other local authorities especially those in the Local Enterprise Partnership.	Proper comprehensive negotiations and consultations with neighbouring authorities for the provision of housing stock must precede any incursion on Birmingham's small surviving green belt in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1510	1. There must be considerable doubt about the population forecasts and there should be a much more flexible approach to the housing numbers. 2. Why are you panning on more retail space when so much is vacant or under-used. With the growth of internet shopping and a decade of restraint in discretionary spending the plan is far too optimistic about this.	1. The housing demand figures should be reviewed and lowered in the light of uncertainties about population growth. 2. The retail expansion figures should be scaled back to somewhere around zero on the basis that many vacant shops will change use and provide capacity for replacement growth. Also you ought to make it clear that the City does not want a Sainsburys local and Tesco Express on every street corner.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1524	Population of Birmingham may or may not grow by the amounts forecast by the ONS. Why does Birmingham feel obliged to provide jobs for everybody who lives here? I have lived in cities in Essex, Humberside and Yorkshire before moving to Sutton Coldfield, and both of my children work away from the City now. It is not the job of Birmingham to provide jobs on tap for its population, but rather for the movements of people to be in response to job opportunities across the country.	The Plan should address urgent current needs, not try to provide homes and jobs for putative residents who may never even move here.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1577	Are BCC figures for the projected number of homes required based on current census figures or on pre credit crunch figures? Do they take account of changes just being implemented to immigration restrictions? Do the ONS projections go as far as 2031?	The plan should confine its definitive house building programme to the shorter term and review housing needs in ten years time.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1624	I agree that population growth among certain communities is the most pressing challenge facing the city at this time. Housing is less of an issue than education. The latter will be pivotal in resolving the issue of worklessness.			Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1645	Developing on the Green Belt will not enhance the city. You will be destroying a section that can not be regained. We all benefit by having Green Belts this is why a law was made to protect them.	Do not develop the green belt. The issue of how to manage an ever increasing population should be considered on a national scale and not need the sacrificing of valuable assets in local communities. The city council must urge the Government to address the issues of an expanding population by considering the development of new towns. These would be purpose built with all the infrastructure in place. Much preferable that trying to fit more people in to a space already overcrowded. Policies should be developed to encourage more sustainable families.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1648	Clearly it is difficult to challenge the projected levels of growth but what is very disturbing is the need for neighbouring authorities to support the city in the provision of housing. I have commented at length on the need to do something about infrastructure (and transport infrastructure in particular) given that the proposed housing developments are in one major suburb. If other authorities are going to have to share the burden then that is only going to increase traffic volumes and burdens on what is a very poor public transport provision.	To reiterate previous comments - consider a strategy that puts housing closer to the place of work. Convert plans for offices that will never be used to providing communities nearer tube main areas of employment. The two biggest employers in the City are the Council and the combined Universities. It already takes an hour to gets from Sutton Coldfield to the University of Birmingham by car. There is no local rail or bus provision from the area if the proposed housing development to the City. It makes sense to place people local to work and retail facilities economically and environmentally.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1695	The council mentions the possible increase in population but does not mention the 17000 houses for which there is already planning permission and also does not mention how many houses are currently unoccupied. The figure in most literature states this figure to be 12000. This is 29000 houses that could be available in a couple of years. In view of this can the council advise why the extra housing is required. If employment is required could not the road network the council are so proud of not be brought up to a decent standard? Currently the roads around Walmley, Sutton Coldfield, and into Birmingham are awful, a repair programme across the city would provide employment and would also benefit the entire city.	The council need to explain why, with around 30,000 houses potentially available within a year or so why the Green Belt development is required. If the council are looking to create jobs then repairing the roads of the city and bringing unoccupied council houses up to a liveable standard would be a far better way of creating these jobs to the benefit of all city residents.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1717	Population growth figures quoted in the proposal are very sketchy and based on an outdated model and I don't envisage how they can be relied upon to form the basis of an ‘objectively assessed requirement’. There is failure to determine whether housing requirements could be successfully accommodated on either brownfield sites within Birmingham or on sites belonging to neighbouring authorities as I have stated in previous sections.	Consideration of a new conurbation as I have previously stated	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1755	The Development plan uses out of date and inaccurate statistics. In addition to this the development plan does not address all of the required housing, which means that the plan is technically incomplete and therefore should not be approved.	The latest figures and accurate predictions should be used, and the plan should set out how all required capacity will be achieved rather than just most of it.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1792			Up to date data is required to make this plan viable It is unclear how the figures have been calibrated. Business investment has yet to pick up in England and Wales therefore the plan for growth is too aspirational with no realism, The data used for population growth is based only on ONS who can only predict until 2021. How can the BCC confidently plan for growth beyond this?	Up to date data provided. More information provided on the formulas used to predict growth and calibration of the figures. An audit to occur on the statistical data to confirm the calculations and figures are correct. The plan revised and represented that is balanced and sustainable.Green belt removed from the plan until accurate data is presented which proves exceptional circumstances to justify release of green belt.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1809	Mrs Philippa Kreuser	CT Planning	Paragraph 4.4 of the BDP sets out that the ONS projections of 2010 indicate that Birmingham will need to find 80,000 new dwellings to accommodate the predicted rise of 150,000 new households in the City. However the Plan seeks only to find land for some 51,000 new dwellings and is expecting the shortfall of some 29,000 to be accommodated by neighbouring Authorities. This represents a substantial number of dwellings to be found in neighbouring Districts and potentially involves the removal of land from the Green Belt in the these Districts. Birmingham City Council should further examine the potential to remove additional land from the Green Belt in the Sutton Coldfield area to accommodate more than the 6,000 homes currently proposed at Langley. There is a lack of explanation in the Plan as to why Birmingham City Council cannot remove further land from the Green Belt within its own administrative boundary particularly given the expanse of the Green Belt in the Walmley to Sutton Coldfield area.	Paragraph 4.4 of the BDP sets out that the ONS projections of 2010 indicate that Birmingham will need to find 80,000 new dwellings to accommodate the predicted rise of 150,000 new households in the City. However the Plan seeks only to find land for some 51,000 new dwellings and is expecting the shortfall of some 29,000 to be accommodated by neighbouring Authorities. This represents a substantial number of dwellings to be found in neighbouring Districts and potentially involves the removal of land from the Green Belt in the these Districts. Birmingham City Council should further examine the potential to remove additional land from the Green Belt in the Sutton Coldfield area to accommodate more than the 6,000 homes currently proposed at Langley. There is a lack of explanation in the Plan as to why Birmingham City Council cannot remove further land from the Green Belt within its own administrative boundary particularly given the expanse of the Green Belt in the Walmley to Sutton Coldfield area.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1813				The figures issued by the NOS seem to be being taken as gospel. They are pure speculation (granted, based on projection models) and may never happen anything like to the extent predicted. I agree some action needs to be taken, but in the first instance this needs to be the regeneration of derelict areas and brownfield sites. Green belt land should absolutely not be part of this plan at this stage, until all other avenues have been exhausted and we are far further down the road to seeing if these population growth predictions are anywhere near accurate.	Concentrate on developing brownfield sites and providing much needed regeneration to the inner city areas. Shelve all green belt land development until all other solutions have been exhausted, and the need for further development is much more a reality rather than speculation. Greenbelt is there for a reason and has been recognised and respected as such for a long long time. I see no firm evidence that there is any need to change this for many years to come yet. Population trends change. What if these projected figures turn out to be wrong and in the meantime our green belt has been destroyed and we are left with lots of empty properties and units. I believe BCC are going into this based far too much on the belief of some projections that may never happen, and indeed are targeting greenfield sites as an easy option before fully exhausting all the existing brownfield sites.	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1816	Consortium of West Midlands Developers and Land Owners	Mr John Pearce	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	We are instructed by a Client Group comprising landowners and developers to submit representations to the Birmingham Development Plan – Pre-Submission Draft. The Client Group have major land interests both within Birmingham City and the wider Birmingham Housing Market Area (HMA) and therefore welcome the opportunity to comment on the emerging Birmingham Development Plan (BDP). For your information this Consortium includes (in alphabetical order): - Barratt & David Wilson Homes (Mercia) - Bloor Homes Midlands - Bovis Homes - Catesby Estates Limited - Church Commissioners for England - Gladman Developments - The Gilmour Family - Richborough Estates This representation forms part of an on-going engagement between members of the development industry and the Council in the preparation of its emerging Plan as it is considered that the issues facing Birmingham City, specifically in relation to the level of housing that is required to meet the City's needs, are of wider strategic significance and will impact upon all surrounding authorities within the HMA to a greater or lesser degree. Consequently, the work	The changes that we believe are necessary to the Plan and which would address our concerns and make it sound include: 1) To reassess the Council's objectively assessed level of housing need in light of the findings of the Study submitted by the Consortium, which indicates that the Council should be planning for between 135,000 and 153,000 dwellings over the period 2011 to 2031. 2) To undertake further work and reassess the Council's SHLAA and identified supply of housing to address concerns over the deliverability of identified sites particularly within the Nechells and Ladywood wards. 3) Undertake further work to reassess the capacity of the Green Belt around Sutton Coldfield to accommodate further growth over and above the 6,000 dwellings currently identified in light of the findings of the Savills' research on the capacity of the Green Belt and the robustness of the housing market in this location to deliver further housing.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp1871				The population data used is from 2010 which is out of date!!! surely the 12,000 empty houses at present can help elevate some of the pressure	give us accurate and up-to-date data and address the empty houses first.		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp1878	Mr Steve Jones	Ciel Properties Ltd	Mr Mark Rose	Ciel Properties Ltd support the preparation of the Birmingham Plan 2031, and its stated intent to positively address and plan for the housing and employment needs of the growing population in the city as set out in Policy PG1. Therefore, the recognition that the proposed development strategy in the Plan needs to provide for around 80,000 new homes in the period 2011 to 2031 (i.e. 4,000 per annum) is also supported, as this seems to reflect the current evidence base which indicates that the number of households in the city will increase by around 80,000 in the 20 year period. Moreover, it is accepted that the city is unable to accommodate all of the housing needs within the city boundary, even with the release of a significant amount of land from the Green Belt at the proposed Langley Sustainable Urban Extension on land to the west of the A38 (formerly referred to Area C). The proposed development of the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension is strongly supported, but as the Plan acknowledges (para 4.7 & 8.11) the City Council must work with neighbouring authorities to secure the development of further homes to contribute to meeting the city's housing needs in the period to 2031. There is, however, no	The City Council must effectively engage with North Warwickshire Borough Council in this respect under the provisions of the "duty to co-operate" introduced by the Localism Act 2011, and referred to in the NPPF. The outcome of that engagement should be fully set out in the Plan.	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp2355	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp2407	Stacey Green	Development Plans Officer Redditch Borough Council		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp2502				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp2753	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp2777		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp2867	Mr Richard Campbell-kelly	Property, Administration & Insurance Manager NEC Group			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3132					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3134					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3323					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3405					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3477	Susan Green	Planning Manager - Local Plans Home Builders Federation			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3670					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3790					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp3817		Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp4091					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp4530					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp4587					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp4595					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp4881	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp4926					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5286	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5310			Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5327		BDW Trading Limited	Mr Stephen Stoney	Technical Director Wardell Armstrong LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp5363	Mr Trevor Eames	Secretary Solihull Ratepayers Association			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5379		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5416	Mr Mark Andrews	Acting Planning Policy Manager COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5497	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5504					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5514		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5532					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5569		Director Richborough Estates Ltd	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5585		Dickens Heath Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5591		Cheswick Green Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5594		Gallagher Estates & Miller Homes	Chris May	Director Pegasus Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5612		AXA Real Estate Investment Management	Mr Paul Rouse	Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5655		West Midlands Harp Planning Consortium	Mr Christopher Burton	Tetlow King Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5696		Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin	Partner Deloitte LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5727					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5788	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1

bp5816		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5843		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5886					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5892					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp5997		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp6010	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Overall levels of growth	PG1
bp306						Details should be given of the location of the six Economic Zones	No	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp846		Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	4.15 Include the role of international students in promoting cultural diversity.			Birmingham as an international city	PG2

bp921			Much more could be made of Birmingham to attract visitors. More could be made of our surrounding 'villages'. We need to promote all our cultures and histories. I think Sutton Coldfield is terribly underfunded and under valued. It has some amazing architecture, the Vesey houses, connections to Henry VIII, the beautiful Sutton Park, and yet it has little development as a tourist destination. The terrible road network around the town serves to divide it but does not allow the pedestrianisation of the lovely areas, only the barren 60's parade. I was in the Parson and Clerk pub (Toby Inn) on the Chester Road, and a visitor staying there asked me where I was off to walking in the area. He hadn't realised Sutton park was literally just over the road. The same is true of Erdington, a truly fascinating area, with architecture and history of its own. But Sainsburys are allowed to build a modern monstrosity opposite our Pugin designed Abbey Church, and the lovely Edwardian Baths and Turkish Baths are to be closed down. Also there are very few decent restaurants or pubs you can walk to or would wish to visit in the High Street in the evening. Everybody has to drive out of the area for a meal.	More interesting independent retailers should be encouraged in the city centre, so many of our small shops have gone. Perhaps areas could be set up, eg. antiques, food, books.etc. Surrounding areas such as Sutton Coldfield and Erdington need investment and improvement, and thought given to tourism.	No	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1001			While birminghams international role is important - there needs to be at least equal emphasis on supporting the existing citizens and businesses of Birmingham	A more balanced approach	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1060	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) have to making Birmingham a world class city to live, work and visit by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect), enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Birmingham as an international city	PG2

bp1201	Birmingham has a history of being an innovative centre for over 1000 trades. This has been de-emphasised in favour of "soft" concepts following Thatcherite leadership against production. SMART manufacturing will enable innovative local production of bespoke components and let us work on that for example. We also need a bigger and better Industrial Museum to inspire the youth towards such creativity. The Science Museum was free when I first visited it as is the Science Museum in London.	Focus on our strengths. Lead and inspire for the future. Improve access to the Science Museum.	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1414	Birmingham to be seen as an International City is very much a long term vision	The plan revised to reflect that of a more pragmatic approach to overall levels of growth. One that is balanced and sustainable. One that is less aspirational and based on realistic export and investment figures. More information to be provided as to the formula/calibration behind the calculations for growth and projected population increase.	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1511	I support the goals but a City that can't pick up its own litter will not feature on the international scene. Please be realistic and tone down the hyperbole in the light of known resource constraints. The major plans in the Big City Culture are threatened by lack of funding. The effects of HS2 should not be taken as being wholly positive. This is a vanity project looking for a problem.	4.15 should include a reference to limited resources.	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1539	Birmingham needs to address its high unemployment and skills shortage before an International City can be achieved. Until we have the infrastructure in place to support the vision of an international city then this strategy is unrealistic. It is unclear if this local plan is addressing the core needs of housing and development or whether it is just focused on the needs of the current city council	Please provide more information on the validity of Birmingham City Council achieving International status.	No	Birmingham as an international city	PG2

bp1561	Whilst policy PG2 addresses the key issues to promote Birmingham as an international city, it's lacking on how to address fundamental issues. The main issues are PG2: - does not note about implementing contingency plans if implementation/funding/ any external issues causes projects to fail (ie: if HS2 doesn't go ahead) - is very centralist. It does not address how other areas of the city, or potential assets can help to promote this goal (eg: Sutton Park).	A little consideration to think of the city as the whole, not just focus on Selly Oak, Longbridge or the City Centre in PG2.	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1646	I support all that is being developed in the city centre to enhance Birmingham and make it a more attractive venue to visit. Especially New Street station, The new Library, metro extensions and a new John Lewis in the centre.	New developments in the centre must not be made to the detriment of out of town local areas. There should be recognition of the value of urban areas and adequate funding so that local libraries and sports facilities are not closed. Sutton Town Centre badly needs serious redevelopment to make it an attractive town able to support the additional residents that building on the green belt will create.	No	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp1718	The HS2 is a hotly contested debate and another unattractive prospect for people living in Sutton and the immediate area. Another example of government heavy handedness and little consideration or proper compensation for residents and lack of respect for the local wildlife. New homes too is a double whammy and a distinct deterioration of all things historic and good about our rich environment. The HS2 will not promote anything for our surrounding towns villages when you are trying to bring visitors and work to the area. If the HS2 will truly deliver, this will be to make North and south more accessible. What happens to us in the middle!!! Decay. I think Sutton Coldfield is terribly underfunded and under valued and I am glad there are efforts for us to remove ourselves from the beuocracy of BCC. It has some amazing architecture, connections to Henry VIII, the beautiful Sutton Park - a designated area of natural beauty, and yet it has little development as a tourist destination. The terrible road network around the town serves to divide it but does not allow the pedestrianisation of the lovely areas, only the barren 60's parade. The same is true of Erdington, a truly fascinating area, with	More interesting independent retailers should be encouraged into Sutton and Erdington centre, so many of our small shops have gone. RE consider the impact of HS2 vs homes Surrounding areas such as Sutton Coldfield and Erdington need investment and improvement, and thought given to tourism.	No	Birmingham as an international city	PG2

bp2010					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp2779		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp5498	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Birmingham as an international city	PG2
bp832					There is so much jargon and waffle in all this that it makes it very difficult for the ordinary man to understand. Presumably this is a part to prevent objection to these plans to destroy the green belt and local environment, wildlife and natural heritage	Resubmit the proposals in plain English having undertaken full research which can be quoted and documented	No	Place making	PG3
bp922					I agree that new builds should be of the highest quality and design, and fit in with local buildings. However, few new developments built in recent years have been built using the above guidelines. (see the design approved for the new Sainsburys building in Erdington opposite the Pugin designed Abbey Church, and adjacent to Victorian shops.) Even the new Library in town is something of a monstrosity, with a bland interior that will become shabby very quickly. With planning restrictions being generally reduced at the moment, and the council officials who might have overseen the application of any restrictions being presumably reduced in number, I don't see how all these guidelines can be applied and adhered to.	I think much more regard should be taken of public opinion, we are the ones who have to look at and use these buildings.	No	Place making	PG3
bp1000					Good but conflict with other polices particualry minimum density pointless if the only part not to be monitored		No	Place making	PG3
bp1026					How is this policy (PG3 Place making) to be implemented and enforced in practice? Will there be specific criteria that must be met by all developers in future planning applications, or is this just a wish list for future developers to maybe think about? Who is going to determine whether approrpriate 'opportunities' have been taken, and indeed define what 'opportunities' should be considered?	It would be helpful to understand how such a policy is implemented, and who gets to determine whether new developments actually meet the intent of such a policy.		Place making	PG3

bp1062	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) have to making Birmingham a world class place that functions effectively now and in the future, with economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) whilst enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Place making	PG3
bp1146	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The Canal & River Trust welcome a policy relating to the creation of a sense of place and we have a number of guiding principles relating to the design of developments adjacent or in close proximity to the canals: Individual waterways and water spaces need to be viewed as an integral part of a wider network, and not in isolation; Water should not be treated as just a setting or backdrop for development but as a space and leisure and commercial resource in its own right. The 'added value' of the water space needs to be fully explored; Waterways themselves should be the starting point for consideration of the development and use of the water and waterside land – look from the water outwards, as well as from the land to the water; A waterways towing path and its environs should form an integral part of the public realm in terms of both design and management; It is important that the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings optimise views of the water, generate natural surveillance of water space, and encourage and improve access to, along and from the water; New waterside development needs to be considered holistically with the opportunities for water-based development, use and		No	Place making	PG3
bp1203			"Place" making is more about inspired regeneration of the (old) living space to the satisfaction of the community living there and not the desecration of our valuable green space on this overcrowded island.	Reconsider the need to grow the space available	Yes	Place making	PG3

bp1376			The Plan is unsound;- (Para 4.21) .....will be provided by the Historic Landscape Characterisation Study which the City Council is undertaking in conjunction with English Heritage. The term 'undertaking' indicates that the ground work has not been completed.	The BDP should be complete when presented for consultation. Residents are being asked to comment on incomplete or unavailable information which makes the plan unsound.	No	Place making	PG3
bp1525			I agree with these aims as laid out in the plan. I wonder, however, if funding will ever be available to do all of this, as many areas of Birmingham need significant upgrades to bring them to the standards aimed for.			Place making	PG3
bp1562			It is unclear how policy PG3 can be delivered. It's wording is open to interpretation, particularly on points one and four.	Maybe to solve the issues, a SPD to identify good design principles to resolve these issues.	Yes	Place making	PG3
bp1653			The focus must be on converting what we already have to achieve these objectives before creating new developments. More needs to be done to make perceived 'no go' areas (especially the inner city areas) safe and welcoming to all irrespective of gender, race or religious belief. As a Birmingham resident of more than 50 years, bought up in Lozells I should not feel that I cannot return there. But I won't because I do not feel safe. If you make the inner city safe you will not need to develop the green belt.	Recognise that there are places where people do not feel that they cannot go and would not contemplate living. Include plans to do something about it.	No	Place making	PG3
bp1886			The council needs to make sure policies and practices are in place to ensure the efficient use of brownfield land. Often land is wasted due to poor design, or needlessly used. For example, the Longbridge site created a potential for a large industrial development - when there was news on the TV about a wonderful employment site being created there it turned out to be just another supermarlet. The council should take a standpoint that land is limited and must be used effectively, not simply frittered away.	The council needs to make sure policies and practices are in place to ensure the efficient use of brownfield land. Often land is wasted due to poor design. The council should take a standpoint that land is limited and must be used effectively, not simply frittered away.	Yes	Place making	PG3
bp2368	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Place making	PG3
bp5199	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Place making	PG3

bp5501	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp5670		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp5756	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp5779	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp5802	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp5817		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp5835		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Place making	PG3
bp91					Why have you ignored Mere Green empty shops since you agreed for the shopkeeper to be evicted, then the developers went bust- why agree this before you knew they could pay- big mistake and yet you have ignored it for years- if you really wantedto develop these areas you would have dont it- but no- you just want to build on virgin land destry wildlife- someone must be making money out of this	if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, in Sutton there is land at the back of the town, running by the train line, it has been deretict for years, the old Lucas factory in Mere Green, the shops that are empty and decaying in Mere Green another eyesore - use this land plus the thousands of other sites across the city. We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp130	There is a lack of information on alternative solutions considered to minimise the use of green belt land	Show the all the assessment carried out on alternative scenarios to minimise the need to build on green belt land. Include assumptions on, current capacity and usage together with future needs assessment together with the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp238	Plan relies on development in the green belt in circumstances which are not exceptional, this makes the plan unsound: • The need has been assessed to accommodate a particular level of development. The proposals involve use of land designated green belt because the urban area cannot accommodate all of this and there are no other alternatives within the City boundary. Opting for use of the green belt is the easy option requiring no thought. The fact that there is a shortage of development land in the urban area is not an exceptional circumstance, it is inevitable that development land will grow short and now that it has that fact will pertain into the future and cannot be defined as exceptional. Either now or later a different solution to providing for housing need must be found. Solutions to accommodate housing beyond the City boundary are still under discussion with other authorities, as is the LEP development strategy for commercial development. Birmingham's plan is therefore premature. The green belt land in question is of high landscape and amenity value and has tremendous value in its own right for the community, now and for future generations, as comments made in response to each	• Avoid green belt development altogether and adopt a different strategy across the region which focuses development on a new approach for growth on brownfield land across the whole West Midlands conurbation, including the Black Country, where it would be encouraged, or in properly planned settlements beyond the green belt. Both options would be more sustainable than the current Plan. Shortage of development land is an issue all over the world, not just in Birmingham, and other design solutions are being explored to address it worldwide, creating higher density development in urban areas in attractive new ways. • If the Inspector considers that the present plan is sound then adopting a phased approach to development over the plan period with greenfield/green belt land not developed until most of the brownfield land/ development in urban areas has been delivered is essential. Phasing is vital for related infrastructure – transport improvements including railway connections, health service provision, schools etc as any development takes place.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp242	There is litte explanation for the reasons to build on the green belt. The view that the green belt is accessible is clearly wrong. By its very nature the sites at Langlet SUE and Peddimore are mainly served by country lanes and even if new roads/ dual carriageways were constructed on the new developments, the adjoining residential areas would not be able to cope with the increased traffic. The Planning Inspector would be well served to visit Walmley/Sutton Coldfield Town Centre/A38 at peak times to witness the gridlock which now occurs. In order to facilitate building on the green belt a comprehensive upgrade of transport facilities, road, rail and public would be needed at a cost of millions of pounds. No developer would contribute the kind of money needed. It is interesting to see Mere Green marked on the plan. The area has gone from a thriving village centre 10 years ago to a couple of supermarkets, collection of charity and bargain shops and the majority of boarded up shops following a number of failed development proposals. There is, however, no mention of plans for its regeneration. Plan 4 show the white elephant that is HS2, should this be built the green belt will have been	More evidence of a detailed transport study for all of the proposed areas. Retention of the green belt until it is demonstrated beyond any doubt that all brownfield sites have been used and the population warrants more house building.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp250	There is nothing to suggest in this plan that you have thoroughly investigated any alternative options to building on Green Belt Land.	I would like you to share with Residents, all of your investigations and assessment carried out to ascertain how much available urban Land and Brownfield sites there are throughout the city, along with the 12,000 empty houses, and even more empty office spaces and commercial property. I would also like you to provide a proper breakdown of the cost of bringing these properties into habitable accommodation. This would provide us with a true indication of the cost and whether it outweighs the cost in terms of the loss of our environment if our Green Belt is pulled from under our feet.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp278	5.11 To meet the needs of the growing population and ensure that sufficient high quality accessible land is available for residential and economic development the City has also planned for the expansion of the urban area through the removal of land from the Green Belt. This will enable the delivery of a planned sustainable urban neighbourhood and a large employment site both located in the northeast of the City. 5.12 The City Council will continue to work proactively in these locations with existing landowners, stakeholders and other agencies to bring forward developments. interesting that none of your information on here shows or tells where else you have looked at and decided not to use. DO NOT TAKE THE GREEN BELT , there are so many sites around the city that could be developed , you are taking the easy option by destroying the green belt so you can build all in one place to make it easier for you.	you are taking the easy option by destroying the green belt so you can build all in one place to make it easier for you.Instead you should be looking at the disused sited like Lucas the shops in mere green, the disused land in Sutton coldfield Ldv washwood heath the list goes on not to mention the abandoned or boarded up sites on the Hagley road	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp548	Replace sustainable growth agenda with sustainable utility agenda. Focus on underutilised brownfield sites to accommadate any transformation of sites in order to modify trapped potential energy into more dynamic kinetic energy. Democratically involve the Bham population in choices regarding human and non-human development and chosen population levels.	Replace sustainable growth agenda with sustainable utility agenda. Focus on underutilised brownfield sites to accommadate any transformation of sites in order to modify trapped potential energy into more dynamic kinetic energy. Democratically involve the Bham population in choices regarding human and non-human development and chosen population levels.	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp574	Re TP10 and GA5: it is my understanding that the Green Belt was established after the war to stop Urban sprawl and that green belt boundaries should only be changed where all other alternatives for building have been exhausted. I feel strongly that Green Belt land should not be encroached on - the impact on future generations should be considered.	Birmingham CC should look at all existing and potential brownfield sites first including in other local authority areas. this will mean smaller residential developments in areas where there are already services, such as health, schools and existing transport links. As it stands, the Bham Plan would only appear to be of benefit to the developers, not new or existing residents.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp662	5.10 Sutton Coldfield, we don't need improvement on the 'retail and leisure offer', if the Mall reduces its horrendous rents, smaller shops could come back, open and stay open, not have these pop up shops bleeding the town dry every Christmas. Sutton used to have plenty of independent shops. Its fails to mention anything in brief about the Mere Green, Langley extension and the Peddimore development, summarising every where else. The council have brushed over it so it goes unnoticed maybe? Sutton Coldfield has been used as a cash cow and hasn't been given anything back. The area requires money to repair the roads, that have been so badly damaged over the past 10-15 years. Another and expensive waste of money is wheelie bins, for goodness sake how much will that cost to do when the simple plastic bag is unoffensive, cheap easy to reproduce, in fact the council no longer provides them so why spend more on fixing something that really isn't broken.	Stop these big developers and Councillors taking back handers to build on beautiful greenbelt land. It is there for a reason. I have made further comments regards brown field sites such as the Cincinnati Milacron site, the amount of land there could regenerate the whole area. Stop talking a load of guff, speak plain English so everyone can clearly read and understand any plans, and stay away from the Greenbelt. Recycle, reuse, and invest in brownfield sites creating local jobs and eradicating the ghettos, providing investment for the inner city poorer area. I will tick no to speaking at the examination in public as i'm not very confident at public speaking but if push comes to shove to protect this valuable land from development then i will speak on the issue.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp699	Green belt should be left alone, build on brown field sites	Green belt should be left alone, build on brown field sites	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp763	The plan states that there will be two primary schools, a secondary school, medical and shopping facilities. There is no doubt that there will be a big need for all these facilities and more. The plan does not contain enough detail on how these will be funded and the time frame for their construction. The plan relies on the developers providing the funding as and when they see fit	Funding should be secured and detailed before the building starts. Schools and medical facilities should be built alongside any houses failing that the council should provide detail of how existing schools and medical facilities will cope with the influx of new residents Please provide details of where the schools will be built with evidence that they are within walking distance of homes and evidence of the sustainability of such plans	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp824	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	Green belt development should be avoided altogether.	Adopt a different strategy across the region which focuses development on a new approach for growth on brownfield land across the whole West Midlands conurbation, including the Black Country, where it would be encouraged, or in properly planned settlements beyond the green belt. Both options would be more sustainable than the current Plan. Shortage of development land is an issue all over the world, not just in Birmingham, and other design solutions are being explored to address it worldwide, creating higher density development in urban areas in attractive new ways.	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1020			Peddimore proposed development is too big. Part of the site is at risk of flooding and the local facilities in Sutton Coldfield will be overloaded. Please distribute the housing in smaller developments including, where available, on ' brownfield sites'.	See above.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1030			"5.11 To meet the needs of the growing population and ensure that sufficient high quality accessible land is available for residential and economic development the City has also planned for the expansion of the urban area through the removal of land from the Green Belt." Where is the evidence to support this statement? If Green Belt land must be built on, then there must be a very pressing case for doing so, where is the evidence for such a case? Statements based on possibly unreliable population growth extrapolations do not make a compelling case. Such evidence would also need to show that all possible alternatives have been exhausted. This plan should be considered incomplete when such evidence is not included.	Greater evidence to support the claims (or at least reference to other analyses) should be provided.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1063	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the aspiration and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to supporting growth, wherever required by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1163			STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS PLAN FOR DESTROYING ALMOST ALL REMAINING GREEN BELT LAND	Should adopt something other than the easiest option, and incorporate the Black Country - if indeed population pressures are as great as you claim	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1184			I cannot see in your plan that you have looked into alternative options to building on Green Belt land.	You should carry out and include in the plan proper investigations and consultations with residents to establish how much available urban land, brownfield sites, empty houses and other buildings that we have throughout the City. I would also like to see a proper calculation of costs to bring those sites and buildings back to living space. This should have been done before you even began to consider using Green Belt land.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1204			Growth should be about improvement in QUALITY of life and not just urban spatial sprawl, which is both unnecessary and unsustainable.	Reconsider growth plans versus regeneration	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1205			Growth should be about improvement in QUALITY of life focused on regeneration and not just urban spatial sprawl, encroachment on the Green Belt, which is unnecessary and unsustainable.	Increase focus on regeneration	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1415			Test			Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1427	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities and exceptional circumstances proven can the decisions made for releasing green belt land for development. Only when a mature plan is in place for spatial growth and delivery can decisions be made. The supporting evidence documents clearly indicate that building on the green belt does not need to start until 2023. It is therefore very unclear why a plan is being presented which indicates building on the green belt will start in 2016. The plan is not consistent with planning policy.	A relevant/coherent/cohesive strategy for Birmingham should be developed where all reasonable alternatives have been considered and based on a vision developed by both the accountable council and local people and communities. One that has input from the GBSLEP and looks at the wider strategic issues for growth and economic recovery. A strategy which considers as a baseline that Birmingham is the most densely populated city in the West Midlands and has limitations for growth. A strategy is required where focus is on the wider strategic issues and need areas for growth. Not only here in the West Midlands but looking at joint working with other neighbouring areas looking at the real issues in the Midlands and England and Wales and developing a plan which is to the benefit of local people and communities and not just those of a city council. The BCC to cooperate "constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis" to a sufficiently advanced degree to make the plan mature enough for examination. Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1433	The BDP is unsound because it appears to be selective in commenting on the presence of Historic or Closed Landfill sites. I have serious concerns that there is no consistency in commentary in Section 5 - Spatial Delivery of Growth. The proposal for building on Green Belt Land and Brownfield sites should pay particular attention to historic landfill sites and all proposed development sites should indicate historic landfill sites. For example on Bordesley Park 5.72 and Eastern Triangle 5.95 landfill activity is clearly identified. The Government Environmental Agency Landfill Website also shows these sites. However the same Government website also shows a historic Land Fill site near Ox Leys Road it shows 'Null' for Licence. Ref Historic landfill (Grid reference: X: 415,304.71; Y: 295,681.73) However 5.55 Langley SUE does not mention or indicate the presence of the historic Ox Leys Road Landfill Site The BDP is unsound as it does not appear to have an even handed approach to the explanation to the community of the presence of historic and closed landfill and waste disposal areas. It has failed to engage and inform the local community of significant possible areas of interest and discussion.	The BDP Plan is unsound as it does not appear to have an equable approach to investigating and/or informing communities of the negative and positive aspects of any proposed development. Review BDP and ensure all pro's and cons are shared with communities and stakeholders.	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1444	Re Birmingham Plan - Re TP10, GA15. I strongly object to using green belt land, when will it end !! Green Belt land is to protect our countryside for future generations and whilst brownfield sites are available why are they not being utilised appropriately ?	Use brownfield sites or this country will end up like the holiday resorts in Europe derelict and where no one wants to live !!!	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1463	.."To meet the needs of the growing population and ensure that sufficient high quality accessible land is available for residential and economic development the City has also planned for the expansion of the urban area through the removal of land from the Green Belt. This will enable the delivery of a planned sustainable urban neighbourhood and a large employment site both located in the northeast of the City. "Building on land designated as green belt is not a solution. Green belt was created to protect the environment - this proposal destroys it. What about protecting the environment for future generations? What about protecting wild life? What about ensuring the well being of the existing population?	It should not go ahead. More should be done to look at alternatives.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1512	Your plan shows growth at Mere Green. You have clearly not noticed that Mere Green is full. The infrastructure is too small for the current population: roads and other facilities can't accommodate any more growth.	Delete Mere Green from the plan of sites showing growth areas.	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1593	I object to the use of Green belt land for housing development - Langley and Peddimore. The reasons for creating green belt land - to stop urban sprawl - are still highly relevant yet it continues to be eroded.	There is housing stock available in Birmingham, thousands of empty houses and houses with planning permission - so why is there the need to use green belt land?	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1597	I would be interested to see the data that supports the claim that 5.10 Sutton Coldfield, needs improvement on the 'retail and leisure offer' We have 3 large retail parks already in the area with empty units. Sutton Town Centre continually has empty units as the rents are too high to enable smaller businesses make it a viable place for their business to be located. Until Jaguar took its land back we had 3 cinemas if you count Star City, Wyndley Leisure Centre, tennis courts and various football and rugby grounds. So who said it needs improving. I have lived in Sutton all my life and have never been asked my views on this. I would suggest this data is flawed and it begs the question - is there a financial incentive for someone in having more retail/outlets built. If the Sutton population was survey and asked if they would prefer this or to keep their green field sites - I think the answer would speak for itself.			Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1630	1. The Big City Deal for Birmingham anticipates that “the population of the GBSLEP will grow by 179,000 (+9.4%) to 2026. Of this, 112,000 or 63% of the total will take place within Birmingham…resulting in a need for around 66,500 new units of accommodation within a tightly constrained urban area” This document was released in July 2012. 2. Birmingham City Council has been consulting with local Sutton residents since December 2012 on a projected population increase of 150,000 with a requirement to release Green Belt to accommodate a 10,000 housing development due to a housing need of 80,000. There are material variances between what is forecasted; July 2012 the figure is stated as 112,000. November 2012 the figure is stated as 150,000. There is no explanation for the material variance of 38,000. The plan is based on 2008 data calibrated with information from the 2011 census. Therefore there is no reason for this variance unless there is no precise data available to plan to. 1. October 2013 the plan was released with the revised figure of 5,000 within the plans life (6,000 total) 2. The pre submission plan evidence document states within the plans life it may well only be able to	Before any release of the Green Belt is considered then a full financial audit to occur on how effective and efficient the statistical data used for this plan is to warrant the decision. These figures to be reviewed with the local community (per planning policy that planning is a “collective exercise”) to ensure they have confidence in any decision made.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1635				National Planning Policy Framework states: “Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built Environment “ “Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored. Species that have been isolated can be reconnected. Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature – and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul” “…. sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations”. The BDP is not justified as it has not followed the very purpose of the NPPF. It cannot demonstrate that: The details within the plan specifically for the community in Sutton Coldfield are about change for the better. The land should remain open for people to experience it “. This is to the benefit of future generations. By releasing the Green Belt it contradicts this very statement. Removing what little green belt land we have is not about “positive growth” or making environmental progress. It is in fact the very opposite.	Please explain how the above have been applied and adhered to within the plan as it is unclear for the Langley SUE and Peddimore.	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1700	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton	Support paragraph 5.9. The re-use and redevelopment of existing urban land should be the focus for new development. However, these sites are often more expensive to develop than green field sites and can be constrained by site configuration and relationship to surrounding uses and buildings. It would help to bring these sites forward if planning obligations and design standards were viewed with greater pragmatism. Viability assessments can go someway towards helping to inform this process, but should allow for greater Developer profits (within reason) to help offset the risks and costs of empty rates, site clearance etc., to make such sites attractive to developers.		Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1708	I do not believe the document sets out a compelling case for building these houses on Green Belt land. Green Belt was designated to prevent urban sprawl and the council are proposing to ignore this and build on this land. Birmingham does not have a great deal of Green Belt left - less than 15% of the original designated area - this should be preserved and only altered where a compelling reason exists.	There is no justification for this paving over of Green Belt land. With planning permission existing for 17000 homes and 12000 empty homes available the necessity for the homes quoted within the document is simply not made. Can the council explain why Green Belt is to be released rather than utilising available urban sites? Especially where Housing Stock is clearly available.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1719	This will destroy all the green belt and there is not a strong enough case or reasoning to do so. The main jobs created are likely to be the city centre and the infrastructure will not support this even with some investment. The local rail network is already subject to congestion as are the roads. It will just create more. I concur with all the other comments made in this section			Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1764	For the following reason the plan is unsound. (Para 5.7)'The City's administrative boundary is however constrained and there are also limits to the available land within the urban area to accommodate future growth requirements. As a result land will need to be removed from the Green Belt for housing and employment development.' NPPF 178. There is a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries particularly those which relate to the 'strategic priorities' set out in paragraph 156.	A total commitment to leaving the Green Belt intact. Evidence of joint working with other local planning authorities to meet requirements.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp1832	All aspects must be considered before building on green belt as per NPPF. However as the Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth is not expected to be complete until later in 2014 then all aspects have not yet been considered and so this plan is not sound.	Complete the plan as it is only 61% complete at present. Do not build on green belt.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp1866					I note that section 5.11 refers to greenbelt development (in relation to Sutton Coldfield) while I am not objecting to such development, as I agree that it is esential for more homes to be built in birmingham to house the growing population, I would like to emphasise the importance in allocating an appropriate phasing period for the delivery of this development. Development sites in the North of Biirmingham should be brought forward on a brownfield first delivery schedule, and the green belt development should be safeguarded until all viable brownfield sites have been developed.	The preferred phasing of the sites included in this section should be clarly laid out and embedded into a specific planning policy to ensure that yur authorities commitment to delivering development on brownfield sites occurs first. The policy should require developers to complete an open book assessment of the viability of all remaining brownfield sites before been given planning permission to develop on greenbelt development. Greenbelt development should attract a higher CIL contribution than Brownfield sites to ensure that there are not significant finacial advantages to developers seeking to build there purely with the motivation of increasing profits.	No	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp2367	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp2754	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5350		Hawkstone Properties	Mr David Smith	Turley Associates	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5502	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5520		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5603	Ms Rebecca Mayman	Wyre Forest District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5698		Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin	Partner Deloitte LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5755	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp5780	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08

bp5803	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Spatial delivery of growth	Q08
bp132					There is no reference to the decline in high street retail due to internet and out of town shopping. the city centre currently has many unused retail units and retail space. Why the need for more, Similarly there is much unoccupied office space with plenty of capacity for expansion. Why the need for more. On a manufacturing front, what incentives will be given to businesses to use the enterprise centres and not locate at I54 especially for automotive businesses	Show the all the assessment carried out including, current capacity and usage together with future needs assessment together with the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans	Yes	City Centre	GA1
bp243					The proposals for the City Centre are to be welcomed, there is, however, no mention of a strategy for dealing with the increasing number of empty shops and officers. The historic shopping streets of New St, Corporation St, High St and Bull St. need to be supported and enhanced.	A clear statement on City Centre management should be included to demonstrate how empty shops/offices are to dealt with.	No	City Centre	GA1
bp307		Mitchells & Butlers Retail Ltd	Mr Marcus Plaw	Associate Director COLLIERS	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	City Centre	GA1
bp490					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp669					The area of Floodgate Street should be opened up to create a floodplain/water management area and wider shallow open River. It should lead into a public urban park and lake near to the bullring. This could then link with the canal walk ways and form a magnet for shoppers and tourists. This could incorporate the relocated wholesale market and China Town as well as providing extensions to Theatreland with outdoor amphitheatres for plays. This should be Birminghams River ... one of the few deficiencies which would make it a Great City Centre. Also be aware of vehicle access requirements for people with physical impairments in the rush for walking and cycling only.	There should be another area of Green Public open space and water included on the attached map with appropriate annotation.		City Centre	GA1

bp855	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy GA1.2 Eastside. Recognise developments that have taken place already, namely Millennium Point, Parkside (BCU) and the new City Park. Rather than require "well designed mixed use developments including office, technology, residential, learning and leisure" stress overall existing policy of a learning zone. Policy GA1.3 Eastside. Again recognise it is work in progress with massive investment by Birmingham City University in its new City Centre campus While the departure of BCU from Parry Barr is accurately presented, the massive investment in a new city centre campus in the Eastside learning zone is relatively understated.			City Centre	GA1
bp923				I think many of these ideas sound extremely interesting and will enhance the city centre.	I think independent retailers should be included in the programme, so we don't have a city centre that just looks like any other with the same mix of shops. Local trades should be reflected, eg. leather, jewellery. Also, some attraction could be set up such as the Jorvig centre in York, or Madame Tussauds in London, perhaps with reference to our thousand trades. I hope House of Frazer can improve their store radically, it is desperately uninteresting, and needs to think back to the days of Rackham's and Lewis's in the past, when stores were a pleasure to visit, with soda fountains, rooftop gardens and cafes, fountains in the store.	No	City Centre	GA1

bp999			While much of the City centre develpoment has been succesful in its own terms - there has been a loss of local distinctivness. In addition control of land and buildings has moved away from Biirmingham, as has the income from these properties. localy controlled jobs have been lost. Crucial city centre assetss such as independent shops have been lost. Property costs have risen there are less and less opportunitires for lower income individuals and bussineses to be based in the city centre. The wholesale market is to be moved which could further reinforce these trends. The emphasis on the city centre has been at the expense of other parts of the city were conditions have detriorated	A policy seeking to maximxise the overall benefits to the local economy and to local distinctivness from city centre developments	No	City Centre	GA1
bp1068	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policies and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to high quality, distinctive environment by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) whilst enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Need to ensure that negative impacts of development and growth (eg current metro expansion involving loss of vital semi-mature trees in city centre) is adequately mitigated rather than an engineering needs trumps all approach			City Centre	GA1

bp1147	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	Within the City Centre Growth Area Boundary are: Birmingham and Fazeley Canal; Birmingham and Warwick Junction Canal; Digbeth Branch; Grand Union Canal; New Main Line Canal; Oozells Street Loop; and Worcester and Birmingham Canal. These canals are found within five of the seven quarters (Digbeth, Eastside, St George and St Chad, The Jewellery Quarter, and Westside and Ladywood). There are numerous listed canal structures and a number of Conservation Areas within the City Centre Area. A number of the development sites identified on the City Centre Spatial Plan are adjacent to or include the canals. Canal & River Trust would require any development site adjacent to the canal/s to; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network. The waterways can be used as tools in place making and place shaping, and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. Canal & River Trust would seek		No	City Centre	GA1
bp1209			The City Centre is rather crowded with retail outlets and inadequate tram (metro) access.	Focus on facilities and increase tram lines tenfold	Yes	City Centre	GA1

bp1259	Item 3.2 states We will plan to ensure Birmingham’s residents will be experiencing a high quality of life, living within attractive and well designed sustainable neighbourhoods." Policy Policy GA1.1 states "Residential development will continue to be supported in the City Centre where it provides well-designed good quality living environments. "So while the vision wants high quality, the policy is merely for good quality. The policy should therefore be to have high quality living environments. Recent residential developments in the city centre have been notably poor quality in construction. Appartment blocks have been built for which the fabric has rapidly deteriorated, and are likely to become slum developments in the near future. The council therefore needs to have strict building standards to ensure high quality living environments.	Re Policy GA1.1 - reword to state "high quality" not "good quality" and put standards and practices in place to ensure this is actually enacted. * * *

bp1260	Policy GA1.2 "In order for the City Centre to maintain and develop its position as a top visitor destination and driver of the City's economy, significant new levels of growth will be accommodated. The City Centre has potential to accommodate in the region of 12,800 new homes, 700,000 sq.m. of office floorspace and 160,000 sq.m. of retail floorspace."If birmingham is to attract "visitors" then the focus needs to be beyond simply new homes, offices and shops. The definition of "visitors" is not given but presumably this would not include residents and workers nor most shoppers. If Birmingham intends to attract more visitrs then it needs to have more "visitors attractions" e.g. the sea life centre, the NIA. The intention to improve Birmingham city centre by just adding more accomodation, offices and shops is lacking in imagination and aims at a fairly mundane future for the centre. Policy GA1.4 - This only seeks only to improve access by pedestrian and cycles. Public transport will merely be "integrated" not improved. By defaul this means that with the expansion in growth in the city centre with nothing done to improve private vehicle access (if only to keep pace with increased demand) the centre will risk become	Re Policy GA1.2 - actually get more imaginative. Think of how more visitors might actually be attracted by something intersting and positive, noit just rely on "more of the same"Re Policy GA1.4 - the council needsto be realistic and actually plan for impoved private transport access in the city centre, not simply relying on improving cycle/pedestrian links, or "integrated" public transport. Re Item 5.18 - the statement needs to be substantiated, or more realisitically, greater effort needs to be done in plannig for the future to actually deliver a positive result rather than assuming that all things are rosy to begin with. Re Item 5.23 - HS2 should not be accepted as a "done deal". Given the potential impacts of HS2, this the council should consider the options both without and with HS2, not just assume it will happen. Re Item 5.29 - the council needs to reconsider the long term impact of the current recession and state how it will impact on 2031 plans. Re General point on 5.1 - update the map to mark on it the location and boundary of each area defined in the text. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Yes	City Centre	GA1
bp1349	The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.		City Centre	GA1

bp1373	One of the City Centre shopping malls has a significant number of empty retail units at the moment. This provides an opportunity for the introduction of retail individuality in Birmingham something that is sadly lacking at the moment. Large retail companies that take advantage of sweatshops around the world should be discouraged from taking these units. It is so important to support local craftspeople, artists and small individual retailers that can introduce retail specialism and add character to the City of Birmingham.	Encourage localism in retail to help to achieve the City's targets to reduce the carbon footprint.	No	City Centre	GA1
bp1377	The cost of parking in the City Centre needs to be addressed. At the moment there is a wide variation in charges. Employ uniform charges to encourage people who live outside of Birmingham to drive in and enjoy all of the City's facilities. Theatre goers enjoying events at the Rep Theatre and parking in the nearby car park pay considerably less than those who visit the Alexandra Theatre.	Address the issue of the wide variation in parking charges in the City Centre	No	City Centre	GA1
bp1432	The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country and Worcestershire Branch) on behalf of the Inland Waterways Association is concerned that Policy GA1 does not include a specific commitment to the protection, enhancement and promotion of the canals within the City Centre. The canals provide an important historic and open space environment within the City Centre and have been the subject of considerable and mostly sympathetic development. However, there will be many future development opportunities to build on this investment and it is important that the policy includes provision to support and control these.	Policy GA1 should be amended to include provision for the support and control of City Centre developments that include or affect the canals network.	No	City Centre	GA1
bp1528	While development and improvement of the City Centre is laudable, growth should not be the key focus. At some point, this has to stop as the city cannot continue to expand indefinitely.	The Plan should focus on improving what we already have, rather than continually looking for growth and expansion.	No	City Centre	GA1
bp1632	The whole cycling initiative is a red herring and a waste of resources.			City Centre	GA1

bp1701	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton	Support the identification of Broad Street as a suitable location for development, but this should be wider than just office development, it should include residential leisure and tourism uses, or a mix thereof. There is a collection of sites around the junction between Sheepcote Street and Broad Street that have or have had either full planning permission of outline planning permission for large buildings providing a range and mix of uses. This collection of sites should be identified as a development site in the Westside section of the policy text similar to the Arena Central and Paradise Circus sites. This is a landmark location and a key gateway to the City Centre. The Sheepcote Street - Broad Street collection of sites also sit at the eastern extreme of the Greater Icknield GA. Every encouragement should be given to bringing this collection of sites forward for development.	Identify the individual development sites around the Sheepcote Street - Broad Street junction as a development site and add this to Plan 5.	Yes	City Centre	GA1
bp1720				There needs to be consideration given to the reduction in high street retailing due to on-line sales and mega superstores taking many out of town. Additional attractions need to be considered to ensure visitors will come to the city centre. Independent retailers need to be encouraged into the city centre to make it diverse and for people to want to shop there. I also think people need to feel safe when visiting Birmingham with more community policing. I rarely come to the city centre as most of needs can be catered for elsewhere.		No	City Centre	GA1

bp1794	Mr Jon Lord	City Centre Neighbourhood Forum			Object in part to Policy GA1.1 in relation to the locations for future comparison retail development. Two of the locations proposed (around the HS2 station, the area of which is too vague in definition, and wholesale markets) are too distant from the existing retail core and would exacerbate the decline of the existing retailing area and therefore is not in accordance with the objectives of the Big City Plan. Whilst the identified scale of comparison retail development is questionable (as a result of the continued increase in online shopping and spending patterns) any new comparison retail should be focused around the martineau galleries proposal to assist the revitalisation of Corporation Street and High Street along with adjacent streets and arcades. This approach would undermine Policy TP22 which seeks to encourage the development of independent retailing in the city centre. The focus of retail development in areas outside of the traditional retail core will undermine the viability of the existing retailing streets and arcades through refocusing footfall and expenditure. Already, retailing in the city centre is focused on several large scale covered centres located on the periphery of the retail core; a trend which will	There should be consideration of a phasing policy which prioritises the redevelopment of the area around martineau galleries and then the wholesale markets site. The HS2 station area for comparison retail should be tightly defined.	No	City Centre	GA1
bp2530	Mr David Austin	Undergraduate Project Officer Aston University			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp2538	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp2780		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp2824	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp5125					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp5239		The Schools of King Edward the Sixth in Birmingham		GVA Grimley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	City Centre	GA1
bp5332		Aviva Investors		GVA Grimley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	City Centre	GA1
bp5411	Jennifer Smith	Marketing Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1

bp5503	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp5623		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp5757	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp5789	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp5818		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		City Centre	GA1
bp670					excellent			Greater Icknield	GA2
bp924					I am in favour of improving and developing semi-derelict sites. This area is in need of improving. I think the canalside developments sound good too.			Greater Icknield	GA2
bp925					I am in favour of developing and improving semi-derelict sites. I also think the canalside developments sound good.		No	Greater Icknield	GA2
bp1074	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Greater Icknield proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Greater Icknield	GA2

bp1161	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	Within the Greater Icknield Growth Area Boundary are: Icknield Port Loop; Ladywood Arm; New Main Line Canal; Soho Loop; and Rotton Park Reservoir. We have a number of listed structures within the Greater Icknield Area. Many of the development sites within this area and areas of public open space are found adjacent to the canal network. Canal & River Trust would require these development sites to; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network. The waterways can be used as tools in place making and place shaping, and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. Canal & River Trust would seek for any development to relate appropriately to the waterway and optimise the benefits such a location can generate for all parts of the community. The Icknield Port Loop Development Site has the benefit of outline planning permission. We are part owner and working with partners on the		No	Greater Icknield	GA2
bp1350			The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Greater Icknield	GA2

bp1437					The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country and Worcestershire Branch) on behalf of the Inland Waterways Association (IWA) is concerned that Policy GA2 does not include specific reference to the protection and enhancement of the canals within the Greater Icknield area recognising their importance as a historic and open space environment. The IWA is fully aware and has been consulted over the development proposals for the Icknield Port Loop and is fully supportive of these and would want to see these linked to enhanced canal connections with the City Centre. The policy should include a commitment to support and control these developments.	Policy GA2 should be amended to include specific reference to the support and control of developments in Greater Icknield that include canals so as to protect and enhance their historic and open space environment.	No	Greater Icknield	GA2
bp1636					If you are not careful, "family housing" will become "student housing" owned by unscrupulous buy to let landlords. Students can easily outbid families for desirable properties in the city centre.		Yes	Greater Icknield	GA2
bp2693		Sandwell and West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust	Mr Simon Phillips	GVA	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Greater Icknield	GA2
bp2831	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Greater Icknield	GA2
bp5252		The Schools of King Edward the Sixth in Birmingham		GVA Grimley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Greater Icknield	GA2
bp5415		City and Provincial Properties Plc	Mr David Smith	Turley Associates	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Greater Icknield	GA2
bp5998		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Greater Icknield	GA2
bp847	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	5.48 Birmingham City University is fully in agreement with this statement but would stress the need for road access improvements to the main highway network. The whole matter of BCU's departure from Perry Barr is accurately presented.		No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells	GA3

bp856	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy GA3. Birmingham City University welcomes the policy to encourage mixed uses on the City North Campus at Perry Barr after the relocation to the City Centre.		No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3
bp926					I am in favour of any development that would help these areas and reduce unemployment.		No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3
bp1075	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Aston, Newtown and Lozells proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3
bp1148	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust			Within the Aston, Newtown and Lozells Growth Area Boundary are: Birmingham and Fazeley Canal and Tame Valley Canal. The Canal & River Trust have submitted representations on the AAP for this area and we recognise the proposals for regeneration and development in this area, which the canals can support. Wide areas of change and public open space have been identified adjacent to the canals on the Spatial Plan. The Canal & River Trust would require any development in the areas of change which are adjacent to the canal/s to; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network. The waterways can be used as tools in place making and place shaping, and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. The Canal & River Trust would seek for any development to relate appropriately to the waterway and optimise the benefits such a location can generate for all parts of the		No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3

bp1215		These areas were cohesive working class communities from where many leading citizens emerged from Victorian to first half 20th century. The was however a polarisation in society where the successful moved out leaving others behind. Where there was development its was simply in social or affordable housing, thus perpetuating polarisation.	Ensure that mixed redevelopment occurs and not simply "social or affordable" housing	Yes	Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3
bp1351		The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3
bp1378		This is an area that has been recognised as being in need of regeneration. It has good connectivity and the people who live there deserve the opportunity to improve their quality of life, raise their expectations and be part of and benefit from the aspirations of the BDP. Old housing stock needs to meet today's standards or be demolished and rebuilt. Industry needs to be sited in the area to give hope to the residents who are unable to find employment. The 8 ha site that has become available as a result of the relocation of the Perry Barr University Campus could be utilised to provide 320 homes. If 3 storey flats were built this could be increased to 960 homes.	Total commitment should be given to the Aston, Newtown and Lozells AAP.	No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells GA3

bp1439					The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country and Worcestershire Branch) on behalf of the Inland Waterways Association is concerned that Policy GA3 does not include specific reference to the support and control of developments within the Aston, Newtown and Lozells area that affect or include the canals. The canals provide a unique historic and open space environment which is an important asset to the area and the policy should reflect this within its provisions.	Policy GA3 should be amended to include specific provisions for the support and control of developments affecting or including the canals so as to protact and enhance their unique historic and open space environment.	No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells	GA3
bp2832	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Aston, Newtown and Lozells	GA3
bp5336		Director of research Birmingham City University	Mr Nick Hardy	Director GVA	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Aston, Newtown and Lozells	GA3
bp5444					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Aston, Newtown and Lozells	GA3
bp11					From a personal perspective, parking is a major reason for why Sutton Town Centre is not as successful as other retail centres. The Fort has ample parking and has become very successful. The Retail developments to the South of Tamworth have also taken business away from Sutton Town Centre and offer a different type of store notably home furnishings. It is my opinion that there is ample parking in Sutton however charges, particularly in the Council owned car parks put consumers off.	I suggest a transfer of parking ownership from the council to the retailers to facilitate free parking. The only area of "free" parking in Sutton Town Centre. Between ALDI and TGI is popular and is paid for through store purchases. This success should be rolled out to other car parks and possible arrangements with local employers seeking parking could be sort.	Yes	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp42					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp49					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp56					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp77	Mr Keith Pringle	Management Consultant Jakema Programme Management Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp115					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp131			Sutton Town centre plans include the removal of car parking - why, as this could also be made available for rail travel. Sutton as a destination is dying for retail with out of town centres such as the Fort and Tamworth providing better choice and free parking. How will the future Sutton look and who will fund the complete demolition and rebuilding of the town centre to bring about any future opportunity	Provide a fully costed high level plan showing the why, how, funding plan supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp174	Mrs Marie Pringle	Sales Controller McCurrach UK Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp207			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp209			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp298			GA4 TRANSPORT. SUTTON IS A BOTTLENECK. THERE IS NO PLANE PROPOSING ROAD IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC THROUGH. THIS MUST BE THE FIRST CHANGE BEFORE THERE IS NO MOVEMENT ALONG THE A5127.	GA4 1/ MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE A5127. 2/ FROM THE COLLEGE TO THE CHURCH STOP THE TURNS TO SIDE ROADS. 3/ PUT IN OVERHEAD CROSSINGS. STOP PEDESTRIANS CROSSING ON THIS STRETCH OF ROAD.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp364			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp435			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp542			There are many comments contained within this section on Sutton Coldfield which I would endorse particularly relating to its inadequate retail sector. However it's almost impossible to comment specifically on the proposals because the are simply broad brush strokes which lack any "nitty gritty" details. What sort of retail redevelopment do you envisage? A "Touchwood" style or simply more of what already exists? The attached map is of limited help as there are only 2points clearly identified so its almost impossible to see exactly where the development sites and wider areas of change are located. The plan also refers to a new town square. Where would that be and what exactly would it look like? I'm extremely alarmed by this "plan" because of its lack of clarity and detail. Your proposals are so generalised that until you add the " colour" of specific details I will remain in opposition.	Impossible to say as the proposals are vague.		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp586			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp654			There does not appear much appetite for retail development in Sutton Coldfield - the abandonded site between Brassington Ave and the railway is an eyesore - so it is not clear how retailers will be attracted. The bus terminus arrangements are very poor and in great need of improvement	The need for incentives to encourage office and commercial development needs to be addressed The bus terminus arrangements need to be properly considered in the plan	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp700			sutton coldfield should become an independent authority	delay any actions until the political future of sutton is decided	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp743			The proposed building on the green belt should be shelved from the plan until all other avenues have been used eg. existing brown fields sites and sites with existing planning permissions. I can see no exceptional circumstance where green belt should be used for housing use but land bordering the motorway M6/M42 would be better than on the edge of an urban area. All plans are supposed to be about the community and in line with planning policy framework, where is the money coming from? who is paying for it.are we relying on developers to fund it in this current financial climate. How will this effect our local transport links in such a small area as warmley?	There are 12,000 empty houses in Birmingham area and 17,000 homes on Brownfield sites, why can't Brownfield sites in the Black Country, for example be utilised?	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp757			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp808	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	The final version of the High Street CAAMP is already years overdue and has been repeatedly "shelved", allegedly because of staff shortages. Indeed it is hard to see, given the severe cuts in the Conservation team, how much of the city's stated intentions to respect and support the historic environment can actually be achieved. Please note that the description "Old Town" was introduced by the consultants working on the Town Centre SPD and has no currency amongst local residents.	Perhaps a forlorn hope, but a statement to the effect that "the city's Conservation team will be strengthened when circumstances permit" would be welcome. A small point, but I wish "Old Town" could be replaced with eg "the historic heart of the town".		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp927			I agree that a radical re-think is needed to improve Sutton Coldfield. However, recent developments have not exactly improved the look of the town or been sympathetic with the existing architecture. And the Brassington Avenue non-development has been scandalous.	Much more detail required, with exact plans and architectural examples.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp1034			I find these policy points (GA4) particularly vague. As a resident of Sutton Coldfield I would be interested to know what these proposals are intended to do and how they are to be implemented. As a resident of Sutton Coldfield I would also question your assumptions relating to why Sutton Coldfield is underperforming and what to do about it. I personnally enter the town centre rarely and prefer to shop in other locations for the simple reason of free parking and less chance of being stuck in traffic.	Be more specific about the proposals that are intended and the issues they are trying to address. Highlighting the particular concerns of residents that (should) drive these proposals would also be helpful.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1077	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to Sutton Coldfield Town Centre proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1113			Car parking and its cost has a role to play in the regeneration of Sutton town centre. The town has to compete with large shopping centres nearby offering free ample parking. The selling off and development therefore of existing car parks is not a solution and will probably be detrimental. There is not enough information about a new town sqare and bus interchange and its location to be able to comment but if the City sells off what little land there is in the Town centre these changes will not happen.	Look at car parking within the town and commit the City to keeping and enhancing its car parks.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1216			Sutton Coldfield would have benefited from a town centre development such as that of Solihull. That opportunity was missed. Instead of "growth" it needs rearrangement and regeneration -which is rather difficult to realise.	Consider more radical reformation	Yes	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp1278	Item 5.4 Sutton Coldfield Town Centre The lak of progress made with the development of Sutton Town Centre demonstrates the poor ability of the council to actually deliver on its policies. The Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration Framework SPD was put in place in 2009 and in the intervening 5 years nothing has been achieved. At the last public presentation of the plan which was about two years ago, all progress appeared to be dependent upon finding an outside developer who would be able to solve all the problems for the council. For example, the assumption was that once a developer came and told the council what they wanted to do, it would then be possible to test whether this was possible in the traffic model built for the purpose. What should have been been achieved before the plan was approved was the council to use the model to calculate how much additional traffic the centre could take (with whatever improvements could be made) and then convert this additional traffic into its equivalent additional development. It would then be possible to determine firstly whether additional development was possible (something that does not appear to have been tested) and gain	Re Item 5.4 Sutton Coldfield Town Centre The council needs to actually get to work implementing the policy and take a serious approach to identifying how much extra traffic the centre can take and using this to determine how extra development could be accomodated (if any). * * *

bp1352	The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1379	The plan is unsound because it does not follow the NPPF directives. The NPPF (Para 23) states that in drawing up plans the authorities should 'retain and enhance existing markets.....create new ones.....ensure markets remain attractive..... The BDP makes no reference to the existing indoor market in Sutton Coldfield. Many units are now empty and the market lacks character and vitality. Why?	Incorporate the needs of the Sutton Coldfield Market into the BDP. Address the issue of empty units and take action to breath vitality into the Indoor Market. Make the empty units available to local artists and crafts people. Make it possible for new businesses to believe they have an affordable starting point. Think Camden Market, Southwark Market.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1449	I would like to see more detail. I live in Sutton Coldfield relatively close to the town centre and I would like to know what is being included in the proposals to reduce traffic congestion and to stop people who work in Sutton Coldfield from using the road that I live in as a free car park.	I would like to see more detail, particularly on the proposed relief road.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1454	GA5 The land intended for use as the Langley Development of 6,000 homes is an area of natural underground springs, hence the name of Springfield Rd! There is flooding on Springfiled Rd and Lindridge Rd, adjacent to the planned site, every time it rains. I cannot see any mention of these historical, natural springs in the Plan, or indeed, any reference as to how the springs will be diverted, or how they will effect the development.	Much more thorough research for evidence of the springs is needed, and documentation as to how the water will be diverted must be shown.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp1513	The scale of retail growth is totally unrealistic. With the opening of John Lewis in 2015 and the improved Mailbox a short train journey away (and of course the growth of internet shopping), Sutton Coldfield Town Centre will not thrive but contract and rightly so. A policy for the contraction of the retail centre should be devised and its change of use for housing to take pressure off the green belt options.	Rethink the role of Sutton Coldfield Town centre with no increase in retail space and housing being introduced.		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1530	I agree with many of the plans for Sutton Town Centre, although further details of any proposed relief road or bus interchange would need to be given, to assess impact on local population.		No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1563	Most of the goals in policy GA4 have been though of in the last 40 years, with varying degree of implementation or failure (ie: the bus station and Old Town relief road). Whilst the town centre needs better connectivity, design and the shift of businesses to go along Birmingham Road and into the Old Town, to reduce focus on The parade.	The Masterplan helps address the issues above. The bus station and relief road could help achieve GA4, maybe the reopening of Sutton Park line to passenger services can help meet the goals.	Yes	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1614	Policy GA4 – I support the policy of encouraging the ongoing growth and diversification of uses within Sutton Coldfield Town Centre. However, the length of time that some developments (eg Brassington Avenue, bus station) are taking indicates that we may need to go beyond encouragement and offer incentives. I am not clear about the detail of what is being proposed. Is it the implementation of the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration Framework SPD (2009) or is it something different? There is no reference to the development of proposals to establish a Sutton Coldfield Town Council, subject to the results of a referendum.	Make reference to consideration of incentives to accelerate the development of the town centre. Make reference to the decision-making arrangements for the development of the town centre, including the role of any future Town Council, which should be identified as the lead authority. Ensure the timetabling of planning activity is such that it does not reach a “point of no return” before the results of the referendum to establish a Sutton Coldfield Town Council are known and, assuming it is agreed, implemented.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp1665	I am not convinced of the need for more retail area or office area. There is already a significant amount of unoccupied space as it stands and I would challenge whether the impact if the internet on retail has been adequately considered. My logic remains that the Council should prioritise retaining the green belt and accommodating housing in front of more office and retail space. I exclude manufacturing from my thinking though I continue to press for the use of brownfield sites rather than green belt.	Provide an analysis of the impact if the internet on the need for retail space allocation and development. Prioritise housing and adopt a strategy of placing people closer to the sources of employment to maximise the opportunity of people walking and cycling to work (your stated objective).	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1721	So you are also planning a relief road around Sutton!! This had been considered before and will carve up more homes and add more congestion to the surrounding area of Sutton. There have been several failed plans and initiatives in and around Sutton - notably the Brassington avenue development and Mere Green Springs development. More needs to be done to attract retailers to the area as they have to compete with high rental prices and several large superstores in the surrounding area. I concur with the majority of comments made by others in this section		No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1814	Firstly the plans are so vague I don't see how they can be meaningful. There have been plans of this nature for the development of Sutton town centre many times over the years and this one seems more vague than a lot of previous ones that have been muted - but have still never happened. I would comment though that the current infrastructure of Sutton Coldfield is already saturated. Parking is a challenge, roads get gridlocked in peak traffic times, our doctor's surgeries and Good Hope Hospital struggle to cope with the ever increasing demands (and you can't park at Good Hope as it is!), train station car parking is insufficient, etc etc. Secondly, I don't believe any firm decisions should be taken about the development of Sutton Coldfield - either the town centre or the green belt land surrounding it, until a decision on devolved power from BCC to Sutton has been decided.	Shelve the plans until a decision has been made on whether or not Sutton is to have its own town council reinstated (or a form of town council). If plans do still go ahead, far more detail is needed before the public can comment meaningfully. Shelve all plans for greenfield development (around Sutton and indeed anywhere else) until all existing brownfield sites have been fully utilised around the city (and by brownfield sites I do not mean back garden developments - I mean run down areas, old industrial sites, etc).		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp1867			Sutton Town Centre would greatly benefit from the development of some soft landscaping and green urban space, at present it lacks any tree cover, or informal green spaces that could be used for informal picnic areas, or events. The hard paved and hard surfaced area of the town centre is particulally vulnerable to the effects of climate change and the urban heat island effect. It would be helpful to see the incorporation of green roofs and rainawater gardens within the town centre to mitigate against this impact. It would be particually beneficial if Sutton Town Centre had a more formal outside area such as a small profiled amiptheatre (similar to the one between Birmingham Town Hall and Paradise Forum/ former Central Library) This area of lanscaping would allow the town centre to have more public events and artistic displays, and would make an useful seating area that visitors could use . The Plantsbrook runs in culvert through Sutton Town Centre (andf through the development site at Brassington Avenue), where possible this should be opened up and a linear green walkway / route be created along side it to improve the connection between Sutton Park and the Town Centre.	There should be some requirements for new developments to consider the incorporation of green infrastructure, public open space and adaptation to climate change.	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1977			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp1988			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2000			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2265			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2296			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2415			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2539	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2833	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp2851			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp3324			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp3404					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp3424					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp3436					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp3666					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4315					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4389					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4526					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4584					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4593					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4715					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4729					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4844					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp4969					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5010					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5076					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5086					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5095					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5267		PegasusLife Limited	Mr Benjamin Taylor	Senior Planning Consultant Barton Willmore	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5287	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5428					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5473					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5507	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4

bp5511			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5535			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5557			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5728			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp5759	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sutton Coldfield Town Centre	GA4
bp12			The provision of a rail link to the area would not be an enhancement, it would be essential to the success of the scheme and are in my view a pre requisite. Although the A38 is relatively clear at the point in question, one must consider where the traffic will be heading. It is likely that the main route will be towards the City Centre and once the new residence pass the Minworth island they will have a 30minute wait to travel a mile. One must consider whether the new residential estate will truly be a destination of choice with the affordable housing specification planned or will it be below average.	Don't develop on Green Belt until every square meter of brown field is built on first. Once this is done, relax the requirement for affordable homes in the area. Make the new estate able to attract the best people in the UK and abroad to live in order to help the rejuvenation of Birmingham. The land is agricultural therefore have houses with large gardens to utilise this. The sequence of footpaths in the area and leading to Minworth and Wishaw are rewarding however, require better integration and maintenance. This resource has potential to be better than that of the Newhall Valley. You didn't listen to my last consultation response, therefore I have little hope of being listened to this time.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp22			There is significant traffic congestion in the Walmley area already. Most residents already queue at many junctions & it can take 20 minutes to travel 1 mile at the moment. Where will all the extra traffic go? There is only the A38. This is a very irresponsible & unsustainable plan. The railway option just won`t happen, Centro has to reduce its own costs. Cycling to Birmingham or even Sutton is only for a tiny minority & is therefore irrelevant.	Abandon any plan for this green belt development because of inadequate transport links.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp43			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp50			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp51			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp54			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp55	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp57	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp61	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp63	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp64	POPULATION GROWTH We are now seeing the effect of uncontrolled population growth - the pressure on housing. Much of this recent growth is due to immigration and the problem with this is that immigrants do not bring land or jobs with them. So now we are having to dig up productive farmland because of the demand for houses and also provide employment too. The physical loss of land is never properly accounted for. From the statistics provided the population of Birmingham has increased by 10% over the last 10 years, and now 1 in 5 (or 200,000) of us was not born in the UK. If you allow the population to increase a further 150,000 there will have been a 25% increase since the year 2000. This increase cannot be described as sustainable. We already import 40% of our food, which means we cannot feed 40% of the people of this country. We are also being threatened with power shortages, so building more homes is totally irresponsible. WHO WILL BUY THE HOMES? It seems anyone from anywhere could buy these homes? It could be companies, buy to let, foreign investors? Is there no restriction? The homes will not necessarily be for locals. LANDSCAPE In para 5.59 the report says: "The landscape and	The proposals respond to the problem of a potential population increase of 150,000 by suggesting that the only solution is to build, build and build, without any consideration as to alternatives. And of course the most sensible alternative is to stabilise Birmingham's population. We have to start talking about overpopulation. Just building everywhere is the easy way out (but in the end not a way out) of a serious problem. The proposed plans are not suitable on economic, environmental or social grounds and should never have been put before us. Our responses should be to central government as they are responsible for what is happening. This problem is nationwide not just in Birmingham. I feel sorry for Birmingham Council being put in the middle here.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp66	The Green Belt around Birmingham are the lungs of the city. The countryside and green spaces around Walmley have been eaten up by development now for the past 40 years. The current infrastructure is already crammed to capacity. School places are at a premium. The roads towards Walmley Village heading to and from Birmingham creak almost 7 days a week with volumes of traffic. The route via Webster Way towards Minworth which borders the proposed plan has queues of traffic every morning from Walmley Ash Road heading back towards Fox Holllis Road. There is no local rail service to take cars off the roads and there is no political will to improve public transport. The land to the West of the A38 should be preserved for all to enjoy. There are rakes of land banks around Birmingham that would be better suited for economic regeneration. Areas around Saltey, Washwood Heath, Kings Norton, Small Heath that lie dormant. The housing provision proposed will not be affordable to local people. The potential jobs created at Peddimore will rely on folks using their cars to commute to work. Plus the additional pressure on Green Belt towards Tamworth, Kingsbury as the land between this site, the M6 Toll and the	Change the plan. Instead provide the existing community of Walmley with rail access to Birmingham, Walsall, Tamworth, Wolverhampton. This would reduce car jounerys. The area needs another primary school. Walmley and The Deanery are already creaking. Move economic regeneration to the parts of Birmingham that need jobs to be created. There are miles of empty land next to the M6 from Castle Vale, Castle Bromwich, Washwood Heath (old LDV Factory). There is no room for any more houses in the 'green belt' and the infrastructure around Walmley can not cope with more people, more cars on the roads.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp67	If Birmingham City Council believe they require 80,000 why does the plan only show the need for 51,000 homes.Surely the plan is not complete. Why are the Brownfield areas, currently not being used,not part of the land identified for the new housing.My concerns are that once the developers planning applications are approved the AFFORDABLE housing will simply not exist for the many people of Birmingham identified as requiring houses. Low cost social housing must be a priority for people on the minimum and low wages. I do not believe the proposals for building on the green belt would cover this need. I believe the figure of 80,000 new homes being required is exaggerated and upto statistics should be used to determine the current housing needs. Are any statistics available to show how many of the older generation currently occupy much larger homes than they require and who wish to downsize. Therefore making existing larger homes available for families. I do not see any commitment in the plan to provide any of the infrastructure needed. A statement which includes"2 new primary. a new secondary school, health care facilities and local shops and services " is not detailed enough to prove that	My opinions as to any changes are in my comments above.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp71	Whilst I understand that development of some sort must take place in order to provide housing, I have great concerns about the way this plan has been developed and the consequences for the residents of Sutton Coldfield if it is approved in its current form. My specific areas of concern are as follows: OBJECTION NO. 1: Protection of The Greenbelt: (NPPF Page 19 Protecting Green Belt Land) “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open”. “Once escalated, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances” BCC have no justification for this attack on the Green Belt as: 1. Population growth figures quoted in the proposal are very sketchy and do not bear scrutiny as they based on an out of date model and therefore cannot be relied upon to form the basis of an ‘objectively assessed requirement’. 2. BCC have failed to determine whether housing requirements can be successfully accommodated on either brownfield sites within Birmingham or on sites belonging to neighbouring authorities. The Duty to Cooperate is a key requirement of the	1. BCC should rework population growth figures using current models to determine the housing requirement up to 2031. 2. Identify and develop all non-greenbelt opportunities first. i.e. Brownfield sites, empty housing stock, planning applications currently being processed. 3. Complete work with neighbouring authorities to identify opportunities for development and complete building work prior to building on the greenbelt. In particular, The Black Country is known to be desperate for regeneration of significant areas of non-greenbelt land.	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp72	OBJECTION NO. 2: Removal of Agricultural Land From The Rural Economy: “United Nations General Assembly defined sustainable development as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. One of the three dimensions of sustainable development is economic: Birmingham City Council’s proposal is not sutainable as it removes productive farmland from the economy. This land produces crops for some of the major cereal suppliers in the UK meaning that the proposal directly affects the amount of food the UK can produce and consequently has an impact on our economy if food has to be imported. Thus the proposal directly compromises ‘the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ in terms of food production and is also unsustainable on economic grounds. The Council have repeatedly discounted this objection on the basis that the farmland is Grade 3, however, as farmland is graded from 1 to 5, this means that this land is average rather than poor quality and, therefore, should be retained as working farmland. This proposal also contradicts Core Planning Principles within the NPPF (Page 5,	Farmland should be removed from the development plan as it directly affects sustainability in terms of both food production and the effects on the economy. Instead, the Council should complete work with neighbouring authorities in order to identify non-greenbelt sites.	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp73	OBJECTION No. 3: Consultation Process One of the central themes of the NPPF, particularly in Core Planning Principles (Page 5 NPPF paragraph 17) is that the planning process should be a “collective enterprise”, “empowering local people to shape their surroundings” ..... “Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential”. The way in which the Birmingham City Council proposal has been communicated has effectively excluded and disenfranchised the residents of Sutton Coldfield. Most people in Sutton have no idea that this proposal has been made or that a consultation process has begun. This is as true in those areas immediately affected as in other parts of Sutton. The Council’s communication programme has been completely inadequate and ineffective; little or no effort has been made to create awareness of this scheme to either residents, businesses or significant organisations within the area and, hence, this represents a complete failure of the communication and consultation process which is one of the underlying principles of the NPPF.	It is a bit too late in the process to now consult people as the plan has already developed without the participation of local people. If nothing else, Birmingham City Council should undertake an extensive communications exercise to inform residents so that they may comment during the consultation period.	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp74			OBJECTION NO. 4: Damage To The Historic Environment The NPPF, Conserving & Enhancing The Historical Environment (Page 30 paragraph 126, 129, 132 and 133) states "Local planning authorities should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.. .... in doing so they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance" ...."Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting ..... substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional". "Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent" BCCs proposals directly affect the visual amenity and the contribution made by the setting of both Old Langley Hall (Grade II listed building) and Peddimore Hall in contradiction to the NPPF. The plans clearly diminish the value of both of these historic sites by development all around them. The case for damaging these historical assets cannot be	The Council must demonstrate that it has explored every alternative option before developing on land surrounding these historic buildings/settings as, once lost, they cannot be replaced.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp78	Mr Keith Pringle	Management Consultant Jakema Programme Management Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp84			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp92			if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country	as above		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp100	Mr Steve Blue	Operations Manager Mereway Kitchens Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp102			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp104			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp105			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp112			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp113			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp116			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp119			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp120			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp122			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp123			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp124			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp134	MR ALAN CLAWLEY	Birmingham Green Party	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp172	Mrs Marie Pringle	Sales Controller McCurrach UK Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp178			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp180			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp182			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp183			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp185	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp192	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp197				Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp198	I totally object to this planning extension and building on our local green belt land for the following reasons: 1. Transport - the roads around this site that border Walmley are already heavily congested and Walmley Village centre is a regular bottleneck. There is not sufficient, reliable, transport to Birmingham city centre and adding a station at Walmley without sufficient parking in an already congested area will worsen congestion in the area. New Street Station is already too congested due to limited platforms and the proposal to use Moor Street, across the city from the main business area of Birmingham city centre is not sufficient or helpful. The routes into Birmingham are already so congested that they are becoming dangerous and the A38M is a car park at rush hour - you are intending to make this considerably worse. Suggesting bus lanes is not helpful when the roads are already congested. It is much too far to cycle or walk into the city centre. 2. Overcrowding - Walmley is already too crowded. You are already considering an application to have a YMCA and further housing on the border of this development, taking away further green areas and putting in crowded and small homes in an area already overburdened	This plan should not go ahead. Birmingham City Council should reconsider other options and not go for this easy option of just grabbing a piece of land and imposing a new town on it.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp199	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp203	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp205	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp210	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp213	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp215	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp216	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp220	I have real concerns that no one in the council has taken seriosly the amount of traffic congestion and pollution that a potential addition of 12000 cars travelling in and around the walmley area will create should the plan for 6000 residential properties and retail park be approved. We alreaday have massive congestion taking place at peak times in and around Walmley Village, Webster way and the Kigsbury Road from the Asda rounabout heading towards Birmigham. We also already have congestion taking place on exit into and exiting the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre on weekdays and week ends. The plan as i see it will mean that business productivity will be reduced because of people being late for work through no fault of their own (traffic congestion) . I know that development contractors and Birmingham City Council will tell us that additional transport links proposed will will assist in moving the traffic effectively but similar plans introduced in the past have failed miserably. The reliance on the A38 to move traffic is in my mimd irresponsible beacuse it wont cope with the additional demand. The new rail link proposed will not happen due to lack of funds.	Abandon the plan to build on green field sites until all Brownfields sites have been developed. Discuss with neighboring authorities the possibilties of them helping by developing the additional homes planned for Birmingham. The chances are that Black Country authorities would welcome the idea of additional housing development in their areas along with the inward investment into the local economy this would bring.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp222	This plan as it stands is based on out dated information and will infringe on what little Green Belt Land there is left in our City. The Green Belt is a great asset in it's own way as it is a natural corridor enabling wild life to move from one area to another. Putting the Green Belt under concrete will also increase the danger of flooding as nature's natural drainage system will be removed.	Whilst I can see that there may well be the need for new build housing in the future I cannot see the urgency at present. The need may well arise once all Brown Field Sites and vacant housing have been fully utilized. Before any extra building is undertaken the infer-structure needs to be brought up to date to cope with the extra traffic and population. At present the road and transport system is at breaking point as are the schools, health care and numerous other local services. The developer seems to be responsible for providing much of the above, this I believe will not happen as the developer will come to the conclusion that it is neither sustainable or deliverable by having to firstly put in the services.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp224	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp226	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp227	The plan does not show that every possible brownfield area has been identified and considered for development. It appears that the greenbelt has been chosen without considering the long term impact. It may bring the builders some revenue but in the long term it is not a sustainable development. We have not been provided with sufficient information to explain why building on brownfield land has not been fully considered. There are numerous areas which you know need regenerating i.e the black country. Why have you not drafted proposals for alternative areas instead of going for what you see as an easy option....building a new town in an already congested one!!! Statistics show there is a large amount of empty properties which need to be utilised. Why are they being ignored? Walmley is congested with traffic jams as it is. With more houses bringing more people and transport this will congest the area even further. The air pollution will increase and the infrastructure will not cope with the influx. We are entitled to some open space as there are enough properties and traffic as it is. The area will become overcrowded. Just because there is greenbelt land it does not mean you have to build on it.	As above consider ALL brownfield sites and areas in need of regenerating.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp231	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp234	The successive developments off Webster Way have already contributed heavily to the congestion which backs up from the Minworth A38 roundabout, (on the Sutton by-pass as well as Asda/Webster Way); the addition of 6000 new homes (say 10,000 additional cars) - over whatever timescale, will do nothing to ease the problem. Where will these new residents work? How will they get there? More buses would increase congestion. Trains? The nearest station at present is Chester Road. How will they get there? (car) Where will they park? Where is the plan? The proposal removes a large tract of open countryside which I - and many others - enjoy. The offer to designate the New Hall Valley Country Park as Green Belt is merely giving us something which we already have.	Don't build there. It is Green Belt and should only be utilised in exceptional circumstances. I appreciate that more houses are needed in this country, but why use Green Belt, which current lacks essential services - as well as transport facilities, when development sites are available in the inner reaches of the City, which already have gas, electricity, water - as well as good public transport. They are also more likely to be within reach of the first time buyer.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp237	Plan relies on development in the green belt in circumstances which are not exceptional, this makes the plan unsound: • The need has been assessed to accommodate a particular level of development. The proposals involve use of land designated green belt because the urban area cannot accommodate all of this and there are no other alternatives within the City boundary. Opting for use of the green belt is the easy option requiring no thought. The fact that there is a shortage of development land in the urban area is not an exceptional circumstance, it is inevitable that development land will grow short and now that it has that fact will pertain into the future and cannot be defined as exceptional. Either now or later a different solution to providing for housing need must be found. Solutions to accommodate housing beyond the City boundary are still under discussion with other authorities, as is the LEP development strategy for commercial development. Birmingham's plan is therefore premature. The green belt land in question is of high landscape and amenity value and has tremendous value in its own right for the community, now and for future generations, as comments made in response to each	• Avoid green belt development altogether and adopt a different strategy across the region which focuses development on a new approach for growth on brownfield land across the whole West Midlands conurbation, including the Black Country, where it would be encouraged, or in properly planned settlements beyond the green belt. Both options would be more sustainable than the current Plan. Shortage of development land is an issue all over the world, not just in Birmingham, and other design solutions are being explored to address it worldwide, creating higher density development in urban areas in attractive new ways. • If the Inspector considers that the present plan is sound then adopting a phased approach to development over the plan period with greenfield/green belt land not developed until most of the brownfield land/ development in urban areas has been delivered is essential. Phasing is vital for related infrastructure – transport improvements including railway connections, health service provision, schools etc as any development takes place.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp240	Building on green belt should only be done under exceptional circumstances. I do not believe all other areas have been exhausted. 12,000 empty houses in Birmingham and 14,000-17,000 waiting to be built on brownfield sites. This seems an easy option for the developers and Birmingham City Council bothof which should be more imaginitive before stealing our green belt land. Schools,healthcare facilities,local shops & services are mentioned vaguely. Where is the funding coming from and at what stage will they be delivered 0-10years is not good enough. Are the developers going to wait until all the houses are built first. This does not sound effective nor deliverable. We need much more information. A rail station in Walmley again where is the investment and funding coming from-not deliverable. Also a new junction with the A38 but this will in no way help with road capacity.	12,000 empty houses and all brownfield sites should be used and developed first until then abandon the plan. Take a look at the Black Country where regeneration is needed. Regarding a new junction with the A38-need to look in addition at A5 M4 M6 and A47.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp247	I strongly object to this proposal. I do not agree with the classification of it as sustainable when it is devastating green belt land. It is not sustainable in this area to remove the last bits of green belt. This will adversely impact local wildlife, may cause drainage issues (as already suspected in the proposal) in the wider areas. The loss of local green spaces has also been proven to adversely affect the health and well being of residents of the surrounding area. The proposal to add a new junction to the A38 is simply not a workable solution to provide commuter links to the city. There simply are not enough jobs within the local area to support new residents, so inevitably new residents will have to commute to the city centre/ black country / Coventry areas. These commuter routes are already struggling to cope evidenced by daily traffic congestion. Simply adding more opportunity to join the A38 will not provide greater capacity for commuting. There is not the capacity within the local facilities - schools, GP's, at Good Hope Hospital, all of which are already struggling to cope. Neither are there sufficient employment opportunities, evidenced by my own personal experience as a resident of Sutton Coldfield professionally	Housing opportunities should be identified nearer to the City Centre on brownfield sites to improve the sustainability of the plans, lower commutes improve sustainability by reduces carbon output and Birmingham City Council should be going out of its way to preserve green belt land to have any hope of being sustainable.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp255	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp257	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp258	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp260	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp261	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp262	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp267	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp268	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp272				Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp273	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp274	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp277	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp279	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp281	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp282	I totally object as do so many others and my family you have not told us which sites you have looked at and you have not told us why they are not suitable. Green belt should remain green . Quote "England's green and pleasant land" not England's built on open space because its easier.	There are plenty of empty houses if the council is that intent on filling 6000+ homes they should compulsory purchase those and use them.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp284	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp285	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp286	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp287	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp288	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp290	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp292	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp293	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp296	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp297	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp299	GA5 INSUFFICIENT INVESTIGATION INTO EXISTING RESORSES.	GA5 1/ NO GREEN BELT TO BE CONSIDERED UNTIL ALL EMPTY PROPERTIES USED. 2/ NONE GREEN BELT AREA ALREADY PURCHASED BY BUILDERS IS USED. 3/ A MAP OF BROWN FILL AREAS BE PRODUCED. ALL THESE AREAS TO BE USED FIRST	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp302	B1 TP10 GA5 Green Belt Building on green belt will change the environment in walmley village and surrounding area. Walmley will lose its village effect, due to the expansion on green belt. Sutton Coldfield has only 15% green belt left and should only be built on as a last resort not first. B3 Green belt The plan has not explained in full reasons for building on green belt. I understand only 61% has been submitted and figures have been taken from 2007. I have knowledge that there are 17,000 houses will full or are outlined for planning + 12,000 houses are empty so why has the green belt been chosen as the first option when this amount of housing stock is available and once you have started development on green belt it's lost forever. B2. TP35 GA5 Education The plan for education is not realistic. No time is given to when schools will be built, just 0-10years. BCC has indicated they have no money for this project so developers will need support for this and they will not be putting any extra fund until they have a return on their investment. No exact timescale given. Not enough information has been given to indicate there is sufficient money to carry out the building of schools in this development also within walking distance		No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp309	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp310	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp314	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp315	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp317			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp321			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp327			Green Belts were established to stop towns encroaching on areas judged essential for the physical and psychological health of urban residents. Birmingham has very little green belt land remaining and these areas should be protected for future city residents for as long as possible and only destroyed in exceptional circumstances. It has not been proved to my satisfaction that this encroachment is justified at present.	The council's energies should concentrate on getting finished the 17,000 homes which are already planned and the thousands of empty homes in the city should be3 prioritised for occupation. Can the council explain why Green Belt land is preferred to these existing provisions?	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp338			1.Health services are already stretched and oversubscribed. 2. Transport - infrastructure will need addressing - Walmley already has a mile long traffic queue going into Walmley in peak hours. The A 38 entry / exit will increase traffic in the area not decrease it 3. Green belt - why is green belt being eroded when there are urban sites available across the city 4. Flooding already occurs in this area- building and disturbing the land will make it worse 5. Education - no time scales for increase in availability of schools in this area 6. Employment - - we have no idea of the economic growth in north birmingham is this build providing housing for this growth 7. Where is the evidence that BCC have worked with the feed back from the local community	1. Funding for local hospital and new general practices will need to be in place 2. Roads public transport need to be in place prior to any building - reduction in pollution and traffic congestion should be the aim not worsening of these two areas. 3. Justification of Green belt use 4. Plans for flood defence 5. Plans for schools need to be in place before build 6. A strategy for economic growth needs to be in place to highlight which areas are in need of development across the city before any building occurs	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp345	Mr Francis Mason	Walmley Residents Association	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp347			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp348			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp349			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp354			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp358	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp360	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp363	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp365	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp368	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp371	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp373	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp376	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp377	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp378	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp380	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp383	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp386	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp388	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp391	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp395	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp397	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp400	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp401	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp411	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp415	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp417	B1 - Building on the green belt: TP10, GA5, TP6, GA6 B2 - Birmingham has a relatively small area of greenbelt (15%). The importance of our green belt must not be underestimated. Expanding the 'concrete jungle' will exacerbate local flooding, (already in evidence on Springfield Rd and Webster Way. Building on the green belt is obviously a more profitable option for developers, but shouldn't our Council put the needs of the local community first? Ed Balls said in an interview with Andrew Marr (on 1st Dec 2013;) ...every community needs to contribute more housing, "Labour want to protect valuable green belt land, so we can build on brown field sites first so as not to disrupt communities."There is no requirement locally, to build another development in Walmley. A small development is just being completed on Springfield Rd, and the site of the disused Langley School on Lindridge Rd has been abandoned and derelict for years.... waiting to be developed!	We are told that there are some 17,000 properties with either full or outline planning and 12000 empty homes in Birmingham. There are also brownfield sites nearer to the city centre, where potential residents are more likely to find employment. These areas should be utilised first.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp418	B1 - Health: TP36, GA5, GA6 B2 - Planners at the meeting held in Walmley stated that Heart of England Health Trust had been approached and considered that 6000 homes in Sutton Coldfield would not cause problems. These seems totally implausible when our local Doctors' Surgeries are full and no definite provision for more health centres is mentioned in the Plan. I doubt that the Council can afford to extend Good Hope Hospital? The Sutton Observer (17th January 2014) stated on that a report made public on 14th January, that the CQC had found serious issues with Good Hope's A & E, acute wards, maternity, child care and dementia provision. As locals, we know that Good Hope is being pushed to the limit. (The Hospital Trust is threatening to close some services at Good Hope and move to Heartlands!)The Development Plan suggests that much of the housing will be for families, yet there are nothing like enough health care facilities to sustain thousands more people.	Health Care provision should be increase with the extension of or building a new hospital for the north of Birmingham BEFORE a 'new town' is built next to Walmley	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp419	B1. Connectivity. TP37. GA5. GA6 B2. Planning says: 'Development of a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, where most sustainable mode choices also offer the most convenient means of transport', but fails to say how? Currently, roads from Sutton through Walmley to Birmingham are severely congested, as is the A38 at peak times. An extra 12,000 cars will bring the roads to permanent gridlock. An entry/exit Rd onto the A38 will allow more traffic to crawl onto it, but just increase the volume when on it! The Planner's suggestion of a "sprint bus" from Sutton to B'ham is laughable, unless it has wings! Developing the railway line through Walmley would be an asset, but Councillor's inform us that this would not happen for at least 30 years due to lack of funding!	B3. A more sustainable approach is needed. The Sutton rail line through Walmley should be developed before building a new town next to Walmley, Build a development closer to the city centre; less commuting for people going to work and less of a carbon footprint. Let's reduce the congestion and pollution, rather than increase it!	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp421	B1. Education. TP35. GA5 B2. Not stated when these schools will be built, says 10+ years! Family homes with young children will need Nursery, Pre School and Primary places.	B3. Since BCC has no funding for new schools, there should be written guarantees from the developer that schools will be built within the first 2 years of starting the development.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp422	B1. The Consultation Process. GA5. GA6 B2. I live directly next to the land which you plan to develop, yet found out about it quite by accident! I went to the first meeting in Walmley (January 2014) which was attended by local councillors and two people from the Planning Dept. They told us that they had consulted local businesses, schools and health care providers. *I have good contacts within the local schools, none of whom new anything about this. * My GP Surgery new nothing of the plans. * Walmley Residents Association had not been contacted. * The Church in Walmley new nothing. * I refuse to believe that Good Hope had been contacted and made the statement that the Planners commented on, (It's common knowledge that Good Hope is being monitored by the CQC) * Local Councillors are all against the proposal. * There had been no notices posted locally I feel totally deceived and am disgusted that BCC think that they can treat their voters in such a way! You are spending money left, right and centre on vanity projects, unnecessary wheelie bins, compensation to underpaid workers, (& rightly so!) etc, etc. BCC needs money and you are selling your assets; I get it - but you're hurting the very people who	Local councillors should leaflet the community, Planning notices should be displayed in prominent plays. Adverts in the paper before planning goes through to consultation. ALWAYS inform local Resident's Associations. DON'T BUILD IN SUTTON COLDFIELD!	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp424	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp428	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp430	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp436	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp452	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp454	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp455	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp457	Why build on green belt land, when we have brownfield sites still awaiting being built on? Birmingham already has 12000 empty houses.There is insufficient information about schools, healthcare, shops and local services. Where is funding coming from for schools etc?It is not good enough to say schools will be built up to 10 years time, these should be in place from the outset. Where is funding coming from for a rail station on Walmley? Has the Council seriously considered the traffic congestion as a result of this project? We already have congestion In Walmley Village and entering Sutton Town Centre, The reliance on the A38 will not cope with this increased traffic.	Do not build on greenbelt land until other options eg building on brownfield sites and filling current unoccupied properties have been exhausted.Discuss options of housing developments with other local councils who may appreciate housing and investment into their local economy.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp459	GA5 There is little green belt left in Birmingham - only 15%. What is the point in Green Belt if it can be built on anyway? These are not exceptional circumstances and will create urban sprawl.	There are currently many empty homes. - about 12000. There are also 17000 houses with full planning or outline planning. So why is this not being used before destroying Green belt? It is not justified.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp472	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp474	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp477	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp478	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp485	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp488	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp491	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp500	The roads aroung this area are over run with traffic and more development and the removal of green land will reduce the well being of the current Birmingham residents. The local Hosital is over run and run down this development will not help	This land can not be build on	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp502	GA5, GA6 The “local planning authority should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see” Source NPPF Paragraph 69. How was this achieved? My experience is that there was no 'sharing' with this community! There were no notices or meetings arranged locally to inform us of plans or to 'share the vision' of what will completely change our community. Any facilities mentioned in the plan appear to be 'blue sky thinking' as there is no definite time plan for them being put in place. * I would also like it noted that I found the legal terminology in the Plan and the process in which we have to respond to the plan extremely difficult to use. I know for a fact that it has put off many, mainly older people from entering their objections. Was this a cynical ploy to reduce the level of objections?	There needs to be clear evidence in the Plan on what feedback the community gave on the residential environment and on the facilities that they think should be included in the planning. Also some indication of who was approached. The plan should be more user friendly so that EVERYONE can understand the Plan and can access and respond to it more easily.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp503	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp505	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp506	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp508	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp515	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp522	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp523	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp526	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp530	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp531	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp532	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp537	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp540	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp544	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp547	We remain implacably opposed to these proposals to destroy yet more green Belt and agricultural land. In point 2.14 you refer to the city centre being surrounded by : "many pleasant and desirable leafy suburbs each with its own character and identity" and yet this proposal will irrevocably damage the environment and the quality of the lives of those people who have the misfortune to live near to it. You appear to hold Castle Vale up as an example of what can be achieved in terms of this type of housing planning.. God forbid that you re create that else where! We're also very distrustful of your proposed numbers. Initially it was 10,000 new homes which had to be built then that was halved to 5,000 and now we read that it's nearly 6,000. However what we find incredibly alarming is the comment contained in point 5.63 above where you quite clearly indicate that there will be further housing development beyond 2031. You have every intention of gobbling up yet more green belt land until Sutton Coldfield becomes one vast sprawling urban conurbation. The pleasant leafy suburb with its own character and identity gone forever. What short sightedness! You have a duty of care to future generations to ensure	As you travel around the Sutton Coldfield /Birmingham area there are many pieces of land lying derelict. This is where you should be looking to build your : 10,000/6,000/5,000 homes. I offer one example of the old site of Langley school on Lyndridge Road but interestingly you appear to be selling that to a private developer. I'm sure your planning department have a long list of such sites which could be used without the major impact that this proposed Langley development will have.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp557	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp568	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp571	The green belt was left to us and in our trust by previous forward thinking politicians, what right have do you to take this away from us? Further issues regarding the infrastructure of the Sutton Coldfield area need to be seriously considered. Just try to park a car at Good Hope hospital, try to park any where near Four Oaks Station, try driving from Heath Croft Rd to the Four Oaks public house at 5pm, try getting your child into a local school. Say what you will in you well worded documents, but try living here! These plans can only make life here worse.	Build on Brown field sites, of which there are many lying derelict around the city.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp579	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp581	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp589	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp595	The plan argues that the finite size of the city is an exceptional circumstance that justifies building on the green belt. No evidence is provided to substantiate the claim that circumstances are exceptional. The finite size of the city is not exceptional, it was predictable and predicted, which is why green belts were established in the first place. To amend the boundary of the green belt undermines the reason that green belts were created in the first place. It is only by accident of history that the land in question lies within the city boundary. If the boundary followed the western edge of the green belt, then the land in question would be outside the city. It is very unlikely that in those circumstances building in this location would be proposed. If this land was outside the city, then an alternative proposal would have to be made. The fact that no such alternative has been considered demonstrates that the city council has not properly considered alternative options, meaning that the plan is unsound.	The plan should identify what alternative options would be considered if the green belt land was outside the city boundary.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp611	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp613	Mr. R.W. Lees	Sherifoot Lane, Hill Village Road Residents Association	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp616			Walmley does not need further housing development. The village has been over-developed significantly without the necessary supporting infrastructure been developed. Furthermore, the original plans have been significantly deviated from and not in any way adhered to; to the point that the original planning application is invalid. The road between Signal Hayes and Weaver Avenue has been closed for over 10 years; to open it up would result in a high volume of traffic with it being used as a shortcut which would increase the likelihood of road traffic and pedestrian accidents.		No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp618			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp623			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp625			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp629			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp636			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp644			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp647			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp651			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp656			In my earler comments on QI questioned the population growth which is liklely to be over-estimated and the availability of brownfield sites and unused properties that are both likely to be under-estimated. With this in mind encroaching the green belt is probably not necessary	No encroachment on the green belt will take place before the full utilisation of brownfield sites and unused properties to accommodate population growth	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp667	Despite a slight reduction in the number of overall dwellings being proposed – which is welcomed - I remain totally unconvinced with the arguments being put forward by the Council to support plans for the devastation of local green belt within the Langley (Walmley) development zone. I have been a resident here for 22 years and over that time the pressure on the infrastructure - particularly the roads, schools, medical and dental facilities - has become increasingly worse. This situation became worse with the new homes which were built on the site of the old barracks and this latest proposal is likely to completely tip things over the edge. Thankfully our children are no longer at state schools in the area however, when they were we were not able to get them into the schools we originally wanted as a result of the influx of new families into the area. This pressure will increase with the latest plans, forcing people to drive their children even further afield to gain admission to school. Doesn't this defeat the Governments plans to get more people to stop using cars and walk to work/school or use public transport? The roads have become steadily more congested and continue to remain in a poor state of repair and	There remains many un-used sites elsewhere - Birmingham, Walsall, Wolverhampton to name a few - which currently have derelict factories etc which could be used to accommodate some of this development and bring major benefits to the local population by way of affordable properties and employment opportunities. In addition, these areas are already supported by adequate transport services and excellent shopping facilities, schools, hospitals and doctors etc.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp681	GA5 GA6 Infrastructure: the roads in and around Walmley are permanently congested and the addition of 6000 properties, schools etc cannot be sustained. Adding access to the A38 will simply allow more cars to the congestion. A Sprint bus is not feasible unless all major roads are widened, again causing more congestion and increasing the carbon footprint in the area. The addition of an extra 12,000 cars (2 per household) wiill further pollute the air quality around the development site which may create a health implication to the young families who will be living there.	Less houses - to be built further away from existing houses in Walmley. There should be a limit to the number of houses built in any one area to lower the threat of pollution and congestion.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp682	GA5. Healthcare We have been led to believe that because Good Hope Hospital did not respond to the initial email from Planners, therefore they were perceived to have no issues with the addition of approx' 24 thousand more people in the area. I am certain that Heart of England Health Trust and Good Hope Hospital, (currently being monitored by the CQC because of problems there) would not be able to cope with this influx. Local GP surgeries are full to bursting and it is almost impossible to get an appointment to see a GP. More people now visit A&E at Good Hope Hospital because of this, and they are not fulfilling their required targets because of this vicious cirlcle!	Consent by default is not acceptable! We will need a new hospital in N Birmingham, and a full audit of health provision in the area needs to be done. Followed by the addition of new GP surgeries to fulfil the needs of local people.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp683	GA5 Langley Urban Extension / Green Belt Building on the green belt should only be done in exceptional circumstances. This land is protected for future generations. National Framework Policy states that the Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The inward immigration figures used by BCC for their Birmingham Plan 2031 uses inward immigration figures from 2004. These numbers are known to have been overestimated by some 10,000, therefore, building on brownfield sites closer to the city and utilising existing vacant properties will create more that the desired number of houses to be built. No need to sacrifice precious green belt.	* Put a hold on both Langley and Peddimore construction, for at least 10 years (still within the 2031 Plan) and see what needs to be done then. * There are 12,000 empty homes in B'ham and around 14,000 sites already granted planning permission yet undeveloped. These areas should be developed first. * BCC should look at a wider area of the conurbation where there is a need to regenerate areas for new housing. * REGENERATION IS MORE SUSTAINABLE AND ECO FRIENDLY THAN DIMINISHING THE GREEN BELT!	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp684	GA5. Education The plan for 6000 family homes, given that the 'average family has 2.4 children, will create a need for an extra 14,000 places! The idea that 2 Primary and 1 Secondary school will suffice is not feasible. There is also no guarantee as to when these schools will be built or by whom.	The developers, or whoever is to build the schools must give assurance in writing, that the schools will be built at the same time as the houses. There are insufficient school places locally to to accept that many more children.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp692	I strongly oppose any building on this valuable green belt asset. The remaining small areas of green belt in Sutton Coldfield should be maintained for the benefit of future generations. Sutton Coldfield is big enough as it is without this proposed enormous development, the local community do NOT want it. The general feeling is that this is yet another example of BIG BROTHER BIRMINGHAM asset stripping Sutton Coldfield ignoring the wishes of the local community.	The current proposals should be scrapped and the green belt maintained. Birmingham growth plans should centre on redevelopment ofthe existing built environment.with an awareness that outward development is no longer an option. All availlble space is already accounted for! Green areas are too valuable too lose. If further growth is deemed essential the consideration of satellite new villages could be developed by enlarging existing settlements outside the City boundaries while maintaining wide green spaces between.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp693	I would like to have my objections to the development on the green belt in Sutton Coldfield put on record. There are 3 key areas for my objection and they are transportation, immigration and lack of consultation with local interested parties. I believe that any development plan should have a sound and coherent transportation strategy, and with regards to the development of the green belt it does not. It has been based on aspiration and not hard facts. Take the opening of the line which would serve Walmley and other commuter stations, this cannot be decided by Birmingham City Council alone, Network Rail would have to be consulted and there is no guarantee that they would support this move. You can't base your plan on an aspiration it can only be based on what can be delivered. The plans propose a sprinter bus that would run between Sutton and the city centre, which would require Bus lanes down the A38. By opening up bus lanes would cause more congestion on the A38 and surrounding roads. This would cause more problems than it would solve, you don't go a day without hearing on the radio about congestion at Minworth Island, Tyburn House, and the Baggott Arms. Has the	Although I object to building on the green belt, I do believe that we do need more homes. In Birmingham we have 12,000 empty houses and 14,000 sites with planning permission . These areas should be considered to be developed first. We have come a long way from the days of the tower blocks of the 60's, which no one wanted to live in. We are now more inventive with housing design which would give people houses they want to live in.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp695	I would like to have my objections to the development on the green belt in Sutton Coldfield put on record. There are 3 key areas for my objection and they are transportation, immigration and lack of consultation with local interested parties. I believe that any development plan should have a sound and coherent transportation strategy, and with regards to the development of the green belt it does not. It has been based on aspiration and not hard facts. Take the opening of the line which would serve Walmley and other commuter stations, this cannot be decided by Birmingham City Council alone, Network Rail would have to be consulted and there is no guarantee that they would support this move. You can't base your plan on an aspiration it can only be based on what can be delivered. The plans propose a sprinter bus that would run between Sutton and the city centre, which would require Bus lanes down the A38. By opening up bus lanes would cause more congestion on the A38 and surrounding roads. This would cause more problems than it would solve, you don't go a day without hearing on the radio about congestion at Minworth Island, Tyburn House, and the Baggott Arms. Has the	Although I object to building on the green belt, I do believe that we do need more homes. In Birmingham we have 12,000 empty houses and 14,000 sites with planning permission . These areas should be considered to be developed first. We have come a long way from the days of the tower blocks of the 60's, which no one wanted to live in. We are now more inventive with housing design which would give people houses they want to live in.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp704	I support the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension. It is important to plan for new housing, and this is a much better site than the site north of the Tamworth Road. It will deliver a new secondary school which is needed, and the new junction on the A38 bypass will reduce traffic congestion on existing local roads, particular the Asda roundabout. Development north of the Tamworth Road should not be allowed because the green belt there is much more valuable, including far more public footpaths. To make the best use of the land the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension should be an exemplary high density development along the lines of Dickens Heath (Solihull) and Bussy St Georges (France).	Increase the number of homes on the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp707	These plans will seriously risk destroying the balance of homes/amenities/green space in Walmley, currently a pleasant place to live, despite stretched local educational & health amenities & transport bottlenecks; surely not a legacy in keeping with the many positive improvements to Birmingham over the past 3 decades. Instead this element of the Birmingham Plan represents irresponsible vandalism on a large scale. Green belt represents a line in the sand which should be sacrosanct, functioning to protect the environment against irrevocable spread of urban sprawl. Open land has many benefits which would be foolish to discard; wildlife, health & wellbeing, quality of life. In particular, given our current climate trends, it would be irresponsible to destroy farm land and replace it with concrete, tarmac & pavement with it's associated reduction in water drainage. How can this effect be accurately risk assessed at this time?	Green belt should be preserved. It is not optional. Walmley has sufficient homes. Large scale developments should be focussed well within the urban area, not at the peripheries, to better be absorbed within existing amenities & transport structures.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp709	I do not see how you can call this development sustainable when non of the infrastucture is in place or will be in place before building such homes. The current roads around Ada island Minworth, A38 into the city, roads into Sutton are already crowded. Most of the roads are narrow and cannot be expanded, where will the extra 10,000 cars go ? How will Good Hope Hospital cope with the influx of extra people , there appears to be no full consultation with the medical services. Unless schools, hospitals, road widening, new doctors, dentists, shops are built first then the new influx of people will need to use existing stock of these facilities and they just will not cope. The green belt should only be built on in exceptional circumstances, I do not believe Birminghams circumstances are exceptional, what makes them exceptional, they are the same as every other City. Birmingham seems to be taking the easy option of destroying something that has been put there for a reason, to stop the sprawl of big cities into the countryside. Landowners are obviously supporting this as they will make alot of money, I do not think this point should be used by BCC in their arguments.	Remove any changes to the green belt from the plans, be more creative in your thinking and look to regenerate stagnant industrial sites and other such eyesores.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp736	Six thousand new homes means around 25000 more people and around 10000 more cars in an already congested area. The existing infrastructure struggles to cope with the traffic. Any 'improvements' to the roads in Walmley will not be concurrent with the development but will be way after the house building stage. It is difficult to imagine exactly what can be done regarding roads. Public transport improvements by providing bus lanes will not help since the roads are narrow and scope for widening them non existent. More people in Walmley will mean misery for the existing population and newcomers alike. A new junction on the A38 bypass will also have a slowing effect on existing traffic flows which are already near capacity at peak times.	Build where there is scope for new roads before housing is developed. Make sure there is a well thought out plan to cope with additional traffic	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp739	Whilst recognizing the need for additional housing, utilizing Green Belt land should be the last option and not the first as the plan is suggesting. Birmingham has only 15% Green Belt land and building on this land in Walmley will reduce this further and will create an urban sprawl. Green Belt land should be protected for future generations to enjoy. The NPPF states that constructing new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate for the Green Belt and that established Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances'. The Council should not take the easy option of giving in to developers, who will rather deal with a greenfield scenario rather than a brownfield one.	There are numerous brownfield sites within Birmingham, many of which could utilize existing infrastructure, and these sites should be developed as the first priority. There are also 17000 houses with full or outline planning permission and 12000 empty homes. Green Belt land should not be released as an alternative to developing these urban sites. The plan should include a complete audit of all brownfield sites in Birmingham, stating what the possibilities are in terms of housing development.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp742	This is a comment regarding connectivity issues. There is no evidence in the plan that the proposed transport infrastructure is deliverable. The proposed A38 exit/entry will create further congestion and no detail has been given as to how this is to be funded. The roads around Walmley, particularly those in and out of Birmingham are already extremely congested. A proposal to create two bus lanes through Walmley village is ludicrous and whoever suggested this cannot possibly have been to the village. To create bus lanes would necessitate demolishing existing shops - is this appropriate? The plan suggests that the reopening of the Sutton Park trainline is desirable. This will involve massive investment, but no detail of the funding arrangements has been made available. All transport infrastructure proposals must be completed in line with any proposed housing/business development. Any delay will cause further congestion on the roads. The proposed development will probably mean an additional 10000 cars in the Walmley area. Do we really want to increase the risk of further pollution and its effects.	Far more detail is required as to the timing/funding of the proposed transport infrastructure. As it stands the transport provision appears to be unsustainable. Recommendations are as follows: a) detail exact costs and funding arrangements for all transport infrastructure proposals b) plan that all transport projects are completed in line with housing/business development. c) detail contingency plans should the proposed reopening of the Sutton Park trainline prove to be too costly. d) focus on reducing congestion and detail plans to achieve this. e) carry out a study on the impact on pollution of 10000 additional vehicles.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp746	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp747	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp756			No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp758	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp764	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp777	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp784	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp788	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp790	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp794	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp795	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp800	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp803	There is insufficient information about how healthcare will be provided for, just a bland 'supporting facilities will include health care facilities'. There is also a comment that the Council are in the process of understanding what health service provision is required. Surely this should have been undertaken as part of and included in the overall plan. Good Hope hospital is already overstretched and will not be able to support a potential 12000 population increase. No detail has been provided as to how this will be solved.	The exact health care requirement must be identified prior to any development to ensure it meets the needs of any new community. The precise timescale need to be laid out and all costs/funding to be identified	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp809	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp810	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp811	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	We do not accept the contention that a shortage of building land in the urban area constitutes "extraordinary circumstances" (please see our comments on Soundness) so we are opposed to building in this, or any other, part of the Green Belt. We also have objections on the grounds of planning (or lack of it) for infrastructure. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the BDP (2012) cites "capacity assessments of existing services" as an Information Gap, and we see little evidence that meaningful consultations with service providers have been happening since then. The document "Defining the Development" seeks to persuade us that services at an acceptable level will be provided in the SUE but the population figures used are stated to be "at the upper end of the catchment range". What provision will there be for families who move into the SUE in the meantime? What discussions have taken place with the local education authority about school places or with the NHS about medical provision, for instance? The Sutton Town Centre SPD looks forward to a significant increase in retail floor space and some increased office space, so more customers would be welcome, but "Defining the	Short of removing the plans to build in the Green Belt altogether (the ideal), we believe the Plan should require less "wishful thinking" about the provision of infrastructure and more about specific and meaningful consultation and planning in this respect. It should show more regard for the many and very valid concerns of local residents and not show that these are being addressed.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp820	This proposed development is not sustainable when none of the infrastucture has been considered or appears to be going to be put in place to sustain an expansion of the proposed size. The existing roads around the area of Walmley, Minworth, A38 into the city, and Sutton are already over used and have major hold up during various times of the day. Many of the roads are already in a poor state and will deteriate further if 1000's of further vehicles are added to the already congested situation. Hospitals, doctors, dentists will need to be developed for the increase in population and new retail areas will be required. Schools for all ages are already required and should be built at the same time as any development to avoid impacting existing childrens education opportunities. The green belt should only be built on if agreed by a local referendum and when all other options including existing empty houses, brown field sites and land reserved for HS2 has been exhausted. Why is Birmingham different to other cities who appear able to progress sustainable development whilst retaining green belt?	Use all other available options before considerering green belt rather than going for the easy option of starting with green belt. Don't deny future generations the pleasure of green belt by taking the quick fix that cannot be reversed.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp833	6000 new homes on green belt land is not a housing development!! Its a new town!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Utilise the brownfield sites in the city	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp835			The transportation strategy outlined in the Plan is unrealistic, and appears to be based on pipe-dreams rather than solid information and reality. With regards to the proposed sprinter bus to operate between Sutton and the city centre, this could only be effective with the introduction of further bus lanes, the effect of which would be to create further congestion on the already overloaded A38. The addition of a junction from the new development on to the A38 is not a solution to the congestion problem. It would not alleviate the current traffic problems around Sutton Coldfield, which would only be made worse with the addition of 6,000 houses. The suggestion that the railway station in Walmley would be reopened has no basis in fact, and there is no mention about whether Network Rail have been consulted on this. Until such consultation takes place, this cannot be considered to be a serious option.	The question of infrastructure must be more seriously considered in this Plan. The Sutton Coldfield area is already unable to cope with the amount of traffic on the roads, and the addition of another 6,000 houses without a robust infrastructure plan is unthinkable. Full and proper consultation must be made with Network Rail before any claims about reopening the Walmley railway line can be made.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp836			I wish to register my objection to BCC proposal to build 6,000 new homes on green belt land west of A38 as there is no sustainable infrastructure in place or structured plans proposed. The roads within Walmley and routes into Birmingham City are inadequate as they currently stand and do not have the capacity to be widened to accommodate such a massive influx of additional traffic. The National Planning Policy states that Green Belt Land should only be used in EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES and should be preserved for the well-being of our community and the future generations. Additionally, there are no structured plans to facilitate provisions for additional hospital needs, G.Ps, Health Centres and schools to cope with such a growth in population within the area.	BCC should provide a meaningful structured plan to improve the infrastructure which is currently inadequate. The plan does not give any meaningful details of how and at what point the improvements would be made. I believe that BCC should utilise the empty properties within Birmingham and all brown sites and NOT build upon Green Belt Land which should be preserved, especially as Birmingham has a very small area of green belt land remaining. BCC should also consult with neighbouring regions to include The Black Country, an area in need of regeneration.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp841	Cllr David Pears	Birmingham City Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp842			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp844			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp853	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp865	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp869	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp871	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp872	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp873	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp875	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp880	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp881	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp883	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp884	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp885	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp887	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp888	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp889	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp890	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp891	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp900	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp908	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp915	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp928	NO! NO! NO! Do not build on this Green Belt land. It is beautiful open space and forms part of the green lung for the surrounding areas. It is also prime agricultural land. Why is it that people in urban areas are assumed to not mind living in an area that is becoming more built up, yet in rural counties, there are areas designated as having 'outstanding natural beauty' that cannot be built on? We need open spaces more than they do!	Build a New Town outside of the area, and support local people in opposition to building on Green belt land.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp941	The continued erosion of the green belt is seen as a panacea for urban dwelling development. This plan is a soft option and calls into question certain assumptions; 1. With only 15% of green belt remaining according to Central Government figures, this area should be preserved as an environmental buffer. On a very simple level, the greenbelt restricts the size of the built up area. It also absorbs organic nutrients from the city, its trees help reduce winds, and it acts to absorb rain and thereby help prevent flooding. If the area is developed, impermeable structures such as roads and roof space will increase flood risk. In the future, in order to grow our food more sustainably, we will need to use the greenbelt to produce the city's food. This is not something we can do if we have built on it!. 2. Population growth; population projections showing continuing growth, are based on the growth in population that has occurred over the past 10 years. However, in the 40 years before this, Birmingham's population decreased by 40,000 and the growth in population over the past 10 years has only partly replaced this lost population. 3. Housing density; Birmingham's housing density is lower than around 70-100	1. Evaluate existing Brown Field sites and existing vacant office space in an around the current conurbation boundary. 2. Correct population growth assumptions to correlate with actual population figures, cross referenced to the Office of National Statistics values for deaths births, migration and population mobility. 3. Case study comparable European cities with higher housing densities and factor in climate change to find ways of adapting living space to be carbon neutral and limit environmental impact. 4. Consult existing transport providers on their ability to absorb an accurate increase in passenger numbers, and to establish investment plans and criteria. These costs after initial acceptance should be flexed by at least 50% to accommodate "unforeseen" cost overruns. 5. Evaluate the current school population to obtain accurate demographic projections and longevity to provide a base line on which to consult with education providers and to gauge the economic soundness of a short term investment strategy. 6. Evaluate current road building / expansion plans and allow for 50% cost	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp943	I strongly object the the development of this green belt land, Sutton Coldfield cannot cope with the population as it is with services already pushed to the limits.		No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp956	why are you even considering building on green belt land when you have large amounts of undeveloped land (which previously had homes on it) in the Perry Common, Lyndhurst & Pype Hayes to name just a few areas. The whole face of sutton coldfield will change forever & i doubt very much if the infrastructre will cope!!	Build on exsisting brown belt land & take steps to bring back into use the thousands of empty properties which are currently empty!!	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp963	Whilst no-one is questioning the need for more housing within Birmingham and its surrounding areas there needs to be a concentrated effort on utilising all brownfield sites and other disused areas of land within Birmingham before the green belt option is enforced. The impracticalities far outweigh the practicalities of plonking down over 6,000 houses on greenbelt land. You only have to stand on any road or street in Sutton Coldfield on any given time of the day to realise it is choc-a-block with traffic in 2014, let alone adding the possibility of another 12,000 cars to the streets. The influx of more people into Sutton Coldfield all requiring the need to use the facilities of hospitals, GP surgeries and schools.	Utilise all brownfield sites within Birmingham and its surrounding areas before building on green belt land.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp973	Policy GA5 - Langley Sustainable Urban Extension Green Belt is a Government policy for controlling urban growth. The idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts are their openness. Taking away a part will reduce this openness. The supply of land set aside for agriculture, and included in Green Belts, is a limited and decreasing resource. It is the prime mover behind "sustainability" and, although it may not be crucial to our food supply at present, it will so be in the future. In addition to the direct loss of food production and amenities that happens when Green Belt is developed, the environmental threats must be fully evaluated before any change of use decision is made. Particularly relevant at the moment, although the areas under consideration may not be immediately threatened by flooding, any development will lead to increased surface water run-off and foul	1. The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6, should be abandoned. 2.Comprehensive reviews and development of Policies TP10, TP16, TP34, TP35, TP36, and TP37 to be carried out to identify suitable alternative and more appropriate development areas within the City. 3. A comprehensive infrastructure plan developed for Sutton Coldfield and its environs, and Policy GA4 developed to include redevelopment for the whole of the town centre including the railway station and its adjacent car parks, such development to include provision for a public bus, or other appropriate light transport terminus.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1009	The plan is not sound as it does not set out fully the justification for these houses. These house would increase car usage by in the region of 10000 cars, the current infrastructure is not aequate and the A38 , A446 and M42 are allready at full capacity. The proposed sprint bus has not been thought out and will have a detrimental effect on vehicle movements. The poposed rail links are not detailed nad appear to be asperational and not a certainty. The imigration figures used to justify these houses is well out of date and the ltest figures sugest a reduction in the region of 10000 homes from the propsed total required. Ther are also a high number of vacant properties typicaly 12000, also ther are 14000 of approved planning perinsions fro new homes, these need to be the first priority before Green Belt land is considered and Green Belt should only be considered as an option in exceptional circumstances and at present this is not exceptional.	The plan need to include a full transport assesement and set out viable enhancements that would ensure an adequate infrastructure is in place. The rail links needs to fully set out icluding the costings and commitements to commision The abouve infrastructure needs to be in place before hosing is underatken . The use of the latest imigration figures need to be used in the determination of housing requirements. The requirement for existion housing approvals need to be considered in the numbers required and the use of Brown Field sites fully utalised to reduce the burdon on Green Belt land and further enhance the City. Smaller developments around the City and Sutton need to be considered to limit the impact on individual communities and infrastructure The Plan needs to set out whatconsultaion has taken place with neighbouring Authorities setting out how they are accomadating the housing requirements Considertaion of a Metro link from Suttin To Birmingham needsto be considered, the central verge an Eachelhurst road could be used or this.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1023	I lodge an objection to the homes being built on this greenfield site because there are adequate brownfield sites in Birmingham that need to be built on before the greenbelt is even considered being built on. Greenbelt is there to prevent urban sprawl - this development would undoubtedly create urban sprawl. I object to the plans because there are no exact timeframes outlined for when educational provision for the thousands of new people in the area will be created. This will put ridiculous undue pressure on our already overloaded local school, having a detrimental impact on our future generations' education. The plan also doesn't make provision for the "development of a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, where the most sustainable mode choices also offer the most convenient means of travel." as the A338 entry/exit has no funding and the plans will only increase the number of cars on our roads, increasing congestion and pollution. The proposed infrastucture will not support the level of new cars on the road. I also object because the health system is already stretched in the area and there is no explicit commitment to address this fundamental issue around healthcare	The building should not take place and BCC should explain why the greenbelt is being built on first without having used up the other available space. The plans should ensure they stipulate exactly when new education provisions will be in place - preferably at the beginning of the proposed development. BCC should focus on investing in the infrasturcture of the are, rather than making it worse. We should have specific detail on what exactly wil be provided in terms of health facilities, and when these will be delivered.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1027	It is very clear that the plan is not viable and is unrealistic from a transport point of view. The BCC proposal to improve transport infrastructure is completely inadequate and there is no information about how it will be financed. I live in the Green Belt and commute around Birmingham for work. The traffic is already unbearable, the A38 at Minworth roundabout is featured every morning on the radio and it is very common for A446 to be at a complete stand still from Bassetts Pole Island to the M42 island. Other significant areas where there are large volumes of traffic include the B4148 at the roundabout with Chester Rd and also Reddicap Hill Rd/Coleshill Rd into Sutton town centre. An additional 6,000 houses will undoubtedly exasperate these problems. The addition of a new junction on the A38 will only make the congestion at Minworth worse and will certainly not help to resolve the local traffic issues. The plan also refers to the reopening of railway stations but the decision to expand the railway network is completely outside the control or influence of Birmingham City Council so again this is not a viable option.	BCC should ensure that transport infrastructure plans are realistic with proper surveys and reports to back up the proposals and that funding is in place to build these new infrastructures. It would be wise for these infrastructures to be in place prior to any new houses to demonstrate that they improve the current situation.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1031	This is the last area of countryside adjacent to Walmley; the proposal to release it to developers is astonishing, given that Walmley is already overdeveloped resulting in severe congestion in the area and all routes to Birmingham. The proposal to afford the New Hall park Green Belt status is underwhelming, given the ease with which this status can be lost, apparently.	Imaginative redevelopment of run down areas closer to the City - where the jobs are - would be far more logical. The services, facilities are all in place, public transport is cheaper/better, limiting the potential added burden on the roads. Furthermore, housing in these areas is more likely to be within the reach of younger people price-wise.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1041	Policy GA5 - Langley Sustainable Urban Extension Green Belt is a Government policy for controlling urban growth. The plan is not sound as it does not set out fully the justification for these houses. Sutton Coldfield cannot cope with the population as it is with services already pushed to the limits. With only 15% of green belt remaining according to Central Government figures, this area should be preserved for future generations. I object to the BCC proposal to build 6,000 new homes on green belt land west of A38 as there is no sustainable infrastructure or structured plans in place.	The plan does not give any meaningful details of how and at what point the improvements would be made. The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6, should be abandoned immediately. Smaller developments around the City and Sutton need to be considered to limit the impact on individual communities and infrastructure. The exact health care and school requirement must be identified prior to any development to ensure it meets the needs of any new community. The BCC should utilise the empty properties within Birmingham and all brown sites and NOT build upon Green Belt Land which should be preserved. Far more detail is required as to the timing/funding of the proposed transport infrastructure and what effect 10000 extra cars will have on the environment.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1044	Birmingham City Council appear have created the develpment plan without involving the local communities in its development, how then can the plan be considered as a shared vision if local residents have not been involved with its inception.	Abandon all proposed works planned until local residents are fully involved with proposals put forward by the council and are in agreement with its contents.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1045				Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1046	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1049	I wish to object to the proposed development of all 6000 houses on green belt land in areas given. National planning policy make it clear Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances! The empty houses and undeveloped sites in Birmingham must be fully reused first to get to the point of exceptional circumstances.	Refuse the planning permission. Revisit methods of redeveloping site and unused homes to make Birmingham a great and pleasant place for all the people to live here in particular those who actually pay their council rates.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1061	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1064	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1079	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Langley SUE proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1084			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1107			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1108			The Green Belt should not be used for development. The situation is not extraordinary enough to infringe on the Green Belt and is against the spirit of Government policy regarding Green Belt. If built on it would increase urban sprawl which the Green Belt is there to prevent. A city should not expand so much that it gets so close to adjacent towns. More could be done to identify brownfield sites for housing of which Birmingham has many. As far as industrial development goes the coutryside is not the place for expansion. There is already traffic congestion on the roads of Sutton Coldfield and there are many large, derelict industrial sites in Birmingham that could be used for industry. The people of Birmingham deserve to have countryside on their doorstep to enjoy and this is the only farmland within Birmingham. A balance needs to be achieved between development and quality of life and this is not the way. As far as the land being of little ecological value, it wasn't that long ago that the area was home to skylarks and lapwings. These are now endangered nationally and the City should be playing its part in improving areas of countryside to encourage these and other	Birmingham should be looking at the wider picture nationally to take responsibility for preserving our Green Belt. It should investigate brownfield sites, talk to neighbouring authorites and look at the bigger national picture, not work in isolation. We do not need larger cities and the plan should address putting a limit on the area of urban sprawl.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1127			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1138			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1149	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	Although no canals fall within this growth area, the requirement for connectivity from this growth area to existing pedestrian and cycle routes in the wider area should also include linkages to the Birmingham and Fazeley Canal. For example a new pedestrian bridge to cross the canal from Minworth Industrial Park providing a link to the towpath and the Canal & River Trust welcomes the opportunity to be involved in/comment on the location and design of such a bridge. A bridge crossing shall need to comply with the following principles: It should be ensured that the bridge clears the towpath sufficiently to maintain the current width of the towpath so that it will not restrict the Trust and other users use of the towpath; The minimum headroom for the bridge Canal & River Trust can allow would be based upon the lowest bridge headroom along this stretch of the Birmingham and Fazeley Canal; All works should comply with the "Code of Practice for Works Affecting Canal & River Trust" a copy of which is available on our website. To ensure a good design standard, the following aspects should be fully considered; parapets; safety and drip details; positioning and design of supporting structures; abutment position and		No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1177			There is currently no justification for releasing green belt land. Green belt land should be non-negotiable. The numerous brown field sites, where the road and transport infrastructure is already in place, must be developed.There have been some excellent developments in and around the city centre e.g. developments adjacent to the canal netwotk. The transport network around Sutton Coldfield is already overloaded leading to heavy congestion at certain times of day which is going to be made worse by more roads leading into the town. There has not been enough consultation with the existing local community. The plan does not contain enough information but is full of unrealistic and rather presumptious jargon about encouraging people to use bikes and public transport and developing a community spirit.	I think the current plans should be scrapped until all the alternative brown field sites have been developed. In the future if these areas need to be looked at again then the existing community should be consulted from the outset so local people are party to the development and not having it imposed on them.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1181	OK Leys Road Historic Landfill Site 5.5 Langley SUE The Birmingham Development Plan is seriously flawed and unsound. The following is an extract from the BDP for Bordesley Green, note the comments on Landfill '5.72 The Wheels site and surrounding environs is the major opportunity for transformational change in the area and provides the potential for new employment uses that are integrated with the adjoining areas of Saltley, Bordesley and Small Heath. There are issues with regard to land contamination (the Wheels site is a former landfill site) and infrastructure (mainly transport and access) that will need to be addressed as proposals for the area come forward' The landfill sites are clearly shown on the Environmental Agency Landfill Website Looking at Sutton Coldfield the same government website also shows (amongst a number of others) a Historic Landfill site called 'The Ox Leys Landfill Site' However despite the fact there is a large area of the Langley SUE shown to be a landfill site it is NOT shown or mentioned in the Section 5.5 Langley Sustainable Urban Extension. This is rather difficult to understand because the Environmental Agency Landfill map places the	The Langley SUE(5.5) needs to show a full and true representation of the site planned for development. A full explanation of why there has been a serious omission when there is duty for BCC to engage fully and honestly with the local community and general public who may have an interest in the Langley SUE development. The proposal to build on the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension would appear to be contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 120 and 121 and is therefore unsound.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1202	The plan has omitted any reference to the Ox Leys landfill site which was in operation until 1968. The plan cannot be considered sound when such an important piece of information has been left out out of the consultation process.	Provide full and detailed information about the Langley SUE	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1213	Since I've found out that an exceptionally important piece of information has been left out of the section relating to the Langley SUE i.e. The historic Ox Leys Landfill site I believe that the plan is unsound because the full facts have not been disclosed to the public.	Present a true and full description of the area designated for the new development.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1220	The precepts leading to the conclusion that more land is required are not proven. Population trends are unreliable and we should be planning for less damaging growth. Along with Housing, Retail and Office space needs are changing rapidly with use of telecommunications. Unnecessary destruction of the Green Belt cannot be described in any way as sustainable. Building on Green Belt will increase carbon footprint of the city despite any mitigation. It is "accessible" merely for developers of green field sites. The plans for improvements to the infrastructure are neither clearly indicated nor quantified. Trams/rail are needed to get people out of cars whilst buses use the same road space as cars (bus lanes do not work). The roads will not take another 10,000 people on them (even on buses). The proposal has not been properly consulted with adjacent authorities.	Work on different precepts. Consider alternatives.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1226	There is already a problem with traffic congestion in the Walmley area. Adding 6000 houses will greatly exacerbate the problem and it is difficult to see how improvements to road junctions can be made without demolishing houses. Re-opening Penns Lane railway station seems very unlikely to happen because it just runs down to Water Orton where it joins the main B'ham New Street - Derby line which must be close to capacity.	The plan to build on the Green Belt should be dropped because of the inadequate transport links to Birmingham which is where most people will be commuting to. There are large areas of inner Birmingham which are under-populated and need to be re-developed with greater housing density. This is where new housing should be built.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1236	Totally disagree with the release of Green Belt at land west of A38 - this is a short sighted and easy option by the Council - the Council are not being objective - they need to raise funds due to their inept mismanagement of equal pay claims and the resulting £750m debt placed on tax payers in Birmingham. Releasing Green Belt will provide funds into the empty coffers of Birmingham CC - they therefore have a vested interest in this project being passed, hence the difficult and awkward consultation process. Some of the aims of the plan are to conserve and develop the environment and reduce the carbon footprint - building on Green Belt seems a bizarre way of meeting this aim. With 12,000 empty homes in Birmingham and 17000 given permission to be build, the release of Green Belt is not a justified decision. Why are existing sites not being used, unless it is purely a money deriving process to replace Equal Pay Costs. Government Policy is to maintain Green Belt to prevent Urban Sprawl - this development at Langley goes against that totally - agricultural land will be lost at GA5 and GA6 thereby reducing self sufficiency and increasing carbon footprint as more food is imported,	Derelict and run down shopping areas should be redeveloped as housing. Brownfield sites should be developed first. The plan should be drawn up by a neutral body and not Birmingham CC who are making decisions based on financial need and not on quality of life and existence of it's tax payers. There needs to be far more detail of definite investment in all areas across the city, before the easy option is taken. This is a city I will live in for potentially another 30 years, of which that time period is the whole of the time within this plan - i should be consulted with other tax payers to contribute to create this plan together, not a plan put together that does not reflect my thoughts and desires as a Birmingham Tax payer.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1246	Ref GA5/TP10 There are currently thousands of empty homes, hundreds of empty shops and acres of Brownfield sites that are available. Green Belt is there to prevent Urban Sprawl and Birmingham only has 15% of Green Belt Land left.Green Belt should be maintained. Building on GreenBelt does not improve the environment and maintain quality of life for its residents, which are supposedly some of the aims of the Plans. The Council are releasing the Green Belt lands to raise funds to pay for the debacle of mismanagement of Equal Pay Claims - the Council has a vested interest in this land being released, as they will benefit financially.	Building Houses from 2016 should not be allowed to happen on Green Belt when there are thousands of empty houses unused in Birmingham. Birmingham Council needs to explain to it's tax payers why Green Belt has been chosen as an easy option and first option instead of building on brownfield sites across the city.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1279	Item Policy GA5 The policy of removing Green belt status to allow this urban development is contrary to numerous parts of the plan relating to the protection and improvement of green spaces, natural landscape, etc, and therefore should not be included. The case for "exceptional circumstances" to remove Green Belt protection has not been made: the only attempted justification is the single line in paragraph 5.56 which provides no substantive argument, points to no supporting evidence but merely blandly tells the public that there is "limited capacity" (rather than an absolute stament of no capacity). At the Sutton New Hall Ward Committee of 31/01/2014, the officer from the city council presenting the plan to the public stated that the original plan for 10,000 houses on the existing Green Belt had been reduced to 5,000 owing to the fact that the council did not believe that such a number could be constructed in that time. This statement made it clear that the council was automatically assuming that Green Belt land would be built on, rather than being the last resort once brownfield land had been used up. The apparent ease by which the 10,000 could be reduced to 5,000 by relocating the excess	This section of the plan should be removed, as there is no justification for removing Green Belt protection for this area of land. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible that further points will become apparent	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1280	Connectivity 4th bullet point "Strategic modelling has been undertaken so that impacts and appropriate mitigation, where necessary, can be identified and discussed with the Highways Agency (in relation to the Strategic Road Network) and adjoining highway authorities."The modelling of the transport impacts for this major development (and hence for the whole plan) are badly thought out and fundamentally flawed. To assess the impact of the development and the proposed mitigation measures, the council and their consultants have used the West Midlands PRISM model. As described in the reports produced to support the work for the plan, this is a complex "four stage" model, so called because of the different stages used in determining its final forecasts. As key part of the modelling process is the manner in which travel costs (based on travel time and distance) feeds back into the underlying travel demands (i.e. how many people want to go from where to where). [This is shown in Figure 2.1 of the report "Transport Modelling Assessment, Initial Output Report" January 2014.] Such models are widely used for testing proposed new infrastructure, the need for varying the travel demand being demonstrated	Remove the so called "Langley Sustainable Urban Extension" from the proposals. Undertake a proper modelling analysis for the plan, one that does not rely upon existing residents/workers having to change their place of residence or palce of work unwillingly. Actually carry out proper and detailed analysis of the model to identify where additional capacity is needed to maintain current travel patterns. Consider more than just superficial transport improvements. * * *

bp1310	THIS PLAN IS NOT SOUND. It is not positively prepared. There have been no clear studies into what infrastructure will be needed and only woolly suggestions as to how it will be put into place - eg creation of bus lanes - how will this be done? Will a lane in the already overcrowded roads be shut soley for bus use? How will Sutton cope with the extra thousands of children who need school places as all the schools are already oversubscribed? Will one secondary school and two primaries provide for this - I think not. Why is there no consultation with the local education authority? Why has there been no formal response from Good Hope Hospital about its ability to provide for a further 15 000 residents? The estimated increase in B'ham population is based on old data from 2004 and I believe more recent figures suggest that it will not continue to grow at such a great rate and so the number of extra households required should be reduced. It is not justified - there are 12000 empty properties in Birmingham and 17000 sites for which planning application is in place. These, and the conversion of disused industrial sites should be used first prior to any Green Belt erosion. It is not effective - There is no evidence that there	(1) Utilise all existing brownfield sites first. (2) Utilise all 12000 vacant houses. (3) Use the 17000 homes for which planning application has already been granted. (4) Liaise with surrounding authorities especially the Black Country where much land is available and regeneration is very much needed. (5) Make proper studies into the transport issues that would arise due to 6000 extra households. (6) Proper consultaion with health and education authorities over provision for extra 6000 households. (7) Consider ditching this add on plan to Sutton Coldfield and consider liaison with many other regions with issues relating to new home provision and the consideration of building new towns from scratch so that the infrastructure can be put in place as the town grows	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1332	I object to the plan to build this many houses on green belt land, which is there to prevent urban sprawl. This is green land at the edge of the city and should remain that way. I do not consider that this plan is an exceptional enough reason to use green belt land. As I understand this plan covers the provision of 51,000 new homes in total yet 80,000 may be needed, there is a shortfall of 29,000 homes still - where are these to be built - also on green belt? The New Hall Valley is not a sufficient replacement as it is not on the edge of the city. There is currently planning permission for 17,000 homes within Birmingham not yet built (for example the Brassington Avenue site in Sutton Coldfield) and 12,000 empty houses. Whilst it is more complicated to deal with these sites one by one, surely getting these houses built and empty houses re-occupied should be a greater priority than building on green belt. I can see that it is cheaper as only the land cost has to be considered but the permanent loss of this amenity and agricultural land should not be considered unless there is absolutely no alternative. There is a proposal for two new primary schools and a new secondary school, as well as new health facilities. I assume the	Enforce the building or sale of the 17,000 houses on plots which already have planning permission, and take steps to achieve re-occupation of the 12,000 empty houses in Birmingham before green belt building is considered. Work out where the shortfall of 29,000 houses is to be accommodated before publishing this plan, as it is incomplete. Ensure that funding is in place to make sure that the three proposed schools, additional healtcare facilities and the slip road to the A38 are built at the same time as the first houses are being built, otherwise the likelihood is that these might follow up to ten years later. Ensure that definite plans for bus provision are in place for the new estates including a route to Heartlands Hospital, otherwise all travel from this new estate will be by car, which does not fit in with plans to make this sustainable housing.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1347	I object to this development plan for a number of reasons: 1) The green belt should be preserved as there is not much left in Birmingham, developers should focus on areas of Birmingham where there are derelict houses and improve on those before taking more green belt land. 2) There will be more pressure on health providers in sutton coldfield who are already over subscribed. There are no plans in this proposal about increasing health facilities. 3) the plan does not consider the transport system. With 6,000 new homes and a potential of 10,000 additional cars will not reduce congestion 4) School places are already very limited and there are no funds in place and the plan doesn't demonstrate that provision for education is sustainable.	1) Efforts should be made to fill the 12,000 empty homes already in Birmingham and focus on improving those areas. 2) The plan needs to consider the over subscribed health service. They need to consider expanding Good Hope hospital and increase primary care, secondary services. 3) Train line needs to be re-opened. A38 needs more funding. There is already enough congestion in these areas. More thought needs to be given to this issue 4) More information on education and how primary/secondary schools would be funded	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1348	I object to this development plan because it has not been clearly thought out or planned. Some of my concerns are related to transport, education, health, green belt. My main concern is the green belt land. There is only a small amount of this left and it should be preserved, there are far more exisiting housing estates that could be developed/improved, including many empty homes. Secondly, transport, congestion is high especially during school rush hour, this will only get worse with extra 10,000 cars on the road, who will all be fighting to try and get to the same schools as there are no clear requirements outlined in the documentation about improving schools or additional schools. This also be a burden on the healthcare provision, the hospital, doctors surgerys are already oversubscribed and struggle with the current demands upon them.	Not build on the green belt land, instead concentrate on filling the 12,000 empty homes and improving current housing estates and run down areas. Clear indication needs to be given on improvements to the current transport system i.e. road improvements and improved public transport. Again with school and the health services, clear information needs to be given on what services will be provided and how they will be funded.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1380	The plan is unsound for the following reasons:- 5.56 & 5.57 in the BDP refers to the release of land from the Green Belt for housing development. The NPPF Core Planning Principles clearly state that Green Belts must be protected... reuse land that has been previously developed(brownfield Land) NPPF (Para 83) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances..... City Deals Wave 1 (GB & Solihull LEP) Page 17 - Developers‟ difficulty in raising affordable loan finance and potential purchasers‟ difficulty in accessing mortgages and deposits against new homes means that developers are less willing to take risks with city brownfield sites and are therefore increasingly attracted to previously undeveloped land outside Birmingham's boundaries. (lifted as it is written and punctuated from the LEP) The LEP document clearly states that developers are attracted to Green Belt on a purely financial basis. This is not an ‘exceptional circumstance’? The BCC Housing Targets 2011-31 Technical Paper (Para 6.5) states that 2016-2021 will see housing delivery taking place on the land removed from the Green Belt. NPPF (Para 51) Local planning authorities should identify and	The BDP needs to state its commitment to retaining the Green Belt. The Brownfield sites should be used first. The BDP needs to state its commitment to retaining the 'best and most versatile agricultural land' A timescale needs to be introduced into the plan and there needs to be a commitment to building services alongside and as required by a development.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1403	The proposal in the connectivity section is vague and insufficient concerning improvements to the road network. At peak times there are already congestion problems at surrounding pinch points not only at the A38 Minworth Island but at other points on the A446 and A4097 and also on the A38 at the A452 junction and onto the Expressway. These must be addressed prior to building new houses which will put significant extra load on an already stressed network. The additional rail capacity with new stations must also be planned and achieved early and not done as an afterthought	Improvements to the road and rail network infrastructure must be Phase One. They must be mandatory, explicit, significant and not just relating to within the immediate local environment of the development	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1422	The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered . As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs. Planning policy is clear that removal of green belt land should be in exceptional circumstances. BCC have yet to prove what are exceptional circumstances. If using the current housing supply, as identified in the Technical Targets Paper, then building does not need to occur on the Green Belt until 2023. The proposal to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound. The release of the green belt removed from the plan until this has been determined. Green belt land removed from the plan as there are no exceptional circumstances proven yet and or when reviewing the housing stock available a requirement for releasing Green Belt until 2023. A plan presented which is consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF. A plan which removes the requirement to build on the Green Belt.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1428	Ox Leys Road Historic Landfill Site 5.5 Langley SUE The Birmingham Development Plan is seriously flawed and unsound. The following is an extract from the BDP for Bordesley Green, note the comments on Landfill '5.72 The Wheels site and surrounding environs is the major opportunity for transformational change in the area and provides the potential for new employment uses that are integrated with the adjoining areas of Saltley, Bordesley and Small Heath. There are issues with regard to land contamination (the Wheels site is a former landfill site) and infrastructure (mainly transport and access) that will need to be addressed as proposals for the area come forward' The landfill sites are clearly shown on the Environmental Agency Landfill Website Looking at Sutton Coldfield the same government website also shows (amongst a number of others) a Historic Landfill site called 'The Ox Leys Landfill Site' However despite the fact there is a large area of the Langley SUE shown to be a landfill site it is NOT shown or mentioned in the Section 5.5 Langley Sustainable Urban Extension. This is rather difficult to understand because the Environmental Agency Landfill map places the	The Langley SUE(5.5) needs to show a full and true representation of the site planned for development. A full explanation of why there has been a serious omission when there is duty for BCC to engage fully and honestly with the local community and general public who may have an interest in the Langley SUE development. The proposal to build on the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension would appear to be contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 120 and 121 and is therefore unsound	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1431	The plan is unsound. It requires more details of the research and analysis required to comply with National Planning Policy Framework 120 and 121. The Environmental Agency Landfill register shows a Historic Landfill Site called Ox Leys Road Landfill. Historic landfill (Grid reference: X: 415,304.71; Y: 295,681.73). There are no assurances provided that all Historic Landfill Sites and surrounding areas are will be thoroughly investigated. .	The Plan should include a detailed methodology on what research and assessment process will be undertaken to ensure no existing or future environmental hazard for future home occupiers.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1448	BCC uses Sutton Coldfield and Sutton Park in it's current state as an asset to Birmingham in this document yet the plans for development of the Green Belt will substantially rob the area of it's desirable leafy suburb reputation. Already the general infrastructure is overcrowded and struggling, the road systems are heavily congested and the buses and trains very overcrowded at peak times. How does massively increasing the population on the Green belt help this unless you are effectively intending to build a complete new town including a hospital, surgeries, schools, large link roads and employment there. This certainly would change the whole character of this area that still makes living here desirable. Sutton Coldfield is not the place it once was because it has previously not been developed sensitively by BCC. Residents of the Four Oaks area rarely go into the town anymore because of the extremely bad development, poor shopping and the diabolical parking. They prefer to spend their considerable wealth in better shopping facilities such as Solihull, Tamworth or Lichfield. Fact.... there has been a great exodus in recent years of residents from Sutton Coldfield into Staffordshire because of the way this area has	DO NOT DESTROY THE GREEN BELT it is not necessary and for that reason has no place in this document.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1452	GA5 Langley Sustainable Urban Extension I have been lead to believe that the site which is proposed for the Langley development of 6000 homes was used for landfill some years ago. I am unable to see any mention of this in the Plan within the evidence for assessment of land. There is therefore, no reference as to how this land should be treated. There is also no reference to the historical “springs " which surround the land to be used for housing, or what will be the impact of such a development on them, and vice versa.	More thorough research of the land is definitely needed.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1453	GA5 When I moved to the area where the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension is to be built some 30 years ago, I was assured that the land along Springfield Rd was unlikely to be developed because it was previously used for landfill. I don't see any mention of this in the Plan?	The history of the land to be used must be more thoroughly researched.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1456	GA5 The land intended for use as the Langley Development of 6,000 homes is an area of natural underground springs, hence the name of Springfield Rd! There is flooding on Springfiled Rd and Lindridge Rd, adjacent to the planned site, every time it rains. I cannot see any mention of these historical, natural springs in the Plan, or indeed, any reference as to how the springs will be diverted, or how they will effect the development.	Much more thorough research for evidence of the springs is needed, and documentation as to how the water will be diverted must be shown.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1479	Is this a little ironic when considering you are proposing to build on the Green Belt? "5.62 New Hall Valley Country Park is an important green wedge which penetrates deep into the urban area and is designated as Green Belt. Retaining a green corridor to the Country Park and the wider Green Belt is a key element of the proposed development. At an appropriate time in the future this green corridor should be redesignated as Green Belt."	Keep this land as common land/country park if it means it can't be built on!		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1480	1: National Planning Policy Framework stipulates that "Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances". Nothing within this plan provides sufficient evidence of any exceptional circumstance, especially given my doubt over the validity of the figures being proposed and the fact opportunities identified in by other Authorities appear to have been ignored. 2: Also if this Plan is sufficiently progressed to justify the rezoning of green belt, surely it should specify the exact extents of the substantial green corridor of at least 40 ha connecting New Hall Valley Country Park with the wider Green Belt beyond the A38 that will be an integral part of the development.	1:Accurate and reliable figures on population growth should be obtained. The proposals to redefine green belt should be tested against whether the need is an exceptional circumstance as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework. 2: The plan should clearly define the green corridor stipulated in the Plan	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1483	Birmingham City council are intending to use Green Belt land to build. Birmingham, according to statistics only has 15% Green Belt remaining. How can this be justified in the knowledge there are several identified sites that are not Green Belt that have or hold full or outline planning permission. The plan to create 6000 additional homes on the green belt site is flawed. There are 17000 houses with full or outline planning permission as well as a further 12000 empty homes. How can Birmingham City Council justify this scheme? Related to TP10 and GA5	BCC to use the finance and resource to re-develop existing urban sites with existing housing stock that has the infrastructure to cope. Agree that Green Belt land should remain Green Belt, and decline the proposal to build on Green Belt Land and not ruin Sutton Coldfield.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1486	I object to the removal of Green Belt land as outlined in these proposals. No real justification, other than convenience for developers, is provided for this increase in urban sprawl. Little Green Belt remains within the city boundaries and it would be scandalous to remove more.	More serious consideration needs to be given to smaller scale development of brownfield sites and developing and improving existing housing stock.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1494	I wish to object to the homes being built on this greenfield site when there are many brownfield sites around the city that should be considered first and I feel this development would add to urban sprawl. This plan does not make provision for a goo intergrated transport system. There is no funding for the proposed entry/exit on the B38. Therefore this will add to the pollution and congestion around Walmley.	This development should not take place, the city council should use other available sites around Birmingham.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1497	This is the last area of countryside adjacent to Walmley; the proposal to release it to developers is astonishing, given that Walmley is already overdeveloped resulting in severe congestion and pollution in the area and all routes to Birmingham. The proposal to afford the New Hall park Green Belt status is underwhelming, given the ease with which this status can be lost, apparently.	Imaginative redevelopment of run down areas closer to the City - where the jobs are - would be far more logical. The services, facilities are all in place, public transport is cheaper/better, limiting the potential added burden on the roads. Furthermore, housing in these areas is more likely to be within the reach of younger people price-wise.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1503	It states in this section that "Land to the west of the A38 at Langley represents the most sustainable option to accommodate additional housing growth and will have the least impact on the Green Belt." This is simply not true. Whilst it no doubt represents the most sustainable option to accommodate additional housing growth in the Green Belt, that presupposes an acceptance that building on the Green Belt is an acceptable course of action to begin with. It is not and the "least impact on the Green Belt" is to leave it alone! The law of the land stipulates that Green Belt should only be deregulated under "exceptional circumstances". What is "exceptional" about steadily growing population over 20 years in a city which has acres of unused brown land and empty properties.	The planners must be more imaginative and look for all alternatives to wrecking green belt (neighbouring population centres, brown fields, canal side, refurbishing empty and derelict accommodation, etc.) before suggesting that the requirement is "exceptional" enough to justify a “Sustainable Urban Extension” –another abominable corruption of language to hide an unpalatable real meaning.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1527	This all sounds very green and sustainable - until you consider the council has currently made significant numbers of park employees redundant. More allotments sounds great, but the council is unable to pay for even basic repairs on the existing allotments. Anyone who commutes to central Birmingham will not be persuaded that the comment 'Improvements will be required to increase the capacity of the local road network' is a reassuring commitment. This is the green belt, and it doesn't have to be high in 'landscape components'.	Keep the green belt and review what brown field sites might be available.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1531	Green belt - Green belt is supposed to avoid urban sprawl, this plan to build is not justifiable as it will create urban sprawl, B'ham has only 15% remaining green belt land and this should be preserved with boundaries being altered only in exceptional circumstances. Education - The plan for education is not realistic as there are no specific timelines for the provision of schools, just an idea of 0-10years plus, BCC advise they have no funds to support infrastructure and are therefore reliant on the developers providing this infrastructure. The developers will not invest until they have seen a profit on their investment. Transport - The plan does not demonstrate a sustainable high quality transport system with choices being both sustainable and convenient, the plan will only increase congestion, the A38 entry/exit has no funding, the proposal will increase congestion around Walmley village. 10,000 additional cars will increase pollution. The sutton park rail line opening is deemed desirable but should be essential. Health - There is no clear explanantion of what health facilities will be provided, the policy on health does not address the needs of an already over subscribed health infrastructure, there is no	Green Belt - It can not be justified to begin building in 2016 as there are 17,00 houses with full or outline planning and 12,000 empty homes, BCC should explain why green belt is being released first before these alternatives. Education - There is not enough information to ascertain if the provision for education is sustainable, funding should be guaranteed before development commences with schools being built within walking distance of the development and inside 2 years. Transport - Focus should be on reducing congestion and pollution, not increasing, a more sustainable approach is needed, funding for transport infrastructure should be guaranteed before any development commences. CO2 emissions and the pollutiuon impact of an additional 10,000 cars should be researched Health - There needs to be detailed explanation of planned health facilities, funding, what is to be provided and when and the plan needed to show how it will address the needs of an already oversubscribed health service as well as the increase in population from the new development. A new hospital should	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1534	There should be no building on Green Belt land. Birmingham does not have to provide homes for everyone who may wish to live there, and removal of precious green space is not sustainable. No land should be redesignated as Green Belt, as it is clear from Birmingham's plans how much value is placed on this!	The Plan should not allow for any development whatsoever on Green Belt land.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1554	I wish to lodge my objection to the plans outlined in Policy GA5 on environmental grounds. Green belt - My understanding is that any plan to build and develop on Green Belt land should only be undertaken once all other options have been explored. There is a wealth of brown site possibilties as well as a large number of empty housing units that should be re-developed before Green Belt land is built on. In this instance there are enough alternative sites that can be re-developed negating the need to build on the Walmley area until at least 2023. I fail to understand how the decision is being taken to start developing this site in 2016. Birmingham City Council has already built on 85% of land designated as Green Belt land up to the present date. Green belts were agreed in order to prevent the urban sprawl that is prevalent across the country - this proposal will only contribute to the erosion of these areas and contribute enormously to the urban sprawl that should be avoided.	Re-devlop those unused industrial brown belt sites and empty houisng prior to developing the Green Belt.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1558	The building of new homes on this green belt is completely destroying a beautiful area. We do not want or need homes to be built here. Walmley is full enough as it is. Traffic is heavy during peak times, this would create more traffic and pollution. There is plenty of areas and land that could be developed on in Birmingham that need improvement. Walmley doesn't.	Choose another area to build upon. Full stop.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1566	The green belt land should not bu used until brown belt land has been fully utilised. Starting any builidng on this land in 2016 is unjustified. There is no evidence of a system of sustainable, high quality, intergrated transport. The conjestion in this area will be unmanageable and the overall volume of traffic in and around Sutton Coldfield will be an enormous strain on the road systems.	Don't start building in 2016 and preferaable don't build at all on this green belt land. Provide more transparent information as to why this is being steam rollered ahead. There should be direct information through residents doors from the council. Funding for transport infrastructure should be guaranteed before any building starts.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1570	The Big City Deal Wave 1 states “40% of the land-area of the LEP is Green Belt. This figure rises to 92% in Bromsgrove. Much of this is treasured agricultural, amenity, leisure and/ or protected landscape. Some, however, is land on the urban fringe that might otherwise be attractive for development and which would make an invaluable contribution to meeting the demand for new housing".	Does this mean the edge of Birmingham or the edge of Bromsgrove? If Birmingham (i.e their green belt) the BCC to provide evidence and more detail on why building on the remaining 15% of the green belt in Birmingham is justifiable when all reasonable alternatives have not been considered.The BCC should consider that there are more suitable and known alternatives. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1572	National Planning Policy Framework states: “Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built Environment “ “Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored. Species that have been isolated can be reconnected. Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature – and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul” “…. sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations”. The BDP is not justified as it has not followed the very purpose of the NPPF. It cannot demonstrate that: The details within the plan specifically for the community in Sutton Coldfield are about change for the better. The land should remain open for people to experience it “. This is to the benefit of future generations. By releasing the Green Belt it contradicts this very statement. Removing what little green belt land we have is not about “positive growth” or making environmental progress. It is in fact the very opposite. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with	Please explain how the above have been applied and adhered to within the plan as it is unclear for the Langley SUE and Peddimore. The plan to be consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1583	Even if the developers do build the proposed 3 new schools, where will the money come from to pay for staff wages, equipment etc. Whilst these schools are being built how is the temporary overload on adjacent schools going to be handled? Connectivity New Entry/exit to the A38 will only increase the congestion at the roundabouts either end. Can West Midlands transport afford new public transport ideas. Sutton Park railway line will need massive investment, where is this money to be found?, and the line does not go directly into central Birmingham. Increased congestion 'leads to indirect and cumulative effects on the economy, on peoples health and well beingand on air quality'. Less reliable deleveries will deter local investment in local industry.	Responses from LEA should determine any changes. Have the LEA been consulted? Wider transport issues need addressing	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1589	What commitment do we have that the current green wedges and remaining green belt is retained? That changing the status of Newhall Country Valley Park to Green Belt does that mean at some future stage that the Green Belt will be used? (Policy GA5, bullet point 5.62)	5.62 explained as to what are the advantages of renaming as green belt.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1601	National Planning Policy Framework states: “Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built Environment “ “Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored. Species that have been isolated can be reconnected. Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature – and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul” “…. sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations”. The BDP is not justified as it has not followed the very purpose of the NPPF. It cannot demonstrate that: The details within the plan specifically for the community in Sutton Coldfield are about change for the better. The land should remain open for people to experience it “. This is to the benefit of future generations. By releasing the Green Belt it contradicts this very statement. Removing what little green belt land we have is not about “positive growth” or making environmental progress. It is in fact the very opposite.	Please explain how the above have been applied and adhered to within the plan as it is unclear for the Langley SUE and Peddimore.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1613	The BCC should ensure " the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation "	Some of the land in the proposed Langley SUE is previous landfill and therefore there is requirement for this to be assessed as above as stated in the planning policy.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1616	Policy GA5 – I do not support the principle of removing land to the west of the A38 at Langley from the Green Belt. I believe that all non-Green Belt land should be fully developed before development on Green Belt land should even be considered, let alone implemented. The National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, March 2012) states that “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl”. Building 6,000 new homes and the associated infrastructure of schools, health care facilities, local shops and services would create additional urban sprawl. It also states that “The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”. Any proposal to remove land from the Green Belt for urban development is in direct opposition to these characteristics. It also states “Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land”. The Birmingham Development Plan should therefore be including plans to do this, rather than remove	Ensure that every opportunity to develop all non-Green Belt land in Birmingham is taken before considering any plans to develop Green Belt land. Undertake additional discussions with neighbouring authorities to identify other non-Green Belt areas that would benefit from regeneration through the provision of additional housing stock and associated infrastructure with the support of Birmingham. Replace proposals for urban extension with proposals to enhance the use of the Green Belt land. Ensure the timetabling of flood risk modelling is such that it is undertaken before there is any further planning activity. Ensure the timetabling of planning activity is such that it does not reach a “point of no return” before the results of the referendum to establish a Sutton Coldfield Town Council are known and, assuming it is agreed, implemented.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1626	Releasing this section of green belt land for housing development will not solve any of Birmingham's housing problems in the long term and sets a precedent that will inevitably lead to the rest of Birmingham's green belt land being built on in the future. Regardless of whether or not the green belt is built on, sooner or later Birmingham is going to run out of space, and alternative solutions will have to be found. Why not do that now, rather than wait until all the green belt is gone? Further development on the edge of the urban area just encourages more car use - the residents of the proposed development will have to travel to work, and even if bus links are provided the vast majority of these journeys are going to be made by car. The City Council may have good ideas about how the development should look and how a sense of community can be encouraged, but the reality is that developers will build what will make them the most profit and detailed plans are not going to be made with the needs of the community or city in mind.	Instead of building on green belt land, increase the density of housing developments on brownfield sites within the city. This can be achieved by looking to build more high-rise buildings. Please reexamine the notion that 'young professionals' like to live in flats in the city centre while families want to be pushed out to the suburbs in 'Barratt boxes'. Why not build modern affordable flats built with families in mind? As Birmingham runs out of space, we are all going to get used to living in less of it, and innovative, family-friendly high-rises seem a better use of space than cramped uninspiring detached homes on green belt.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1634	The consultation documents presented summarises that “The development of a sustainable urban extension offers the opportunity to create a relatively self-contained new neighbourhood which in some respects contributes to the environmental enhancement of the locality through green infrastructure provision for example (which may help to offset air quality impacts) and the employment of high design standards in integrating new development with the existing urban area. The character of the development in respect of the high quality design, the provision and use of sustainable transport, trip generation, and waste management for example, will determine its sustainability credentials, but these will only become apparent towards the end of the plan period and beyond, hence the inclusion of a number of uncertain effects “ I do not agree with a plan where the “sustainability credentials will only become apparent towards the end of the plan period and beyond or one that is uncertain. The plan has too many uncertainties for the new development for the Langley SUE to be considered sustainable.	A plan presented which is clear and confident on the sustainability credentials of a " Langley SUE". A plan presented that does not include uncertainty on the effects such a development will have on to be environment and existing urban area.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1647	I object strongly to any use of the green belt in this area; it is there for a reason - to prevent urban sprawl, to enhance biodiversity and to make the city of Birmingham more pleasant for all. Preserving green belt is fundamental to living in a sustainable environment. A reference to building more schools has been made and the provision of health services and transport links. However these lack detail and cannot therefore be effectively commented on.	Do not build on the green belt and certainly not without including more detail in the plan, such as:- There must be more in the plan about how new schools re to be provided. Who will fund them? When will they be constructed? Unless construction takes place before new residents are housed the result will be bolt on extra classrooms in already over crowded schools in the Sutton and surrounding area. This is not sustainable and will certainly undermine both established and new residents. Details must be given in this plan. There must be plans for a new hospital or for Good Hope to be extended- again the plans must give information about the funding for this and time scale. If residents have to travel to another city hospital it will increase the amount of car use across the city making it unsustainable. Will there be plans to enhance the level of shops in Sutton town Centre so that residents do not have to make a lengthy journey into the city centre? There must be plans for the building of new rail lines and stations and who is to fund it. There may be a reference to this in this large document but I haven't	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1652	Policy GA5 I am puzzled as to why I cannot find any mention in these proposals of the Ox Leys Rd (B76 2SY) LANDFILL SITE. The last waste was received on 31 December 1968, long before stricter regulations were brought in. Is this omission an oversight or deliberate? Whichever it is, planning permission must be refused.	1. There should be no plans to build houses on top of an historic landfill site without very careful prior investigations. 2. There should be no plans to build on this green belt land before all other brownfield sites etc have been utilised. It is a vital open space for the well-being of the people of Birmingham and Sutton Coldfield,	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1680	Green belt land refers to an area that is kept as an open space. The main purpose of the green belt policy is to protect the land around larger urban centres, and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife. Building on this green land will not only destroy the habitats of smaller animals, but also larger mammals, for example; horses, donkeys and farmers. As there are currently 12,000 empty homes within Birmingham and a further 17,000 sites with permission granted, building here would be unjust.	As BCC's plan is only 61% complete, it does not fully address the requirement to build on green belt land. Utilise existing, empty houses and brownfield sites within Birmingham.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1682	I can only repeat my comments that the transport infrastructure cannot sustain a development of this size. I would also comment that Birmingham City Council's track record of supporting Sutton Coldfield's infrastructure development and maintenance has been poor over the years (and I speak as a born and bred Brummie that is not that impressed by Sutton). I am not convinced that you have adequately considered the impact of putting another 15000 people (a rough estimate based on your figures of 2.6 people on average per household) into this area. The hospital cannot cope now; my experience of the GP facilities is not good (there is insufficient provision); there are not enough school places and the bus and rail services in the proposed area are non-existent. Your thinking that people will use public transport and cycle us misguided and over optimistic. There is no evidence that the current or future generation is going to be weaned off the private car and therefore the assumption that existing arterial routes (i.e. the A38) can cope is simply wrong (and that is without considering the additional traffic from the additional housing that other local authorities are going to have to create to support Birmingham's	As previously stated - keep the green belt and focus on accommodating housing within brownfield sites. Re-prioritise housing ahead of unnecessary retail and office developments. Expand the areas to be converted from "economic use" to housing - for example transform Digbeth from the sad former industrial area that it is to an urban village - so close to the city that you can walk to work and access all of the othe arm entities if the city without the need fir a car journey.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1705	As per previous comments, this development does not appear to have adequately considered the current area in its proposal. Local green sites have already been substantially developed in recent years which has put a significant strain on local schools, hospital services (which are currently being reduced rather than expanded) and transport systems. The roads within the area are significantly restricted by traffic during rush hour including local roads, the A38 and M6/M42. Further development in this area will overwhelm the local infrastructure and the current proposals to address these problems are vague and completely inadequate.	Plans to develop the green belt should be withdrawn and other urban areas should be considered / re-considered for development.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1756	This plan does not justify in any way building on a Green Belt site especially as their are brownfield urban sites still to be used. Green Belt by its very name should remain Green unless there is a compelling reason why it should be built upon and this plan is simply not it.	There is planning permission for 17000 houses and there are 12000 houses currently unoccupied. This is potentially 29000 houses that would be available by 2016 where this plan is due to commence. Surely waiting to see the housing situation should these houses be built and or reoccupied would make more sense. Especially as there are brown field sites to be utilized before Green Field sites should be considered.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1763	To Build on this land is surely in breach of Government Policy introduced to prevent Urban Sprawl. Existing National Policy is clear that Green Belt should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. Birmingham City Council can hardly consider their need to build on this green belt exceptional, given that they have 12,000 empty houses at their disposal, plus a large number of empty commercial buildings and brown field sites. Within the Langley area there is an empty Council owned former school and surrounding land. It is my understanding that this area was used for Landfill, there was no mention of this in the plan or any evidence to imply that investigations regarding landfill had been made. There are a large number of natural streams in this particular area, along with Springfield Road and Wishaw, has any thought been given to what will happen to that water.	I suggest that the city makes better use of the empty homes that still blight our city, they amount to 12,000 and some are actually Council owned. It is totally unacceptable that the city should still have a large number of properties and derelict sites owned by them and that they have not prioritised, before considering green belt land within this plan. I would also expect that a thorough investigation is carried out regarding the previous use of this land for landfill and implications for building on it, along with the consequences of building on natural streams and natural water drainage.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1783	Firstly I find it alarming that we are expected to provide real comments on a plan which is stated to be only 61% complete. It is therefore difficult to see how any serious decision can be made during this consultation period. We need some detailed information and reassurance that the infrastructure plan is both achievable and sustainable. To that end I am seeing a lack of information regarding the general welfare of the residents in regard to adequate health care provision and no real indication that the transport infrastructure could be improved to support the current growing number of vehicles on the roads without the addition that 5000 homes. HEALTH I fail to see anything in the plan about funding and improving hospital services; Good Hope and its A & E are already struggling (see ambulance handover waiting times). It no longer has a paediatric ward so is already ill equipped to support the increase in infants that this housing development would bring. TRANSPORT Major congestion in the area already exists on the key route into the city and to access the motorway network. This route is the boarder of the proposed hosing and industrial developments. Additional access to the A38 will not ease congestion on this road; it	Additional public transport should be put in place with funding from the start before any building commences. Explore possibilities such as a tram link from the sutton coldfield area into the city. Actually ring fence funding to develop the additional rail commuter stations. A clear policy / strategy for educating our children with guaranteed funding and being a conditional requirement. An indication that the plan takes into consideration wider projects outside of its boundaries such as the HS2 development and bordering authorities plans for housing and other developments.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1785	I find it alarming that we are expected to provide real comments on a plan which is stated to be only 61% complete. It is therefore difficult to see how any serious decision can be made during this consultation period. We need some detailed information and reassurance that the infrastructure plan is both achievable and sustainable. To that end I am seeing a lack of information regarding the general welfare of the residents in regard to adequate health care provision and no real indication that the transport infrastructure could be improved to support the current growing number of vehicles on the roads without the addition that 5000 homes. HEALTH I fail to see anything in the plan about funding and improving hospital services; Good Hope and its A & E are already struggling (see ambulance handover waiting times). It no longer has a paediatric ward so is already ill equipped to support the increase in infants that this housing development would bring. TRANSPORT Major congestion in the area already exists on the key route into the city and to access the motorway network. This route is the boarder of the proposed hosing and industrial developments. Additional access to the A38 will not ease congestion on this road; it	Additional public transport should be put in place with funding from the start before any building commences. Explore possibilities such as a tram link from the sutton coldfield area into the city. Actually ring fence funding to develop the additional rail commuter stations. A clear policy / strategy for educating our children with guaranteed funding and being a conditional requirement. An indication that the plan takes into consideration wider projects outside of its boundaries such as the HS2 development and bordering authorities plans for housing and other developments.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1787	A major Landfill site has not been disclosed which sits on the potential to be Langley SUE. This should have been noted as a potential risk that may or may not have been mitigated with regards to land contamination. The springs surrounding Springfield Road have not been disclosed. This should have been noted during the land assessment. Has sufficient land assessment therefore occurred?	Land assessment made to ensure as this is a historic landfill and therefore no records, building does not occur on contaminated land. Land assessment made to ensure there is no environmental impact on these springs with a 6,000 house development. BCC to allay residents concerns these were merely overlooked rather than excluded/not disclosed. BCC to disclose all details of land assessments with the community prior to any public examination or finalisation of any plan.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1789	Congestion is already very poor in and around walmley particularly at peak times and weekends. This development will bring Walmley to a halt with the extra traffic generated. There are insufficient services to support this growth.	BCC should consider existing brownfield sites and unused housing stock first.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1802	GA5 Growth Area - Langley Sustainable Urban Extension GA6 Growth Area - Peddimore I am completely opposed to the plan to build homes on the green belt sites in Sutton Coldfield. According to National Policy the proposal to build on greenfield sites can only be used in exceptional circumstances. There appears not to be an exceptional circumstance for this development because there is currently capacity on brownfield sites in Birmingham, there are 12,000 empty houses in Birmingham and there are more than 14,000 sites with planning permission already granted. The government has recently re-stated that "unmet need" would not constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt (Ministerial Statement quoted on the Planning Portal, 23rd January 2014). We have seen an increase in congestion on the roads over the years, The roads in these areas are already full to capacity. Building in this area will remove these greenfield sites for use by the local population. These areas are regularly used for dog walking, running, walking and in general to enjoy outdoor green spaces. This will be removed to the detriment of the local population. This	The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6, and the other Greenfield areas, should be abandoned.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1803	It has come to my attention that a vast landfill site was in operation from the 1940s to 1968 on the area of land designated for Langley SUE. Looking at the Environmental Agency Historic Landfill site it is very clear on the map. further information informs us that both domestic and commercial waste was dumped there. This was all happening before regulations were applied in the 1970s. This means that nobody really knows what is in the ground there and poses all sorts of questions regarding pollution and contamination. My question is 'Why has there bee no reference to the Ox Leys Landfill site in any section of the plan while the precedent of disclosing landfill sites can be seen in sections relating to Bordesley Park and the Eastern Triangle? '	Provide full and true information on all sites in the BDP.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1806	Policy GA5 The city is now faced with a choice between urban renewal or destruction of its green belt breathing spaces. I've lived in Birmingham over sixty years, worked for a Birmingham company all my working life and am proud to be a Brummie. As a media man, the launch of the NEC, ICC and the NIA were proud moments when this city joined the world's big league. It now risks losing its innovative reputation. Also, where is the site-specific monitoring and/or modelling that is needed to aid any risk assessment and address any uncertainty about the nature of any emissions from the historic Ox Leys Rd LANDFILL SITE?	The existence of the Ox Leys Rd LANDFILL SITE MUST BE brought into the public domain. Presumably the land-owners and developers are already aware of it?? Reclaiming brownfield sites must be the priority. There are sufficient in a 15 mile radius of the city centre to feed its natural growth. These are the places that provided the industrial wealth that made Birmingham great. Cheap and quick-fix housing sprawl devouring precious green belt would be a betrayal of all that previous generations of Brummies have worked for.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1822	GA5 5.5 The plan states that local people will play a meaningful role in shaping development and managing the new neighbourhood which will contribute to a sense of community. I and my friends and neighbours are local people and we already have a sense of community which we feel is being destroyed with the total obliteration of our local surroundings if this major build is brought to life. Our whole neighbourhood will be changed beyond recognition, how will that give us a sense of community?? The stress of this is acutally causing harm to many of my friends and this complaint proceedure is so complicated that many people I live by are just too overwhelmed to comment. Where is your duty of care to the local people of Walmley, Peddimore, Minworth and Sutton? This is a life changing plan for so many people, this plan is not giving a sense of community. The roads around Sutton, Walmley and Peddimore are very busy, as I am sure the planning department already has seen. I cannot turn right out of my estate to join Walmley Ash Road due to the volume of traffic already present, we have to turn left and travel up to and around a small island. How are we going to get out of our estate when the lorries and	Change the location of the plan away from green belt land. Split up the volume of houses and put them on brownfield pockets of land where there already are roads in place. Utilize the 12000 houses and flats which are ready and waiting to be refurbished throughout the city of Birmingham. This would provide work for builders in 2014 not 2016. Build the 17000 homes which already have planning permission outlined or granted. This would again provide work for builders in 2014 not 2016.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1834	Ref 5.56 - This is not exceptional circumstances and cannot be considered as such until all other avenues or sources of land for housing development within the existing built environment have been used or considered. Due consideration should also be given to proper engagement with adjacent Local Authorities and alignment with their Planning for growth and use of land. In some instances those Local authorities may have reason or grounds for objection to the Birmingham Plan as this will push the Birmingham Boundary ever closer and impact upon green spaces in adjacent areas. Retention of the Green Belt should be considered sacrosanct and any withdrawal of designation must be rigorously examined through proper engagement with Local communities etc. Sustainability and Design - The existing Transport Infrastucture, Education and Leisure provison are already at or above capacity and significant capital Investment is required to bring the present facilities up to date. Increased demand from additional housing will require a complete re-think and considerable new provision. The Plan statements do not appear to show that this has been thought through or planned for in any	The planners must revisit the detail requirements for Policy GA5 and re-engage and consult with the community.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1841	The current residential situation in Walmley has reached it's full capacity - the primary and secondary schools are full, the traffic going through the main village is congested and green belt areas are few. We simply do not have the space from our existing facilities to accomodate additional housing i.e. church, doctors, dentists, schools and also employment. Traffic is at all time high in this area as can be evidenced by the recent road works carried out on Fox Hollies Road - the tail backs to cope with the existing traffic was shocking and this is without 1000's of additional homes. We pay significantly higher council tax to live in a pleasant surburban area with efficient local amenities and green belt surroundings.	Consider building on urban sites where housing stock is already available and preserve our green belt.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1842	The use of green belt land for 6000 new homes is outweighed by the availability of unused housing stock and other available developments such as underused/disused brown field sites, surely more encouragement should be given for developers to use current day technology to develop such sites first - ease to build and the resultant cost saving as opposed to brown field sites should not be the only consideration as once developed & lost there will be no further space green or otherwise. The comments in the policy are that this would be a 'destination of choice' this does not just fall to the housing provided -the desirability for this area will be lost by the very factor that the Green belt that gives the community a bank of protection against urban sprawl will be gone. The inclusion of a manufactured 'green space' will do nothing to replace this. Successive governments have supported the importance of green belt and this policy does little to maintain that requirement either for residents existing or future ones. The comment that landowners will not object comes as no surprise as they have already released land for developments purposes within the local area.	Before continuing with this development clear evidence should be shown that there is a true shortfall of housing and that all avenues to utilize existing housing stock across the City have been undertaken.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1868	I support the growth of new development on this site when it has been proven that all reasonabily viable brownfield sites have been developed. I welcome the inclusion of policy wording to ensure that any development there is suatainable, but as this has a varied and quite a loose definition I feel that it would be essential for a Masterplan to be developed with very specific design and comminty infrastrcuture requirements included within it. For example highlighting a green corridoor of 20 meters either site of any known watercourse of water features, and an attractive linear parkway throughout the site. If your Authority is committed to planting rrees, then could you consider planning fruit or nut bearing trees, so that the community has a resource (a community orchard) rather than some trees that look green but are only useful for shading. Further requirements for community infrastructure including schools, community halls, sports facilities, local shopping facilities etc.. should all be part of the policy requirements for development at this location. There should be a range of propoerties at this location to meet the needs of local key workers such as nurses, teachers and other comparative	The plan should include policies to ensure delivery of the above issues specifally within this section of the document. Consideration should be included within this and the transportation section of this plan top look at rail / light rail connectivity.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1873	With only 15% of green belt remaining according to Central Government figures, this area should be preserved for future generations. I object to the BCC proposal to build 6,000 new homes on green belt land west of A38 as there is no sustainable infrastructure or structured plans in place.	do not build on protected greenbelt land, our infrastructure cant cope as it is. Address brown land and empty homes first.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1875	Green built land should remain protected.	Don't build on protected land, sort out the unsightly 12,000+ empty homes first.	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1879	Mr Steve Jones	Ciel Properties Ltd	Mr Mark Rose	Ciel Properties Ltd support the preparation of the Birmingham Plan 2031, and specifically the recognition within the Plan that the release of Green Belt land around the city is required to meet the identified development needs in the period to 2031. That reflects the reality that the capacity of the available land within the urban area is ultimately limited, and would not necessarily accommodate the type and character of development required to meet the identified needs of specific parts of the city's population. This approach is supported by national policy as set out in the NPPF (para. 83). Indeed in respect of the latest planning reforms Mr Pickles 6th September 2012 statement noted: "We encourage councils to use the flexibilities set out in the national planning policy framework to tailor the extent of green-belt land in their areas to reflect local circumstances." Consequently, Ciel Properties Ltd specifically support the identification and allocation of the land required for the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension in Policy GA5 (formerly referred to as Area C). The comprehensive and robust evidence base that underpins the Plan indicates that this is clearly the best strategy for providing the housing	The City Council is encouraged to effectively engage with North Warwickshire Borough Council in this respect under the provisions of the "duty to co-operate" introduced by the Localism Act 2011, and referred to in the NPPF. The outcome of these discussions should be set out in the Plan. Furthermore, Policy GA5 refers to the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document to provide guidance on design, phasing and access to ensure the comprehensive development of the urban extension. This process should take account of the land to the north of Lindridge Road and the contribution that it can make to meeting housing needs in the city.	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1895				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1903				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1904				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1907				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1909				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1917				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1921				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1925				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1926	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1927	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1929	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1930	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1933	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1934	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1937	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1944	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1945	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1948	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1955	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1958	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1959	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1961	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1963	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1967	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1970	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp1978	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1981	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1983	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1989	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp1993	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2001	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2004	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2013	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2017	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2021	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2028	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2031	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2033	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2035	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2037	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2038	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2039	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2040	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2041	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2043	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2049	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2055	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2062	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2063	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2071	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2076	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2083	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2085	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2091	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2095	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2098	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2102	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2106	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2111	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2115	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2120				Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2121	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2128	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2135	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2136	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2139	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2144	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2151	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2157	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2159	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2161	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2167	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2175	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2176	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2178	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2180	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2182	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2183	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2191	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2192	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2195	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2199	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2201	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2203	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2205	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2206	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2208	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2209	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2212	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2215	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2220	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2229	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2230	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2233	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2234	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2235	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2236	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2239	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2241	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2243	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2245	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2248	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2249	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2250	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2251	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2254	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2255	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2256	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2259	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2263	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2268	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2269	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2270	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2274	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2283	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2284	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2290	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2292	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2293	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2295	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2297	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2303	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2310	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2317	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2321	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2327	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2329	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2331	Vale Dale	Head Housekeeper New Hall Hotel & Spa	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2333			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2334			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2341			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2350			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2356	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2370			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2372			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2378			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2381			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2388			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2395			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2397	Mr Darren Clueit	Container Control Co-Ordinator @ BMW	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2401			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2402	Sarah Moult	VPS Administrator @ BMW Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2405	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2406	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2413	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2416	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2419	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2426	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2430	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2435	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2439	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2441	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2442	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2444	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2445	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2451	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2459	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2467	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2470	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2472	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2473	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2475	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2476	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2480	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2485	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2492	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2493	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2494	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2500	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2501	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2505	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2507	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2509	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2511	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2518	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2521	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2523			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2524			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2528			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2535			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2540	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2542			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2558			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2564			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2571			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2582			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2586			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2587			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2588			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2589			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2590			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2592			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2594	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2598	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2599	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2600	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2605	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2610	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2616	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2617	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2620	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2621	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2624	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2629	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2633	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2639	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2648	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2656	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2664	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2670			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2676			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2685			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2692			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2694			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2703			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2705			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2720			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2725	Sally Maguire	Lead Advisor Natural England	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2737			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2744			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2755	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2796			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2797			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2801			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2802			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2804			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2805			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2812			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2814			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2815			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2817			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2819			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2822	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2827			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2849			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2852			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2855			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2860			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2862			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2866			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2869			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2871			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2873			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2881			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2883			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2891			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2893			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2899	Mr Tim Lawrence	Partner	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2900			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2902	Rt Hon Andrew Mitchell MP		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2904	Mrs Elizabeth Flowith	Jon Flowith & Partners	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2905			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2906			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2918			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2919			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2920			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2923			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2925			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2926			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2928	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2933	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2937	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2938	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2939	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2943	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2945	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2948	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2949	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2951	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2955	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2959	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2962	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2966	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2972	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2974	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2975	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp2976	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2978	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2983	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2992	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp2996	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3000	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3002	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3004	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3005	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3012				Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3020	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3022				Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3025	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3027	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3031	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3034	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3040	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3041	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3043	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3047	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3049	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3055	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3056	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3058	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3060	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3062	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3064	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3067	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3069	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3074	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3076	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3078	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3080	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3084	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3090	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3095	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3100	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3102	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3108	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3109	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3112	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3113	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3118	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3119	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3120	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3123	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3135	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3145	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3150	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3153	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3159	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3162	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3167	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3172	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3179	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3183	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3187	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3193	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3197	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3202	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3209	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3210	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3213	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3215	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3220	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3224	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3235	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3240			No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3242	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3253	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3263	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3265	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3268	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3271	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3275	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3282	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3313	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3315	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3317	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3319	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3321	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3330	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3336	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3338	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3340	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3346			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3353			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3358	Mr Ray Harris	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3364	Mrs G A Pestridge	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3370	Mr Paul O'Connor	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3376	Mr Robert Smith	Roughley Neighbourhood Forum	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3382			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3388			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3394	Mr David Pestridge	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3400			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3402			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3412			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3415			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3421			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3423			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3426			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3427			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3433			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3434			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3437			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3444			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3445			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3448			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3449			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3454	Mrs Sue Fenoughty	Executive Member of BAEE (UK) Editor Environmental Education	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3456			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3459			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3461			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3468			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3470			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3482			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3486			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3488	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3492	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3494	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3496	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3498	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3500	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3502	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3503	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3504	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3505	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3506	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3510	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3512	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3513	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3520	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3526	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3527	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3529	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3530	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3536	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3538	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3540	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3542	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3543	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3552	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3553	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3554	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3558	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3560	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3566	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3568	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3570	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3572	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3575	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3578	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3582	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3587	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3591	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3592	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3601	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3602	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3604	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3612	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3614	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3615	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3616	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3621	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3625	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3632	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3635	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3636	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3640	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3644	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3645	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3650	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3658	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3662	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3678	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3679	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3684	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3685	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3690	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3696	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3698	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3707	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3709	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3711	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3717	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3718	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3719	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3724	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3726	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3727	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3729	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3730	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3732	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3734			No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3743	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3744	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3755	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3764	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3766	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3768	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3771	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3772	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3776	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3778	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3782	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3787	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3805	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3806	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3815	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3821	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3825	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3827	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3835	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3837	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3841	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3854	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3855	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3865	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3868	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3869	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3870	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3875	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3879	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3881	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3884	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3887	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3890	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3894	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3897	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3901	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3906	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3909	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3912	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3915	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3924	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3926	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3927	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3929	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3932	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3935	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3939	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3941	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3944	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3947	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3949	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3950	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3955	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3958	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3961	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3964	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3967	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3969	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3972	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp3973	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3975	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3979	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3983	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3984	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3986	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp3996	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4000	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4003	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4006	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4010	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4018	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4026	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4034	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4038	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4040	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4044	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4050	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4053	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4060	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4063	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4065	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4067	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4076	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4077	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4078	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4087	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4088	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4092	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4095	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4106	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4113	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4117	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4125	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4129	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4130	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4132	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4135	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4137	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4145	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4152	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4153	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4162	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4165	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4168	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4173	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4178	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4183	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4188	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4193	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4198	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4203	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4208	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4213	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4218	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4223	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4229	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4234	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4236	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4244	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4252	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4256	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4257	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4259	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4262	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4265	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4267	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4272	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4276	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4281	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4283	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4285	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4286	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4290	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4292	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4294	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4295	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4297	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4300	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4305	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4308	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4311	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4313	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4314	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4317	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4321	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4325	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4330	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4332	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4334	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4335	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4341	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4345	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4350	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4352	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4355	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4358	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4361	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4367	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4370	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4378	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4388	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4391	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4392	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4397	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4400	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4401	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4403	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4409	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4415	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4420	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4424	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4428	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4432	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4434	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4436	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4438	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4440	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4441	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4442	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4443	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4447	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4453	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4459	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4461	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4466	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4469	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4471	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4474	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4476	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4481	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4482	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4486	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4500	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4501	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4505	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4509	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4518	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4519	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4522	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4524	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4532	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4536	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4538	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4543	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4547	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4549	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4554	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4555	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4560	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4568	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4573	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4574	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4576	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4578	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4580	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4582	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4591	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4599	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4601	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4603	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4608	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4609	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4612	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4613	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4614	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4616	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4618	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4620	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4622	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4631	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4634	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4636	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4638	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4643	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4653	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4659	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4661	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4664	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4666	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4667	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4670	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4673	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4679	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4680	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4686	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4691	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4692	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4699	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4700	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4702	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4710	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4711	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4712	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4714	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4716	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4730	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4733	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4735	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4739	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4745	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4752	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4753	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4754	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4756	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4760	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4765	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4772	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4773	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4781	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4782	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4784	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4786	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4788	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4791	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4792	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4797	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4800	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4802	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4804	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4806	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4807	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4811	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4814	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4826	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4831	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4834	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4835	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4838	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4839	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4841	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4842	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4848	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4853	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4855	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4856	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4863	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4867	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4871			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4873			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4874			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4878	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4886			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4897			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4899			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4900			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4901			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4908			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4910			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4915			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4919			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4927			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4931			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4939			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4940			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp4942			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4951			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4956			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4960			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4965			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4967			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4974			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4992			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4993	Councillor Lyn Collin	Birmingham City Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4994			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp4997			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5000			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5002			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5004					No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5007			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5009			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5011			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5013	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5019	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5024	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5025	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5030	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5038	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5040	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5042	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5043	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5054	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5058	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5059	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5060	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5063	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5066	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5070	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5078	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5079			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5080			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5082			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5083			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5087			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5089			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5090			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5092			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5094			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5099			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5100			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5101			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5103			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5105	Mrs Louise Baudet	Parish Council Clerk Curdworth Parish Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5107			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5108			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5111			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5112	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5113	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5115	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5116	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5117	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5119	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5120	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5121	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5122	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5123	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5124	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5126	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5127	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5128	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5130	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5131	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5141	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5146	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5147	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5153	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5155	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5158	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5159	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5167	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5168	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5169	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5176	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5181	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5185	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5191	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5194	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5203	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5206	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5209	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5210				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5211				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5212				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5213				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5219				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5224				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5226				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5227				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5230				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5231				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5234		Walmley Cricket & Tennis Club	Mr Jon Flowith	Partner Jon Flowith & Partners	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5235				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5241				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5245				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5253				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5258				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5259				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5265					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5273					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5277					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5279					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5283					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5288	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5305							No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5324		Rubery Holdings Ltd	Mr Nigel Gough	Director - Town Planning and Development Department CP Bigwood	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5330		Consortium of Landowners/House Builders & Promoters	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5341	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5353		Miller Homes	joanne hedgley	Planning Director Pegasus Planning Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5355					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5356					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5365					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5368	J Coleman	William Davis Ltd	Mr Alasdair Jones	Director Marrons Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5369			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5372			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5373			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5378			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5385			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5388			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5400			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5409			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5418	Mr Mark Andrews	Acting Planning Policy Manager COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5421			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5425			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5427	Mr Matthew Taylor	NDD midlands Asset Development Team Highways Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5430	Rev Steven Doel	Reverend St John's Church	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5432			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5436	Mr Matthew Bowers	Head of Planning and Regeneration Tamworth Borough Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5439			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5443			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5448			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5455			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5456			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5461			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5474			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5477			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5488			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5506			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5510	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5537			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5559			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5613			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5621			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5644			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5648				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5651				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5653				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5657				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5663				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5668				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5671	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5672				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5675				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5676				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5679				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5693				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5700	Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin	Partner Deloitte LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5703				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5708				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5715				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5716				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5720			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5729			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5736			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5741			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5748			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5763	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5781	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5790	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5804	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5850			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5855			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5865			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5868			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5876			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5885	Mr Nick Dawson	Connectivity Manager Staffordshire County Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5920		Acocks Green Neighbourhood Office	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5

bp5981			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp5999			These comments relate to TP10 and GA5. Justification has not been provided in this plan for building on the Green Belt. This plan makes a mockery of the term Green Belt. The land was designated as green belt in order to prevent urban sprawl, whereas this plan will actually create it more so!	Birmingham city council should explain to the people affected by these plans why green belt land is being considered to develop an urban site on, when there are 12,000 empty homes available that could be utilised instead.		Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp6017			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp6020			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp6022			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp6024			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Langley Sustainable Urban Extension	GA5
bp13			This development adjoins the proposed residential development and is therefore likely to prevent the aspiration of the SUE to be a 'destination of choice' as few people aspire to live next to a factory or warehouse. It is my view that the SUE and Pedimore proposals are mutually exclusive in their current forms. I do not live next to the development however, people do. Can you not see that by doing this, you are wreaking their lives?	I propose the Cllr's responsible for this go round each of the properties that live that side of the island individually and listen to what they have to say.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp44			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp52			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp58			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp79	Mr Keith Pringle	Management Consultant Jakema Programme Management Ltd				Peddimore	GA6
bp85			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6

bp93			if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore. We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country	as above		Peddimore	GA6
bp101	Mr Steve Blue	Operations Manager Mereway Kitchens Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp103			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp106			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp114			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp117			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp121			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp125			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp133			Why is development land needed in this area. There is a major development at i54 how has that been taken into account in identifying the needs? What assumptions have been made on the use of the extensive brown field opportunities in Sandwell and the Black Country?	Show the all the assessment carried out on other brown field sites, especially in the Black country Identify current and future needs detailing how they have been independently assessed Detail the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp138	MR ALAN CLAWLEY	Birmingham Green Party	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp173	Mrs Marie Pringle	Sales Controller McCurrach UK Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp181			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp186			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp187			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp193			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp204			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp206			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp211			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp214			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp217			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp221	Sutton Coldfield and Walmley already have a number of retail units already built which have been standing empty for some time. We also have a considerable number of shops in the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre lying empty which when taking into account both of these elements would suggest that businesses are not looking to open up/ relocate to Sutton Coldfield. The reference to access improvements has been discussed and tried in other cities without and real tangeable success and to rely on an already poor public services is irresponsible because we will have more congestion and pollution taking place in walmley to that already taking place. I would also like to know where the additional costs for extended public services will be coming from because the the City Council is aleady having to sell of some of its best assets to raise money owing to low paid workers. Its seems that the local authority are intent on destroying what bit of green field land remains in Birmingham for a business forecast that may be way of the mark	Postpone the building of any retail units on any green belt land until further consideration to the use of suitable brown fields sites have been considered, also check the viabilty of neighboring authorities assisting in this paricular requirement.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp225	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp228	There is no requirement or need to build the industrial site. This is what you have included to justify the housing development. The industrial site will not offer locals employment it is extremely likely that a further influx of traffic will come in for those employed and visiting creating congestion. This in turn will increase air pollution and create health issues. Transport links are not sustainable and where is the budget for all of this in the long term? There are so many cuts as it is and no doubt the council will not have the budget in the long term to maintain the development and have back up for building on potential flood sites.	As above	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp232	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6

bp236	Plan relies on development in the green belt in circumstances which are not exceptional, this makes the plan unsound: • The need has been assessed to accommodate a particular level of development. The proposals involve use of land designated green belt because the urban area cannot accommodate all of this and there are no other alternatives within the City boundary. Opting for use of the green belt is the easy option requiring no thought. The fact that there is a shortage of development land in the urban area is not an exceptional circumstance, it is inevitable that development land will grow short and now that it has that fact will pertain into the future and cannot be defined as exceptional. Either now or later a different solution to providing for housing need must be found. Solutions to accommodate housing beyond the City boundary are still under discussion with other authorities, as is the LEP development strategy for commercial development. Birmingham's plan is therefore premature. The green belt land in question is of high landscape and amenity value and has tremendous value in its own right for the community, now and for future generations, as comments made in response to each	• Avoid green belt development altogether and adopt a different strategy across the region which focuses development on a new approach for growth on brownfield land across the whole West Midlands conurbation, including the Black Country, where it would be encouraged, or in properly planned settlements beyond the green belt. Both options would be more sustainable than the current Plan. Shortage of development land is an issue all over the world, not just in Birmingham, and other design solutions are being explored to address it worldwide, creating higher density development in urban areas in attractive new ways. • If the Inspector considers that the present plan is sound then adopting a phased approach to development over the plan period with greenfield/green belt land not developed until most of the brownfield land/ development in urban areas has been delivered is essential. Phasing is vital for related infrastructure – transport improvements including railway connections, health service provision, schools etc as any development takes place.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp239	Seriously whenever labour run birmingham city council this green belt land comes up for issue they are only interested in lining their own pockets hand in hand with the builders and the land owners will be very happy and rich the schools carnt cope now ever been through Walmley in rush hour no didn't think so no good transport links , no train link all the pubs near train stations charge to park your car why because there is already not enough parking spaces. There are threats to close good hope hospital tamworth residents already use good hope so with a proposed 6000 houses ie 4 people to a house so where are the facilities for an extra 24000 residents plus all their cars . There are plenty of brown sites In and around birmingham and the Black Country that can be used without destroying green belt land that will be lost for ever	The plan should not be allowed to proceed if the plan goes through there should be a judicial review	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp241	We already have a large industrial site at Minworth opposite the Asda supermarket where some units lie empty so I do not see the need for more. The increased traffic will cause congestion and pollution in an already congested area. I am also concerned regarding Peddimore Hall. By building all around it and not conserving its setting it will be seriously affected.	The council should show that they have diligently explored all alternative options before building on Peddimore.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp248	I strongly object to this proposal. A new light industrial site simply cannot be justified by the city council evidenced by the empty units on the Forge Lane Industrial estate within a mile of this proposed site. Another mile on and closer to major transport links is the ex-Cincinnati site which has been empty for over a decade which could be used. The section 5.67 is simply not true and it is a scandal that it has been used as a justification. it would be more sustainable and less environmentally damaging to the local area to use either of these sites. it has been shown that green spaces benefit the health of local residents and this scheme clearly reduces that benefit. Secondly the roads surrounding the proposed scheme are already overly congested and there are not the public transport links to the area to service commuters to the new site, especially since it is not within walking or cycling distance of the cross city train line, thereby making the cycle and walking routes mentioned absolutely worthless. It is my opinion that companies would see the transport difficulties and the lack of local facilities such as somewhere for employees to shop/lunch as not conducive to attracting best employees nor as a convenience to themselves		No	Peddimore	GA6
bp256	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp259	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp263	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp265	Anyone who has used a train service and looked out of the window can only question the statement "The shortage of suitable brownfield sites within the urban area to meet the City's needs for large industrial sites represents the exceptional circumstances justifying the release of Green Belt land for development." The City Centre is surrounded by one eyesore after and another. Surely what is meant is that it is far too difficult to assemble a brownfield site. Difficult is not an adequate reason to use part of the green belt. Yes it is difficult to assemble a development brownfield site but develop the green belt and leave the eyesores - what sort of city do we want?	A constructive overall plan to address development of the brownfield sites in the City.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp269	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp280	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp283	There is no need for further industrial sites in this area the roads can not cope as it is and public transport is virtually non existant it's already a danger to attempt to cross the road to wards asda where you will find opposite the Minworth industrial park with a the neighbouring Maybrook industrial park both with empty units also within a mile in the opposite direction you have Midpoint park , the castle vale OYO site The Castle vale enterprise park and the new Prologis site. Building "NEW EMPLOYMENT/INDUSTRIAL UNITS" is purely a smokescreen for attempting to build houses on our green belt.	Use the existing industrial sites and leave the Peddimore and other green belt sites alone.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp294	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp328	The development of this area in addition to the proposed residential development at GA5 would make an inappropriately large incursion into an already diminished Green Belt. Kingsbury Road and the Sutton Coldfield Bypass area already heavily congested routes and any volume of employment provided would attract traffic from other areas of the city than the proposed new residential developments.	The Council should concentrate its employment development energies on existing brownfield sites within the city to enhance the proposed residential and community developments inside Birmingham's existing city boundaries.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp339			1.Where are the plans for more health services - new general practice will need to be in place with more secondary care back up 2. Education - planning of primary schools need to be in place- they need to be local in walking distance 3. Transport - A38 exit / entry will make traffic worse in the area 4. Green belt erosion 5. Feed back from the community does not appear to be have listened to	1. Plans with how funding is going to be obtained for health services need to be in place 2. Schools provision needs to be in plan - local and available to the housing development 3. Transport plans to reduce pollution and traffic congestion 4 Justification of use of green belt when urban sites are available across the city 5 More information to the local community 6. Plans to reduce flooding in the area.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp350			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp366			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp369			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp372			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp374			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp379			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp381			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp384			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp389			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp392	Mr Francis Mason	Walmley Residents Association	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp396			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp398			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp409			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp412			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp413			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp437			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp447			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp453			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp456			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp458			Walmley already has industrial estates, where units remain empty, why do we need more? The roads around Asda already have traffic congestion, which will increase significantly .Also the added pollution is a concern. Why are we building around Peddimore Hall, the building/surrounding area should be conserved, not ruined.	All other options must have been exhausted, before looking to build on Peddimore.Do not build further retail units when the existing ones lie unused.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp469	this is no good this area is over populated now traffic jams at peak times in walmley village and main roads in walmley no places to park the doctors you cannot get an appointment for over a week now if this goes through it will be a month hospital good hope you wait weeks and on top of this you now want close part of good hope down you have not thought this out properly and to destroy open country side its just criminal when there are other sites in brown sites at that in Birmingham	just scale it down and scrap the industrial site to put a thing like that is just destroying a beautiful area	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp470	These comments relate to GA6, GA5, TP10, TP16. Please note this. Info on distribution of economic growth over Greater Birmingham and Solihull not finalised until Spring 2014 so how has this plan been prepared accurately without this information? Employment area will increase traffic congestion as will the A38 entrance and exit.	Before a decision is made on where an employment area is there needs to be a clear strategy for economic growth and regeneration. This will highlight the most appropriate area for housing development. Needs a fully funded and sustainable transport infrastructure t reduce congestion and emissions.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp473	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp475	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp486	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp489	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp492	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp501	The Kingsbury road is over run with traffic with etra investment onto the local area and the roads into Birmingham town centre this will add extra traffic the the A38M and other roar during the rush hour and will course extra road deaths. The local schools are running at maximum and this will not help an ever iterating local services.	Do not build on this land	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp504	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp509	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp510	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp516	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp524	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp527	We already have a large industrial site at Minworth opposite the Asda supermarket where units lie empty. The increased traffic will cause congestion and pollution to an already congested area. I am also concerned regarding the historic site of Peddimore Hall, that by building all around it, it will be seriously affected by not conserving its setting.	The council should show that they have explored all alternative options before building on Peddimore.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp528	I am totaly against the development on the green belt areas, you must not go ahead with the building of a possible 10,000 more homes in the Sutton Coldfield area for many reasons. Sutton does not have the infrastructure to cope with any further building of dwellings. The schools in Sutton Coldfield both Primary and Secondary are already oversubscribed even to the fact that Whitehouse Common School are already trying to increase the size of the school – this is even before further houses are built. With an average of 3 persons per new household, that's an average of an extra 30,000 people wanting to either see a doctor or visit the A&E department at Good Hope, this hospital already has problems trying to cope without additional families moving into an already over-crowded community and from what I understand their are no proposals to either build a new Hospital or expand on the existing one. The roads around Sutton Coldfield are jammed everyday with the vast quantity of cars that already pack our highways, you are proposing a new junction on the Sutton Coldfield Bypass (A38) to access the new development, this would only add to the congestion on the A38 down to Minworth	Not to build on any green belt land at all. Only brown field sites must be used.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp533	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp551	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp560	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp561	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp569	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp575	ReTP12, GA5, GA6: The proposed development diminuishes the value of both Old Langley Hall (Grade II listed) and Peddimore Hall (moated manor house). This contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) chapter 12 which states "Local Planning Authorities should set out a positive strategy for the conversation and enjoyment of the historic environment ..... irreplaceable resource, conserve in a manner appropriate to their significance. Significance can be harmed or lost ..... by development within its setting". Can the Council prove it has explored all alternatives to building on this Green Belt land. Is there not enough industrial development/warehousing in Minworth already?	Bham CC should show it has looked at all alternatives before developing land round these historic buildings and sites. There are not many historic building left in Birmingham and they should be valued and promoted, not build around by houses and industrial developments. How can BCC justify this development around historical sites when the Sustainability Appraisal states there is uncertainty where a large proportion of Birmingham's housing needs are to be located?	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp580			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp582			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp593			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp609			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp615	Mr. R.W. Lees	Sherifoot Lane, Hill Village Road Residents Association	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp620			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp624			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp626			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp630			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp637			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp655			I am completely against the proposed area for Peddimore and the surrounding green belt land from Minworth up to Lindridge Road. This is a financial benefit for the council and not a benefit for the residents of Sutton Coldfield. Developers will pay top value for Green Belt land compared to Brown Belt (which is widely available and proven). All Brown Belt land should be utilised prior to thinking about Green Belt (land which is to be protected from urban sprawl, not cashed in). The plan is flawed with many areas not reviewed in the proper detail (not enough brownfield sites which is not true) - this has lead to many concerns about the development and the potential issues that will arise from the additional population, vehicles - let alone the disruption of the build when transporting the materials for the build. A recent small build on Springfield Road has lead to many disruptions for local residents including road closures for pipeworks - imagine this when catering for 6,000 houses on main commuter roads? I understand the requirement for housing is critical but you must look into empty housing and brownfield developments - we must consider the impact on the environment for the generations ahead before we turn	A factual review into the feasibility of the following areas to ensure that the local area can handle the disruption, additional vehicles and population in an already dense area: - Education: In an area where schools are already at full capacity and the exclusion zones ever encroaching - where will a potential 4,000+ children be schooled in pre, junior and secondary ages? New schools would need to be ready by the time phase 1 has been populated. - Transportation: Adding a junction on the A38 will not improve traffic flow on the assumption. 10,000 additional vehicles will most likely travel via Bassets Pole or Walmley Village - both of which could not handle additional traffic during 8-9am / 5-6pm. The suggestions of a shuttle bus are ridiculous as people will not be incentivised to use a bus service that is then stuck in traffic. - Infrastructure: To help reduce potential nightmare traffic, the council need to not just review but implement a private build for a new train station. A potentially huge project but justifiable if you wish to reduce traffic. This will include reviews and budgets for new bridges and	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp657			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp705			Peddimore has a controversial history. Given that Philips pulled out of a previous industrial development plan leaving the city council with egg all over its face, and given the current economic climate with slow, if any, regional growth, I'm not convinced there will be any demand from industry for the site. And therefore no jobs. The green belt would be lost for nothing. Shame on you.	There are sites along the A38 closer to Birmingham, not just in Minworth but in Erdington too which would be more attractive to industry and more accessible for the workforce (given the lack of transport in Walmley and the sketchy nature of transport links in the plan. ('Additional bus services'? Don't make me laugh.)	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp710			I am opposed to any building on the green belt and to change green belt for industrial use when there are no developers wanting this site is criminal. The green belt is there to stop the sprawl of housing and industry into the countryside and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. What are the exceptional circumstances, I do not believe BCC has proved this point. There are already industrial sites in the area that are not full, Midpoint for one. There is no need for this site, it is greed on the part of BCC who own alot of this land and are not therefore inpartial on this matter. Where is the infrastructure for this site, the surrounding roads cannot cope with an influx of lorries. It might be NEAR to the M42 but it is not on the M42, traffic still need to get to the main routes. The destruction of an area with many historical and listed buildings breaks all conservation considerations. Leaving Peddimore Hall islanded in the middle of a huge industrial development is wrong. What about Forge Farm another Grade 2 listed building one of only a few A framed farmhouses left that will sit directly opposite this huge development altering this conservation site for ever.	Remove all building on the green belt from the plan. Prove the case for such huge industrial developments inside the city boundaries.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp741			An industrial development is being proposed on Green Belt land at Peddimore. There is currently no demand for such a facility and I am concerned that there is a conflict of interest here, as Birmingham City Council own all or part of this land. There are numerous brownfield sites within Birmingham for such a facility to be built, if required.	The Council should detail who requires such a facility. It should examine all potential brownfield sites in Birmingham and explain why they are proposing building on the Green Belt, rather than utilizing these sites. There are advantages in developing a brownfield site, existing infrastructure, local workforce, and the Council should have regard for the NPPF statements on Green Belt development, which it appears to have ignored.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp749			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp759			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp761			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp765			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp778			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp779	Mr Philip G Sharpe	Planning Officer The Inland Waterways Association (Lichfield Branch)	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp785			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp789			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp791			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp801			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp812	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	My previous comment seems to have got "lost in the ether", so I'll just repeat that we are opposed to any major development of this sort in the Green Belt and we do not consider that the necessity for a major industrial site here has been proved. We also want to know why it is thought necessary to take 80 hectares for the purpose, when elsewhere in the BDP it shows that 60 hectares would be the minimum requirement (ie would be acceptable). The site when operational would generate a lot more traffic on already congested roads.	Demonstrate the necessity (if you can) for this proposed site, rather than just a wish to have a site available in case someone wants to use it.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp815			There seem to be plenty of business parks around the city which have empty units. Why is it necessary to build more which may remain empty. Do businesses want more space to expand at present? I think not. If the land is developed and the premises are taken then transport problems will add to the inadequate road infrastructure in Walmley and surrounds. The land is deemed to be agriculturally poor, nevertheless, any land which could support crops will become more important for food production in future. Once built on and concreted over like any green belt it is lost forever.	Make sure the land is really wanted and will be totally utilised before losing it forever as green fields.		Peddimore	GA6
bp821			Minworth industrial park and the Prologist park by Severn Trent already have empty units and until these areas are fully utilised there should be no thought of speculative industrial development on green belt land. There are many brown field sites around the area that should be redeveloped and occupied before considering taking away green fields. The infrastructure that will be required for employees of any developments needs to be in place before agreeing to any development. The proposed site of industrial development will result in large lorries using the narrow roads, with existing schools on them, as cut throughs when the main roads are blocked or subject to road works.	Ensure that all existing industrial development sites and brown field areas are fully utilised and occupied before considering development on green belt land.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp843			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6

bp845	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp857	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp868	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp870	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp874	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp878	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp882	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp886	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp892	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp901	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp910	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp929	i am totally opposed to industrial development of Green belt land.	Birmingham City Council should support the residents in the fight against this development of Green belt land, and should argue against it. I can only think large amounts of money are being made by landowners or the council if this development goes ahead.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp976	Policy GA6 - Peddimore Green Belt is a Government policy for controlling urban growth. The idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts are their openness. Taking away a part will reduce this openness. The supply of land set aside for agriculture, and included in Green Belts, is a limited and decreasing resource. It is the prime mover behind "sustainability" and, although it may not be crucial to our food supply at present, it will so be in the future. In addition to the direct loss of food production and amenities that happens when Green Belt is developed, the environmental threats must be fully evaluated before any change of use decision is made. Particularly relevant at the moment, although the areas under consideration may not be immediately threatened by flooding, any development will lead to increased surface water run-off and foul water both of which will	1.The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6, should be abandoned. 2.Comprehensive reviews and development of Policies TP10, TP16, TP34, TP35, TP36, and TP37 to be carried out to identify suitable alternative and more appropriate development areas within the City. 3. A comprehensive infrastructure plan developed for Sutton Coldfield and its environs, and Policy GA4 developed to include redevelopment for the whole of the town centre including the railway station and its adjacent car parks, such development to include provision for a public bus, or other appropriate light transport terminus.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6

bp1010			The plan does not set out the reasoning for this industial area to be developed, it does not detail the requirement for these units or detail the vacant units in the City area that should be offerd as the primary option for industry. The exiting infrastructure is not adequate and the proposed addition of a new junction will not ensure that vehicle movement is practical. The xisting congestion has not been dealt with in the plan.	The plan needs to identify the requirement that supprorts this development. A full transprort analysis needs to be undertaken that allows for increased traffic volumes including HGV movements. Proposals for improvements to the infrastructure that would ensure congestion is adressed need to be set out		Peddimore	GA6
bp1033			This is fine, good quality, agricultural land and, whilst the desire for access to the Motorway Network is noted, this would also add to the congestion in the Walmley area - already unacceptable. Where is the demand for these developments which cannot be satisfied by development of areas elsewhere on the M42 corridor - possibly in Warwickshire.	This is Green Belt; you hold it in trust for future generations; if you release it to developers, our children and grandchildren will never recover it. Build elsewhere.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1047			Many industrial parks in city including nearby Minworth and Prologist park near Peddimore already have empty units and until these areas are fully utilised there should be no requirement of industrial development on green belt land. There are many brown field sites around the area that could be redeveloped and occupied before considering taking away green fields. Any accepted industrial development will result in intolerable congestion on surrounding roads, when the main roads are blocked or subject to road works.	Please do not approve this plan until it is absolutely proven there is no alternative. Ensure all existing industrial parks are fully used and occupied before development on green belt land.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1048			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1069			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1080	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Peddimore proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Peddimore	GA6
bp1086			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1111			Green Belt land is not the place for industrial development, particularly as it has not been shown that there is a need for this development, only speculation. There is already traffic congestion in this area. The area has historic significance and I dispute the fact that there is little ecological value, where is the proof? The City should be protecting the Green Belt for the benefit of its citizens and has a duty to sustain its wildlife for future generations. A balance needs to be achieved between development and quality of life and this is not the way. There are industrial estates in Birmingham with empty units and these should be used. Speculation about possible need is not a good enough reason to destroy the Green Belt.	The Green Belt should be protected from any development and priority should be given to filling vacant industrial sites and units within the City. Spreading industrial sites across the City makes more sense when it comes to transport issues and employment. Using one large area of Green Belt land does not benefit local citizens.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1117			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1129			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1150	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	Peddimore Growth Area is adjacent to the Birmingham and Fazeley Canal. Canal & River Trust would require any development to; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network. The waterways can be used as tools in place making and place shaping, and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. Canal & River Trust would seek for any development to relate appropriately to the waterway and optimise the benefits such a location can generate for all parts of the community. There may be a requirement for a new vehicular bridge to cross the canal from the Peddimore site to the towpath and Canal & River Trust welcomes the opportunity to be involved in/comment on the location and design of such a bridge. There are embankments along this stretch of the canal which shall need to be protected. As previously advised a bridge crossing shall need to comply with the following		No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1179	I am totally opposed to the development of green belt land for industry in this area. There are numerous industrial developments in the nearby area, a number of units of which are empty. There are also brown field sites which could be developed. Where is the need for the release of green belt land for fresh development? These plans do not tell us. There is no justification for sacrificing our natural environment and all its wildlife. There is precious enough left as it is.	Scrap the current plans. Explore all the alternatives that would not impinge on our green belt.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1214	There is little in the plan to justify the sacrificing of agricultural land for yet more factory units, in the immediate vicinity there are numerous empty industrial units. There has been no indication that a major investor is waiting in the wings which suggests that the development would be speculative, Although near to motorway network the approach roads are inadequate for current needs and there are no costed proposals other than an improved A38 junction. The promotion of pedestrian and cycleways are not likely to sit easily with industry.	Development should only be allowed if a specific investor e.g. Jaguar/Land Rover comes forward with detailed plans and guarantee of jobs for local people.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1222	There is already a huge development at Hams Hall. Prologis at Minworth is increasing. The area will become strangled with lorries. Frequently the M42 J9 island is already choked with traffic at peak periods. The roads are already inadequate. To add to this without considerable improvement to the infrastructure is unsustainable madness. Where are the needed improved transport links such as trams/trains to transport workers and goods in and out? Have pollution levels been considered from such increases in heavy traffic? Flooding risks will increase by removing this water sink. Water already runs across the KIngsbury Road and spouts up through drains in Curdworth in wet weather. The proposals have not been fully investigated with adjacent authorities. Have brownfield sites in the City been fully considered? Destruction of the Green Belt is by no means sustainable.	Re-examine needs. Consult with adjacent authorities.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6

bp1234	This Green Belt land is not just empty and unutilised. It is productive, agricultural land. Britain already imports 25% of all the food consumed in the country, therefore how can it be sustainable to build on farmland and take it out of production for ever. These fields have been under constant cultivation for a thousand years, but once built on they will be lost permanently.	There should be no industrial and warehousing development on the Green Belt. There are sufficient brownfield sites across Birmingham and the wider West Midlands. These should be developed first.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1239	There are already significant industrial units empty in the area (opposite Asda Minworth, Prologis Park etc). There is no need to develop Green Belt land until all other options are utliised. The plan has not demonstrated a clear high quality integrated transport policy to provide access to such industrial units. If Sutton Coldfield has one of the highest employment rates in the CIty, why build industrial units in the Peddimore Area, build them in the unemployed areas (e.g. Around Winson Green there is high unemployment and huge numbers of derelict indiustrial units around the Soho Forge area).	Build on Brownfield and other options available first before Commit to detailed and high qulaity transport infrastructure before a go ahead for such schemes. Transport is always an add on and not thought through (e.g. Penns Lane - you can travel on a cycle route up Penns Lane, but there is no cycle lane coming down. The transport had to be derived first.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1261	Ref TP10/GA5/GA6/Tp16 The distribution of industrial development across the midlands has not been completed - it is available in Spring 2014 - why is this plan taking no account of that? Unemployment is high in central Bimringham (eg Winson green) - there needs to be development of jobs there and not in Peddimore where employment is high - this seems totally non-sensical. Peddimore has no rail route for infrastructure and in the plan there is no planned development - this will increase carbon footprint and destroy the environment with increased road haulage - going directly against the aims of the plan.	Brownfield sites should be developed first near to high unemployment zones E.g. Soho Foundry area has extensive Brownfield Sites to be developed to address unemployment in more central areas. 100% commitment and funding guaranteed to open new railway lines and stations to provide transport to the new Peddimore site, if and when Brownfield sites become full.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1336	This land was considered for an industrial development several years ago and was rejected after a public enquiry. There are many brownfield, derelict industrial sites within the West Midlands which have much better public transport links and should be redeveloped first before a greenfield site is used. The historic properties mentioned such as Peddimore Hall will certainly not be enhanced if surrounded by factories. This is not an exceptional enough reason for building on green belt land, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Anyone working here would have to drive as the nearest bus provision is in Walmley (unless there are firm plans to extend the bus service) and the nearest railway station is in Wylde Green at least two miles away so this would add to traffic congestion in the area which is already high.	Use a derelict brownfield site in an area of the city with a higher rate of unemployment in which to build this facility, to provide job opportunities where they are needed, and in an area with better public transport facilties.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1381	BDP 5.65 Why is it desirable to take 'high quality' land for industrial development? This high quality land is designated Green Belt and should remain so. 5.66 Why is BCC taking the easy option by suggesting that any Green Belt should be offered. The proposed site is described as being of low ecological and landscape value and sits within a low lying basin.... This area is breathtakingly beautiful at certain times of the year - the vibrant red poppy fields, the yellow blanket of the rape seed flowers and the open low lying basin in itself is an uplifting sight to see. The openness lifts the spirit and refreshes the soul. It is a known fact that the countryside is absolutely essential for the wellbeing both physical and mental of the human race and must be retained for the benefit of future generations. The land is also classified as Grade 3a agricultural land. The NPPF refers to agricultural land in this classification as the 'Best and most versatile agricultural land.' It is unimaginable that BCC could be so short sighted as to consider this site as a possible candidate for the industrial development. Recent global climate change has resulted in a big rethink about the importance of providing crops at home and a	Only use Brown Field sites for development. Present a complete plan for residents to comment on.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1423		The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs. The pipeline for business opportunities wanting to come to Birmingham is currently unknown. Until this detail is provided the most appropriate strategy for economic growth and their locations are unknown. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered for economic growth, a plan which is balanced and sustainable and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound. The release of the green belt removed from the plan until this has been determined. Green belt land removed from the plan as there are no exceptional circumstances proven. A plan presented which is consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6

bp1424	Point 5.66 states Peddimore has low ecological value. However, the ecological assessment produced July 2013 states the area D (the proposed Peddimore development) has moderate to high ecological value. As a naturalist, a professional in the conservation industry and a regular user of the area I agree with the report's classification and contest the designation of the site as low ecological value. I can inform you of the following current high ecological value features of the proposed development site: • Breeding lapwing. Red listed for conservation concern – the most serious designation. • Multiple breeding skylark territories. Red listed species. • Yellowhammers feeding ground and likely breeding. Red listed species. • Overwintering site for merlin. Red listed species. • Regular flocks of hundreds of golden plover. Amber status. • Kestrel. Amber status. Other notable species include brown hares and badgers and many other more common species. Policy GA6 suggests biodiversity enhancement can be achieved by enhancing the brook and reinstating hedgerows. These enhancement features would certainly further improve an already good rural environment, however they would	A reassessment of the ecological features of the site specifically addressing my above points and detailing how the development will enhance the biodiversity of the area.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp1487	Who will provide this large scale industrial development? There is no evidence nationally or locally of companies wishing to create large scale industrial development on this scale. All the evidence is that manufacturing industry on a large scale is in decline with no finance to support such developments. Green Belt land could be destroyed for no purpose.	Smaller scale industrial development to reflect reality should be developed nearer to exising workforce labour.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1491	Birmingham City council are intending to use Green Belt land to build. Birmingham, according to statistics only has 15% Green Belt remaining. How can this be justified in the knowledge there are several identified sites that are not Green Belt that have or hold full or outline planning permission. The plan to create 6000 additional homes on the green belt site is flawed. There are 17000 houses with full or outline planning permission as well as a further 12000 empty homes. How can Birmingham City Council justify this scheme? Related to TP10 and GA5	Decline the plan to build on Green Belt. Utilise existing housing stock. Prioritise developing existing urban sites and agree that development of the Green Belt should only be used as the absolute last resort.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1495	What are the timescales? This seems to be an ill conceived plan to enable there to be sufficient spaces for children to enter education allied to the proposals to build these homes. The infrastructure would not be ready and this will only place further demands on the already over stretched educational establishments in the area of Sutton Coldfield. Birmingham city council has no money to fund these builds and the infrastructure so how do they propose to fund? Related to TP35 GA5	There is not enough detail, information nor in-depth strategy to have any confidence in the plan. There has to be guarantee that any homes built must have the ability to enable of their children to attend a school from day one of moving in, in a school that is local and within a reasonable travelling distance from any newly proposed build. Children in any new housing development should not be expected to have to take buses to school as these schools in the area are already over subscribed and they must have the guarantee that they can attend immediately and locally.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1496	There are many industrial parks in city including nearby Minworth and Prologist park that have empty units and until these areas are fully utilised there should be no requirement of industrial development on green belt land. There are many brown field sites around the area that could be redeveloped and occupied before considering taking away green fields. Any accepted industrial development will result in intolerable congestion on surrounding roads, when the main roads are blocked or subject to road works	Do not go ahead with this proposal, other industrial sites in the area can be utilised.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1532	Green belt - Green belt is supposed to avoid urban sprawl, this plan to build is not justifiable as it will create urban sprawl, B'ham has only 15% remaining green belt land and this should be preserved with boundaries being altered only in exceptional circumstances. Education - The plan for education is not realistic as there are no specific timelines for the provision of schools, just an idea of 0-10years plus, BCC advise they have no funds to support infrastructure and are therefore reliant on the developers providing this infrastructure. The developers will not invest until they have seen a profit on their investment. Transport - The plan does not demonstrate a sustainable high quality transport system with choices being both sustainable and convenient, the plan will only increase congestion, the A38 entry/exit has no funding, the proposal will increase congestion around Walmley village. 10,000 additional cars will increase pollution. The sutton park rail line opening is deemed desirable but should be essential. Health - There is no clear explanantion of what health facilities will be provided, the policy on health does not address the needs of an already over subscribed health infrastructure, there is no	Green Belt - It cannot be justified to begin building in 2016 as there are 17,00 houses with full or outline planning and 12,00 empty homes BCC should explain why green belt is being released first before these alternatives. Education - There is not enough information to ascertain if the provision for education is sustainable, funding should be guaranteed before development commences with schools being built within walking distance of the development and inside 2 years. Transport - Focus should be on reducing congestion and pollution, not increasing, a more sustainable approach is needed, funding for transport infrastructure should be guaranteed before any development commences. CO2 emissions and the pollution impact of an additional 10,000 cars should be researched Health - There needs to be detailed explanation of planned health facilities, funding, what is to be provided and when and the plan needs to show how it will address the needs of an already oversubscribed health service as well as the increase in population from the new development. A new hospital should	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1535	There should be absolutely no development on Green Belt land. This is unnecessary and destructive. Birmingham should be proud of its green belt sites and do everything within its power to protect and sustain them.	No green belt land should be built on.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1560	Do not destroy land that benefits all. Care for future generations and the planet.	NO building	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1564	Peddimore does offer an opportunity to promote Sutton as a research area. Through the main issues around the proposal are traffic issues on the A38, particularly at Minworth roundabout during peak times ad the funding to implement the project..	#NAME?	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp1573	It is unclear why an area north east of Birmingham is required for the largest employment zone when the area in need for regeneration and employment is the inner city.	Please provide me information as to why this has been identified as an employment area of 80 hectares.		Peddimore	GA6
bp1579	Where is the evidence of demand for industrial units for this site. Adjacent areas have unlet/unoccupied units.	Do not use this green belt land until all existing sites are fully utilised	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1600	I object to the use of green belt land for housing. Green belts should not be used for housing under any circumstances.	Birmingham has thousands of houses which are empty as well as those with planning permission. Why is it therefore necessary to use green belt land when there is housing stock available.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1602	“Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built Environment “ “Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored. Species that have been isolated can be reconnected. Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature – and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul” “…. sustainable development is about positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations”. The BDP is not justified as it has not followed the very purpose of the NPPF. It cannot demonstrate that: The details within the plan specifically for the community in Sutton Coldfield are about change for the better. The land should remain open for people to experience it “. This is to the benefit of future generations. By releasing the Green Belt it contradicts this very statement. Removing what little green belt land we have is not about “positive growth” or making environmental progress. It is in fact the very opposite.	Please explain how the above have been applied and adhered to within the plan as it is unclear for the Langley SUE and Peddimore.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6

bp1612	I cannot see how the information to make the decision to build industrial units on this land has been compiled. Firstly there are already empty units Minworth and Prologist park near Peddimore surely this suggests the demand is not there? I am completely opposed to beautiful green field land being desimated when there are so many brown field sites available. If industrial units are required redevelop current eyesores such as the old Cincinati site on Kingsbury Road or the Lucas Factory in Mere Green rather than destroy our environment. Surely this would be a better use of money? How can a Council we voted for belive that this is for our benefit???? Many local residents are very angry that land used for leisure eg walks, cycling, horseriding is being flattened to build industrial units - how does this support the Birmingham "Green" policy? The roads surrounding this area are already at overcapacity - huge queues at rush hour periods, regular accidents making things even worse - please think again this plan is so flawed.	Peddimore	GA6

bp1617	Policy GA6 – I do not support the principle of removing land at Peddimore from the Green Belt. I believe that all non-Green Belt land should be fully developed before development on Green Belt land should even be considered, let alone implemented. The National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, March 2012) states that “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl”. Using 80 ha of land for employment and the associated transport infrastructure would create additional urban sprawl. It also states that “The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”. Any proposal to remove land from the Green Belt for urban development is in direct opposition to these characteristics. It also states “Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land”. As such, the proposals to enhance biodiversity and protect heritage assets are welcomed. The plan refers to access improvements. If the land is to be	Ensure that every opportunity to develop all non-Green Belt land in Birmingham is taken before considering any plans to develop Green Belt land. Undertake additional discussions with neighbouring authorities to identify other non-Green Belt areas that would benefit from regeneration through the provision of additional employment sites and associated infrastructure with the support of Birmingham. Replace proposals for urban extension with proposals to enhance the use of the Green Belt land. Ensure the timetabling of planning activity is such that it does not reach a “point of no return” before the results of the referendum to establish a Sutton Coldfield Town Council are known and, assuming it is agreed, implemented.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1633	The consultation documents presented summarises that “The development of a sustainable urban extension offers the opportunity to create a relatively self-contained new neighbourhood which in some respects contributes to the environmental enhancement of the locality through green infrastructure provision for example (which may help to offset air quality impacts) and the employment of high design standards in integrating new development with the existing urban area. The character of the development in respect of the high quality design, the provision and use of sustainable transport, trip generation, and waste management for example, will determine its sustainability credentials, but these will only become apparent towards the end of the plan period and beyond, hence the inclusion of a number of uncertain effects “ I do not agree with a plan where the “sustainability credentials will only become apparent towards the end of the plan period and beyond or one that is uncertain. The plan has too many uncertainties for the new development for the Langley SUE to be considered sustainable.	A plan presented which is clear and confident on the sustainability credentials of the Langley SUE. A plan presented that does not include uncertainty on the effects such a development will have on to be environment and existing urban area.		Peddimore	GA6
bp1688	Once again I make the point that there is plenty of brownfield space in Birmingham that could be used for the purposes proposed and frankly this worries me as Birmingham's urban sprawl continues to reach out into what is pretty much the remains of what was the local Warwickshire and Staffordshire countryside. And again I have to point to the transport infrastructure as further justification for not proceeding with this development. The further additional traffic that this is going to generate cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure and gridlock becomes an even greater probability for Sutton Coldfield and North Birmingham. Given the location of this development the only option to get to work will be the private car (even if you improve the bus service - no one will use it) and I remain unconvinced that there is no existing site in the City that could not be used for the purposes set out in the plan.	Recognise that the transport infrastructure cannot cope with this development and in particular that people will not use public transport to get to this location - there is no rail link anywhere near by and bus services will not be sufficiently attractive to get people out of their cars.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1707	Development of this site will remove a significant proportion of the already dwindling Birmingham Green Belt. There is little, if any specific justification for building industrial / business centres. The local roads are already under considerable strain and further housing and industrial development will overwhelm these further.	Stop the proposal and consider other locations (particularly the large proportion of inner city land that appears in need of development / regeneration).	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1723	This is fine, good quality, agricultural land and, whilst the desire for access to the Motorway Network is noted, this would also add to the unacceptable congestion in the Walmley area . Where is the demand for these developments which cannot be satisfied by development of areas elsewhere and empty industrial plots of land and units in and around the Birmingham area and along the on the M42 corridor I concur with the already vast number of comments in this section and do not feel I can add anything different.		No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1749	The plan makes no true justification for developing this part of the Green Belt for industrial use. There are countless areas in and around Birmingham where industrial units stand empty and unused. Why are these not been brought back into use before taking valuable Green Belt land?	Remove the building of this industrial area from the plan.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1758	Are all the industrial units that we currently have in this area being used or are they simply empty. Would more urbanisation not lead to greater congestion on the already busy roads?	The necessity to build more empty units and cause further congestion on already busy roads has really not been justified.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1790	Once again the will add additional traffic to an already overcrowded area.	Use brownfield sites first.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1798	The proposed site is greenbelt, and by definition, is not for industrial development. The site is in an unsuitable location for industrial development due to the extremely poor site access and egress for vehicular traffic. Access to the A4097 is prevented by the Birmingham and Fazeley Canal to the south. Access to the A38 Sutton Coldfield by-pass to the west will be extremely difficult to provide safely. Residents of the north part of Minworth (Cottage Lane/Summer Lane will be completely encircled with industrial units. Resident in the south of the village (Park Lane etc.) already are, and complaints from them about noise from vehicles and light pollution fall on deaf ears. There are empty units on Midpoint park and other nearby industial parks, which are proving difficult to let, so there is no need for more. The existing infrastructure is extremely poor. The bus service is essentially a rural service with only half a dozen buses to/from the City centre a day, the last around 6 pm and none on Sundays or holidays. There are no links to cycle routes or other sustailable modes of transport. It is completely unacceptable to design and build a new development which will rely completely on employees travelling to and from	Abandon the proposals at Peddimore. Look elsewhere, if need for more units can be proven.	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1807	The greenbelt exists for a very good reason. It is sacrosanct (unless, I suppose, absolutely no other solution exists - and we are far from being at that stage yet. The proposals are based on speculative guesstimates of a hypothetical substantial increase in population that, as far as I can see, is purely that - a guesstimate. You can demonstrate anything with figures if you have a mind to do so - there is no real substance to them and you are planing on destroying sacrosanct greenbelt land based on what could well turn out to be a myth. Immigration figures are decreasing, things change all the time - it may never happen. Even if it does happen (and if it does, it may not be anywhere near to the extent you are claiming), there are many other alternatives that should be exhausted first, with development of green belt land being only the very last resort - and then ONLY when the problem is proved to exist and no other alternative remains.	All brownfield sites should be developed first. This would provide much needed regeneration to our inner city areas which provides enormous potential for new housing in its own right. By the time this has been done (together with ensuring all existing empty housing is fully utilised), you may well find this is more than adequate. Likewise for proposed new industrial units - there are many empty ones of these already, so again I challenge the figures put forward which again are guesstimates that may never come to fruition. My grave concern is that you will destroy our historical and sacrosanct greenbelt to build houses and industrial units that are not needed, because all of this is based on pure speculation. I repeat, Greenbelt land should not be touched until a) ALL brownfield sites are fully redeveloped and then occupied; b) this envisaged major growth in population becomes a reality rather than a potential myth.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1827	The NPPF says that the green belt is unsuitable for new buildings. I am not clear why Birmingham City Council are not following NPPF instruction with the Birmingham plan to build on green belt. Ther is plenty of brown field land to use instead. There are 12000 empty homes and 17000 homes with planning so there is no need to build 6000 homes on green belt.	Build on brown field only. Do not build on green belt as per the NPPF regulation.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1846	The policy claims that there are no suitable brownfield sites however in the locality there is an under developed trading estate with less than full capacity, in addition there is significant disused factory site which could be developed further. The use of green belt sites should not be used at the expense of using technology to reclaim what is available.		No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1847	5.67 I am un clear why the planners think there is a shortfall of industrial land available in the area? There are actual industrial sites which are standing empty today, some of which are brand new and never have been used. I have called up a list on a website called Completely Trade and Industrial for finding units to let in the UK. Here is a fraction of the list for Birmingham; Spitfire Park, Minworth Industrial, Seeleys Park, Park Road, Abrafract Industrial Court, Acorn Park, Amington Business Park Tamworth, Arden Road Industrial, Arcadia Distribution Centre Solihul, Argyle Business Park...the list goes on for pages and pages more. This is just one list, there are other lists! I would be happy to source areas any company needs for buisness or trade of any type so please contact me if my help is required. As you can see there is clearly no shortage and no need what so ever to build more on green belt.	Do not build on green belt land. Use the land which has already been built for industrial use, and is available to hire imediately, as listed above. Do the right thing and please do not waste precious green belt land.	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1869	I support the growth of new development on this site when it has been proven that all reasonabily viable brownfield sites have been developed. I welcome the inclusion of policy wording to ensure that any development there is suatainable, but as this has a varied and quite a loose definition I feel that it would be essential for a Masterplan to be developed with very specific design and comminty infrastrcuture requirements included within it. For example highlighting a green corridoor of 20 meters either site of any known watercourse of water features, and an attractive linear parkway throughout the site. If your Authority is committed to planting rrees, then could you consider planning fruit or nut bearing trees, so that the community has a resource (a community orchard) rather than some trees that look green but are only useful for shading. Further requirements for community infrastructure including schools, community halls, sports facilities, local shopping facilities etc.. should all be part of the policy requirements for development at this location. There should be a range of propoerties at this location to meet the needs of local key workers such as nurses, teachers and other comparative	The plan should include specific policies to ensure delivery of my above concerns.	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp1896	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp1905	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1908	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1910	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1918	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1922	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1928	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1931	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1932	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1935	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1936	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1938	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1946	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1949	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1956	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1960	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1962	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1964	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1972	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1979	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1982	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1985	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp1990	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2002	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2006	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2014	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2018	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2022	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2029	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2032	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2034	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2036	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2042	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2047	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2051	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2064	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2066	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2077	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2086	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2088	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2096	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2099	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2103	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2113	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2114	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2118	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2122	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2131	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2137	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2140	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2141	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2147	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2152	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp2158			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2163			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2164			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2170			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2179			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2181			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2186			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2187			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2193			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2194			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2197			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2200			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2202			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2217			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2221			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2231			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2237			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2240			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2242			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2244			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2246			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2252			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2260			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2264			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2271			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2276			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2286			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2291			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2298			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2304			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2314			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2318			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2328			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2330			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2335			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2342			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2351			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2354			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2369			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2371			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2379			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2384			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2391			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2396			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2400	Mr Darren Clueit	Container Control Co-Ordinator @ BMW	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2403	Sarah Moult	VPS Administrator @ BMW Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2414			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp2417			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2422			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2427			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2436			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2440			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2443			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2448			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2453			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2461			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2468			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2471			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2474			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2481			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2487			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2506			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2508			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2510			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2514			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2519			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2522			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2526			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2529			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2536			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2541	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2545			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2560			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2566			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2583			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2591			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2593			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2595			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2606			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2611			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2622			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2625			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2634			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2641			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2654			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2659			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2669			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2675			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2681			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2690			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2699			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2710			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2712			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2714			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6

bp2721			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2724			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2727			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2728	Sally Maguire	Lead Advisor Natural England	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2729			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2742			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2749			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2803			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2806			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2813						Peddimore	GA6
bp2816			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2818			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2820			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2823	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2830			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2850			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2853			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2856			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2861			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp2863			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2870			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2875			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2885			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2892			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2894			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2901			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2903	Rt Hon Andrew Mitchell MP		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp2907			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2908			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2921			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2924			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2927			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2929			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2934			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2940			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2942			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2944			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2946			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2952			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2953			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2957			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2960			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2967			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp2973			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2977			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2979			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2984			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp2998			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp3006	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3013			No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3023			No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3026	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp3032	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3035	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3044	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3050	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3057	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3059	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3061	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3063	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3065	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3081	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3086	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3091	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3103	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3114	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3121	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3124	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3136	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3146	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3151	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3154	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3163	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3170	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3173	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3180	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3185	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3188	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3194	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3199	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3203	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3211	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3216	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3221	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3225	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3236	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3241			No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3248	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3254	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp3266	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3272	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3276	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3291	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3292	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3296	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3304	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3305	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3306	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3311	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3312	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp3314	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3316	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3318	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3320	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3322	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3331	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3337	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3339	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3342	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3347	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3354	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3403	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3414	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3416	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3422	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3429	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3435	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3441	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3447	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3450	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3457	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3460	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3463	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3487	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3489	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3493	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3495	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3499	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3501	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3507	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3514	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3521	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3528	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3531	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3532	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3537	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3541	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3545	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3548	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3555	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3557	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3573	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3581	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3583	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3586	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3589	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3593	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3595	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3603	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3605	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3613	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3617	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp3623	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3624	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3633	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3637	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3639	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3641	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3646	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3653	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3659	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3665	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3677	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3680	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3683	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3686	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3691	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3697	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3699	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3708	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3710	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3712	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3720	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3738	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3745	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3746	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3756	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3775	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3779	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3786	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3802	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3808	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3812	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3822	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3828	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3829	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3840	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3842	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3852	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp3857	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3866	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3867	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3871	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3873	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3876	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3880	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3882	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3883	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3888	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3892	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3896	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3899	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3902	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3907	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp3908	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3914	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3917	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3930	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3933	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3936	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3943	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3948	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3951	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3956	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3962	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3968	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3976	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3985	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3987	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp3997	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4001	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4002	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4004	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4007	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4011	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4019	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4027	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4035	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4039	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4041	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4045	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4051	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4054	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4062	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4064	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4066	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4069	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4075	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4080	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4089	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4090	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4093	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4097	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4109	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4118	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4131	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4134	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4142	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4154	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4161	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4166	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4169	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4174	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4179	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4184	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4189	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6

bp4194	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4199	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4204	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4209	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4214	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4219	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4224	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4225	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4230	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4237	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4240	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4245	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4253	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4260	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4278	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4284	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4302	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4309	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4316	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4319	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4327	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4336	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4337	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4342	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4348	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4351	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4356	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4360	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4363	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4364	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4374	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4375	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4381	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4393	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4398	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4404	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4410	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp4416	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4421	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4425	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4437	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4439	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4448	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4454	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4462	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4467	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4475	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4483	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp4487	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4506	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4510	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp4517	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp4523	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4525	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4537	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4539	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4544	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4548	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4550	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4556	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4561	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4567	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4575	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4577	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4579	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4581	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4583	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4592	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4600	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4602	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4604	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4610	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4611	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4615	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4617	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4619	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4621	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4625	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4632	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4635	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4637	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4639	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4645	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4654	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp4660	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4662	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4675	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4682	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4685	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4688	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4693	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4705	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4717	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4728	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4731	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4740	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4748	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4751	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4761	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4774	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4783	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4785	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4787	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4789	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp4793			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4801			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4803			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4805			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4808			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4809			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4812			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4815			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4827			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4832			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4836			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4843			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4845			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4849			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4854			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4857			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4858			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4868			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4870			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4875			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4879	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4892			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4898			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4902			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4909			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4911			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4916			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4920			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4928			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4934			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4941			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4943			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4954			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4957			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4961			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4968			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4975			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp4995			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5003			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5005			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5012			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5014			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5026			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5032			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5039			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5041			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5045			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5055			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5061			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5067			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5071			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5081			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp5084			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5091			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5093			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5102			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5104			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5106	Mrs Louise Baudet	Parish Council Clerk Curdworth Parish Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5109			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5129			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5132			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5142			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5148			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5150			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5154			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5156			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5157			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5160			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5161			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5170			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5171			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5175			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5182			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5187			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5195			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5204			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5207			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5214			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5220			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5228			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5236			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5243			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5247			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5254			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5260			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5261			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5266			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5274			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5278			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5280			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5284			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5289	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp5306			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5342	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5357			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5366			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp5370					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5374					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5376					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5381					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5382		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5389					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5391					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5392					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5401					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5410					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5412	Jennifer Smith	Marketing Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5422					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5424		Severn Trent Water Ltd	Mr Michael Askew	Senior Planner Lambert Smith Hampton	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5426					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5429	Mr Matthew Taylor	NDD midlands Asset Development Team Highways Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5433					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5437	Mr Matthew Bowers	Head of Planning and Regeneration Tamworth Borough Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5441					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5449					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5457					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5462					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5466					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5475					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5478					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5493					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5508					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5512	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5538					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5562					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5614					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5632					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5645					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5649					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5659					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp5673					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6

bp5677					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5686					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5694					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5709					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5717					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5723					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5730					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5737					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5742					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5749					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5765	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5782	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5791	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5806	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5851					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5856					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5866					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5870					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5878					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5888	Mr Nick Dawson	Connectivity Manager Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Peddimore	GA6
bp5907					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp5909					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5910					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5918					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5922		Acocks Green Neighbourhood Office			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5924					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5925					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5931					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5935					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5940					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Peddimore	GA6
bp5942					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp6018					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp6025					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Peddimore	GA6
bp202		Kiely Bros. Limited	Helen Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Bordesley Park	GA7

bp930			Having worked for many years in this area, I would welcome any investment that would improve the area an prospects of the residents.	Attention needs to be paid to transport links between Bordesley Green and the city centre, as this route is congested at all times.	No	Bordesley Park	GA7
bp1081	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Bordesley Park proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Bordesley Park	GA7
bp1151	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	Within the Bordesley Park Growth Area Boundary are: Birmingham and Warwick Junction Canal and Grand Union Canal. For clarification the River Rea has been denoted as a canal on the Spatial Plan which should amended. Wider areas of change have been identified adjacent to the Birmingham and Warwick Junction Canal on the Spatial Plan. Canal & River Trust would require any development in the areas of change which are adjacent to the canal to; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network. The waterways can be used as tools in place making and place shaping, and contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. Canal & River Trust would seek for any development to relate appropriately to the waterway and optimise the benefits such a location can generate for all parts of the community. We would welcome involvement in the production of an AAP for this area and the	For clarification the River Rea has been denoted as a canal on the Spatial Plan which should amended.	No	Bordesley Park	GA7
bp1223			Sensitive redevelopment of this area would be beneficial - IF the focus is on quality build. At least some sort of rapid transit has been considered and would be essential		No	Bordesley Park	GA7

bp1382			All AAP areas deserve the investment that is being assigned to them. Improve the residents living standards by renovating and improving existing housing alongside quality new builds. Provide employment by building required small and large industrial developments in the area and ensure the transport networks can cope with the new demands.		No	Bordesley Park	GA7
bp1393			The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13 with regards to the Duty to cooperate/Legal compliance. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. As this information is not available until spring 2014 it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Bordesley Park	GA7
bp1441			The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country and Worcestershire Branch) on behalf of the Inland Waterways Association is concerned that Policy GA7 does not include specific provision for the support and control of developments that affect or include the canals within the area. The canals provide a unique historic and open space environment that is a considerable asset for the area and the policy should reflect and encourage their protection and enhancement for the benefit of the area's community.	Policy GA7 should be amended to include specific provision for the protection and enhancement of the canals within the area, recognising their value as a unique historic and open space environment.	No	Bordesley Park	GA7
bp2543	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Bordesley Park	GA7
bp2834	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Bordesley Park	GA7

bp3018	Mr Philip Bond	The Tenants of Birmingham Wheels			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Bordesley Park	GA7
bp5337		Bovale Limited	Mr James Hollyman	Harris Lamb Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Bordesley Park	GA7
bp5445					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Bordesley Park	GA7
bp5518	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Bordesley Park	GA7
bp5793	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Bordesley Park	GA7
bp931					Very welcome news that this area is to be improved, drive around the Stetchford area to B&Q or McDonalds, and it is like the forgotten land, looking extremely neglected.	Don't undervalue the River Cole site, any open green area and waterway should be retained.	No	Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp1082	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Eastern Triangle proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp1224					Development on a former sewage site requires extensive and careful works. Enhancement of the Cole valley would be most beneficial as would improved transport links. It is not quite clear however as to what is going where in this extensive area.		No	Eastern Triangle	GA8

bp1358			The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp2544	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp2835	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp5516	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp5792	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Eastern Triangle	GA8
bp6007	Mr Andy Rasin	Hon Treasurer Yardley & District RFC	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Eastern Triangle	GA8

bp83	G. Davies	WWAM Writers Ltd	I remain concerned about plans to create on the Birmingham Battery site a Life Sciences campus and a replacement supermarket plus offices and other retail and leisure facilities, while also retaining use of the Triangle site for small-scale retail, office and other town centre uses. It would be highly counter-productive to implement these schemes at these locations without dramatically improving the road infrastructure leading to and from them. Even without the proposed new facilities, traffic already builds back from the Bristol Road and the Triangle site, causing long, slow-moving queues at rush hours, back down the hill towards and even alongside the University grounds. The half-completed relief road is already overloaded, and the proposed new facilities can only make the situation worse. In Northfield, by comparison, the new road is a genuine, complete by-pass which has much improved conditions within the shopping area. It is a success. In Selly Oak the core of the problem is the Selly Oak Triangle, which has been a bad idea from the beginning. Drivers coming from the south and seeking to enter Sainsbury's have to pass along two sides of it. When they leave, they have to pass along three	It would be highly counter-productive to implement these schemes at these locations without dramatically improving the road infrastructure leading to and from them.		Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp361			cycling routes. needs to be a properly dirctionally signed thought out cyle way linking up exsisitng cycle routes with the canal, the station, harborne, QE, and along the A38. dropped kerbs etc all need to be out in and surfaces maintained and swept! white paint just isnt good enough!	train city councillors and engineers to see roads froma cyclists view!!	No	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp932			Selly Oak is blighted by the busy A38 running through the middle of the town.	Selly Oak by-pass!	No	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp1083	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Selly Oak and South Edgbaston proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp1225	The Medical skills focus makes sense. Not necessarily the growth in office and retail, since changing habits may require less space.	Focus on housing needs	No	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp1353	The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp1443	The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country and Worcestershire Branch) on behalf of the Inland Waterways Association (IWA) fully supports that section of Policy GA9 which supports improvements to the canal network, including assistance towards the restoration of the Lapal Canal. This restoration will require continuing support and control within proposals for the development of the Birmingham Battery site and the IWA will continue to campaign in support of the restoration within this development.	None	No	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp1466	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	Within the Selly Oak and South Edgbaston Growth Area Boundary are the Worcester and Birmingham Canal and line of the former Lapal Canal. We note this policy requires development within this area to be supported by and where necessary contribute towards infrastructure including "…improvements to the canal network including assistance for the restoration of the Lapal Canal". The requirements of the policy should assist with the restoration of the Lapal Canal and further unlock the environmental, economic and social benefits offered by the canal network and canal restoration proposals. This is welcomed. We note that a blue dashed line has been delineated on the Spatial Plan but this is not identified within the key and it does not join up with the Worcester and Birmingham Canal. Its purpose should be clarified. It is important that any proposal associated with the blue dashed line does not adversely affect re-instatement of the Lapal Canal should development proposals be brought forward on the Battery site which lead to the Lapal Canal deviating from its original line, as seen in the current outline planning permission for the site. Development Sites and Wider areas of change are identified	The requirements of the policy should assist with the restoration of the Lapal Canal and further unlock the environmental, economic and social benefits offered by the canal network and canal restoration proposals. Recognise that the Canal & River Trust would require any development in the areas of change which are adjacent to the canal to; not adversely affect the integrity of the waterway structure, quality of the water, result in unauthorised discharges and run off or encroachment; detrimentally affect the landscape, heritage, ecological quality and character of the waterways; prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network.	No	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp2116			The proposal is being made on behalf of the Lapal Canal Trust We would like to suggest in the plan more being said about the intention to restore the Lapal Canal, or Dudley No 2 Canal as suggested by the Atkins proposal partly funded by the BCC in 2008. We believe the restoration project is a wonderful opportunity for improving Selly Oak and it would be encouraging to see this more clearly stated in the plan. We recognise the city's current commitment and support when provision for the canal restoration was made when renewing the Harborne Lane Bridge also more recently in insisting that the Battery Park development by Sainsbury's included provision for the Lapal Canal. The section of the report affected is the paragraphs dealing with Selly Oak and South Birmingham Pages 60 to 63. We would be happy to speak on the issue in public if this is helpful and to give more detail of the planned restoration.	We would suggest adding an additional paragraph on page 60: 5.101A In Selly Oak the Sainsbury development and Harborne Lane Bridge reconstruction provide for the restoration of the Lapal Canal, BCC is committed to assist CRT and the Lapal Canal Trust in the restoration of the canal and the route to Halesowen will be protected. The restoration will provide an attractive pedestrian and cycle route to Woodgate Valley Country Park and will open up the remains of a 700 year old moated medieval Manor house (Weoley Castle) as an additional tourist attraction. Further along the route of the restored canal the Atkins Consultancy proposal identified the California site for housing and Marina development creating business and employment opportunities. In the policy statement we would suggest adding an additional few words in red to cover steps to be made to protect the route of the canal. This seems a necessary action to support the restoration provision already made in Selly Oak and it should form part of the plan "Improvements to the natural environment, completion of key missing	Yes	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp2548	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	As with the aforementioned policies, this has the Bourn Brook missing from the Plan 12 even though it says River on the key. The Bourn Brook used to host a population of water voles so connectivity and protected species issues need to be considered as well. It is an important wildlife corridor between Woodgate Valley and Cannon Hill Park. In light of this, improvements to the natural environment specified within the policy need to include the Bourn Brook as well and not just the canal.	We recommend this is reworded as follows: • Improvements to the natural environment, including improvements to the Bourn Brook corridor to encourage habitat connectivity between Woodgate Valley and Cannon Hill Park, completion of key missing links in the City's Linear Open Space walkway network, and improvements to the canal network including assistance for the restoration of the Lapal Canal.		Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp2781		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	The aspects of Policy GA9 addressing the economic, research and health role of Selly Oak and South Edgbaston are important in ensuring the development needs and wider aspirations of the City are met. The policy should be worded to ensure they form a central element of the wider enhancement of the area over the plan period. The inclusion of up to 25,000 sq m (gross) of comparison floorspace is excessive. This point is dealt with in more detail elsewhere, in comments relating to Policy TP20. Briefly, however, retail development at this level does not reflect the needs of this part of Birmingham and as such is inconsistent with advancing the most appropriate strategy. A corollary of this is that there is no need to allow for comparison retail development on the Battery Retail Park site. The need for Selly Oak can be met on the southern end of the Birmingham Battery site, where planning permission has already been granted. Further strengthening of the retail function of the separate retail park is not justified.	Text should be added as a new paragraph below the first three bullet points to read, “These initiatives form a central element of the wider enhancement of the area. All proposals should, where appropriate, support their delivery. Proposals should not undermine their delivery.” Text in the fourth bullet point should be amended to read, “up to 21,000 sq m (gross) of comparison retail floorspace, including any comparison retail floorspace in food stores” (see further discussion in comments on Policy TP20). The words, “comparison retail,” should be deleted from the bullet point dealing with the Battery Retail Park.	Yes	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp2836	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			see attached: Centro supports the economic regeneration of the Selly Oak and South Edgbaston Area and welcomes Policy GA9.	see attached: However, as this is an Economic Zone and one of the West Midlands busiest stations, Centro request that the University Station and Selly Oak Interchange enhancements are fully recognised and acknowledged in Development Plan Policy. Centro also request that the section "improvements to access for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, including enhancements to the rail station" should be rephrased to "improvements to access for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, including enhancements to University and Selly Oak rail stations".		Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp5334	Universitys Hospital NHS Trust	Mr Nick Hardy	Director GVA	University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Trust (the Trust) is continuing an ongoing process of significant development on its Metchley Park Road and Selly Oak Hospital estates. In recent years the Trust has completed the QEHB development and has secured planning permission for the residential redevelopment of the Selly Oak Hospital site. Other development projects have been carried out on the UHB Trust Estate, and are planned, and the activities of the Trust continue to contribute significantly to the economic wellbeing of the City. The Trust delivers first class healthcare facilities, and significant job opportunities, within high quality development, fully supporting the City Council's objectives for delivering growth in this part of the City. The Trust notes and supports the numerous references to the importance of its activities in the future prosperity of the City. These are most particularly set out within Chapter 5, and in Policy GA9 Selly Oak and South Edgbaston, and its supporting text. The Trust supports the focus in GA9 on the promotion of the area for major regeneration and investment, including at the Life Sciences campus, the University of Birmingham and the new QE Hospital campus area which will remain	The Trust proposes that paragraph 5.109 should clarify the relationship between the BDP and SPD so that it is clear on what basis development management decisions will be taken.		Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp5521	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	We agree with the view that Selly Oak should be developed and regenerated for mix of uses and different types of economic activity should be developed in the area. We note that the policy states quite specific plans to finish off the Selly Oak New Road. However the package of enhancements and improvements for public transport pedestrians and cyclists seem quite vague by comparison. We hope that enhancements for pedestrians does not mean more street furniture and barriers which make any centre less friendly to pedestrians, and less space for people. The proposed developments in Selly Oak risk causing problems on the current system, particularly the road network. In order to avoid the danger of new developments resulting in ever increasing numbers of cars using the road network, we need comprehensive active and public transport provision in and around Selly Oak. A good cycle network and an increase in public transport provision are a must if there is a sizeable increase in developments. Bus Rapid Transit as advocated in the Birmingham Mobility Action Plan would provide a second rapid transit to the city centre. If new houses are developed on the old hospital site then this	Not specified.	Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp5624	Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	Representing a significant change in style from the Core Strategy Consultation Draft (2010), the spatial element of the BDP includes only one policy for each of these 'areas' earmarked for growth. For some reason, there is no policy for Edgbaston, despite the significant role it can play compared to other district centres shown on the plan such as Northfield and Erdington. As a consequence, some of the detailed policy guidance previously contained in the Core Strategy Consultation Draft is no longer included. We consider this is an omission which makes the BDP unsound, on the basis that it does not positively plan for the area's development. Policy GA9 'Selly Oak and South Edgbaston' only covers the University campus and Queen Elizabeth Hospital sites and therefore none of the significant Calthorpe Estate holdings which include strategic growth locations such as Pebble Mill, Edgbaston District Centre and the Hagley Road corridor, Edgbaston Mill and Warwickshire County Cricket Ground; mall of which were previously subject to detailed policy guidance in the previous Core Strategy Consultation Draft. Policy PG1 'Overall Levels of Growth' sets ambitious growth targets which Edgbaston can	In summary, Calthorpe Estates considers that a new policy should be added to the plan to reflect the substantial potential for the Edgbaston area to contribute to achieving the levels of growth set out in Policy PG1, covering the Medical Quarter, Pebble Mill, Edgbaston Mill, WCCC, the Hagley Road Corridor and Edgbaston District Centre, as well as the potential for up to 2,000 new homes.		Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9

bp5832		c/o Turley (Harvest Partnership)	Ms Susie Rolls	Senior Planner Turley	Policy GA9 – Selly Oak and South Edgbaston Our client supports the overall thrust of Policy GA9 which seeks to maximise investment potential and deliver the major regeneration of the Selly Oak and South Edgbaston spatial area (the extent of which is defined by Plan 13). In particular, the policy seeks to harness activities associated with medical technology in the Life Sciences sector in order to further enhance the City's future economic competitiveness. The Policy also clearly recognises the need for further investment and enhancement to improve the diversity, vitality and viability of the retail offer at Selly Oak District Centre. In relation to this, capacity is identified for 'up to 25,000 sqm (gross) of comparison retail floorspace'. Working with the Council, our client has recently secured planning permission for a major new Life Sciences Campus alongside new retail floorspace to help strengthen Selly Oak District Centre (Ref: 2013/02178/PA). However, the policy should recognise that the realisation of these objectives is finely balanced, particularly given the extensive infrastructure and environmental improvements required to regenerate the area. The Policy should recognise not only the need	The policy should recognise that the realisation of the regeneration objectives is finely balanced, particularly given the extensive infrastructure and environmental improvements required to regenerate the area. The Policy should recognise not only the need for further retail development but also the valued contribution that this will make in delivering the overall policy aspirations for Selly Oak and Edgbaston.		Selly Oak and South Edgbaston	GA9
bp3					invest in cycle and sports facilities in cofton park. link cycle routes it to the lickey hills and route 5			Longbridge	GA10
bp933					I think the development of this site is welcome, although the design and architecture of some of the new buildings are questionable.	Increased controls on future developments and notice taken of public opinion on designs.	No	Longbridge	GA10
bp1085	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the Longbridge proposals by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Longbridge	GA10

bp1227	Regeneration here is obvious and underway. Improved transport links are needed - the cross city line is neither reliable nor 24/7. Consider improving leisure facilities.		No	Longbridge	GA10
bp1354	The Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered for growth. As per my comments in section 13. The Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth (SPRG) is still being prepared by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) in parallel with the 'Strategy for Growth'. This is expected to be ready in the spring 2014. A SPRG is supposed to provide context for local plans it is a 20 year plan looking at the distribution of growth across the greater Birmingham and Solihull region. This information is not available until spring 2014 and therefore it is unclear how the BDP has been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements for both employment and housing needs.	Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for spatial delivery for growth be considered sound.	No	Longbridge	GA10

bp2357	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL	See attached: BDC supports the inclusion of the Longbridge site as an important development location, and remains committed to bring it forward over the coming years in line with the policies in the adopted Area Action Plan (AAP). BDC would like to stress that Development at Longbridge needs to remain in accordance with the proposals in the AAP unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As BCC are aware the plan went through significant stages in its production to ensure that the mix of development on site would not only regenerate the local area, but also compliment other surrounding locations ensuring their continued viability and vitality, particularly those close by in Rubery and Bromsgrove. Should development move away from that which is planned, and particularly if retail uses become more prominent then there is a serious risk that development at Longbridge could undermine the success or regeneration of other areas both in and outside the City. BDC is aware and understand though its continued engagement with BCC over Longbridge that flexibility is required in the context of some of the AAP policies, as has been demonstrated by a number of the schemes which have been	See attached BDC would like to stress that Development at Longbridge needs to remain in accordance with the proposals in the AAP unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Of particular concern are what appears to be the current aspirations of the developers to move away from an employment and housing led regeneration scheme, to more of a housing and retail led scheme. New retail proposals over and above agreed levels should be refused. Expect the residential element of this development including the east works in Bromsgrove to be completed before consideration is given to any greenfield development in or around this location.	Longbridge	GA10
bp2550	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	These proposals are based upon the adopted AAP which has achieved substantial benefits for the water environment. Longbridge should be held as an exemplar for climate change adaptation as detailed within the Green living Spaces Plan. Works undertaken through redevelopment include watercourse improvements including deculverting and green infrastructure measures to provide flood risk, WFD, water quality, amenity and leisure benefits. This is what the rest of the city should aspire to, with particular regard to the River Rea flowing through the Southern Gateway (another area highly susceptible to the impacts of climate change).	Longbridge should be held as an exemplar for climate change adaptation as detailed within the Green living Spaces Plan.	Longbridge	GA10

bp2782	St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	Policy GA 10 relates to Longbridge. It essentially cross-references to the policy of the Longbridge Area Action Plan (AAP) suggesting that development will be brought forward in line with the AAP. However the AAP was adopted in 2009 and prepared against a different planning policy context to the emerging BDP. The National Planning Policy Framework has established a fundamentally new approach to planning for sustainable development and this together with a number of new statutory provisions creates clear tensions with what could reasonably be considered to be now out of date policy in the AAP. The AAP should be consistent with Policy within the BDP and take its reference from it. It should also be consistent with the NPPF and latest statute. A review of the AAP to take into account the NPPF and the emerging context of the new BDP would result in significant changes to the AAP. The BDP should refer to the need for review of the AAP. Further, it is not clear from the emerging BDP as to which policy proposals override AAP policy given that many inconsistencies arise including principally the following; - The Longbridge Infrastructure Tariff (LIT) is particularly relevant here as the BDP is	The BDP should acknowledge that policy within the AAP is out of date in some aspects and in need of review. Policy GA10 should be re-written to establish a new policy context for Longbridge and replace policy within the AAP to ensure that policy for Longbridge is both consistent with the NPPF and with the emerging BDP. The new policy should define Longbridge as a District Centre Growth Point with a further allowance for 25,000 sq m gross of additional comparison retail floorspace.	Yes	Longbridge	GA10

bp2837	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	Centro believe that sustainable means of transport will support the continued regeneration of Longbridge. As per the Longbridge Area Action Plan, Centro's Longbridge Connectivity Scheme is seen as the first step towards energising Longbridge's economy and providing the transport infrastructure and gateways required not only to unlock its potential as an attractive and competitive destination but also to stimulate development and inward investment. Centro would suggest that reference is made to the need to improve connectivity in this area and deliver a gateway into Longbridge. Connectivity enhancements will enhance the station and its surrounding environment, improve bus services through the sites and deliver a wayfinding strategy which in turn will improve Longbridge's quality of place and connect neighbourhoods to employment opportunities. All connectivity enhancements should therefore be noted in Policy GA10.	Centro would suggest that reference is made to the need to improve connectivity in this area and deliver a gateway into Longbridge. All connectivity enhancements should therefore be noted in Policy GA10.	Longbridge	GA10

bp5797	Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	Aldi Stores is actively seeking representation with the Longbridge Area and is pursuing a development proposal to regenerate the site to the east of Bournville College Construction Training Centre. Aldi is seeking to develop a mixed use proposal, in partnership with Bournville College, which will deliver food retail and purpose built student accommodation at what is a highly accessible location near to Bournville College itself and allocated neighbourhood centre. This is considered to accord with the regeneration and growth priorities of Policy GA10 (and policy TP32). NPPF states that the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity and ensure that the planning system does not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Investment in business should not be overburdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations. Aldi note its site at Bristol Road South lies within the emerging Regional Investment Site (RIS)area. Aldi object to the current Policy TP17 wording which limits development at the RIS to, principally, Class B1, B2 and ancillary warehousing. It stipulates complementary facilities to the above classes will be supported.	Aldi Stores Ltd propose the rewording of the policy to include: 'Facilities such as leisure facilities, retail and conferencing facilities and other main town centre uses will be supported but only at an appropriate scale and in accordance with the sequential approach to site selection, whilst also having regard to matters relating to impact'. The proposed changes will ensure the thrust of the policy accords with prevailing guidance set out in the NPPF.	No	Longbridge	GA10

bp5833	c/o Turley (Harvest Partnership)	Ms Susie Rolls	Senior Planner Turley	Policy GA10 - Longbridge Policy GA10 refers to and briefly summaries and reinforces the objectives of the adopted AAP for Longbridge, which has a planned level of growth to include 1,450 new homes, 13,500 sqm gross of comparison retail floorspace and 10,000 sqm of office (B1a) floorspace. It is our view that the AAP should continue in guiding and determining future development proposals at Longbridge in line with its intended role as a Local Centre, as defined in paragraph 7.22 of the Birmingham Plan Submission Document. In order to achieve this, we consider that Policy TP20 should be amended as highlighted below to ensure that Longbridge's role does not grow beyond a Local Centre into that expected of a District Centre or to an extent that would have a detrimental effect on other designated District, Sub-Regional and Regional Centres within the retail hierarchy/network of centres as listed in paragraph 7.22. To achieve this, the retail and other use maximum floorspace figures apportioned to that centre must not be exceeded.	It is considered that the level of retail and office floorspace (sqm gross) should be stated, where possible, in Policy TP20 for centres where the figures are known or expressed in other guidance and policy documents published by the Council.		Longbridge	GA10
bp23				Global temperatures are not rising. Those who advocate this are misusing statistics for the own ends, there is a whole industry that depends on perpetuating the myth of global warming. I do however fully support the reduction of air pollution & strongly support tree planting (to absorb carbon dioxide).	The building of 5000 homes in the green belt will increase air pollution due to increased mileage of car journeys on congested roads. Therefore these homes should not be built.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp25				hydro electric dams...we seem to have a lot of rivers...look at encouraging and supporting urban farming local street growing lets cut our food miles and build communities! more tree planting...trees for fuel and trees for food !			Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp135				Why, in a manufacturing city, has Birmingham decided to reduce its CO2 output by 60%? How was the figure of 60% established as feasible and reasonable	Provide details of how and why the level of CO2 reduction was set at 60% and by whom.	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp438				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp550	How come when it comes to human development, a detailed map outlining where this human development will occur is made available in this plan but when it comes to the section regarding non-human development there is no map, no identifiable plan and no mention of the contradiction that the human development that is being enforced in other sections of this plan are actually reducing non-human development within Birmingham.	Make clear that a contradiction exists in that other sections of this plan highlights increased human development therefore overall non-human development is going to be reduced. Additionally highlight that this decision is in accordance with the undemocratic decision to promote within this plan the growth and redevelopment of existing green infrastructure rather than promote the utility and redevelopment of underutilised existing grey infrastructure.	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp596	Proposals to develop in the green belt on the edge of the conurbation are inconsistent with reducing the city's carbon footprint as they will increase the need to travel. The only options for travel between the proposed green belt development and urban centres will be via fossil fuel powered vehicles, which are inherently unsustainable and will increase the city's carbon footprint.	The green belt development should be removed from the proposals.	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp671	The section that mentions investment in trees and woodland should be expanded to include hedges and permanent grassfields particularly waterlogged peaty areas as the most recent research has shown these to be effective carbon sinks. It is also the case that many recycling depots have been shown to export their products to the third world for reuse. There have also been large fires are recycling works in the last 2 years. These matters dissipate the effectiveness of the carbon reduction methods and in some way need to be mentioned in the land use plans. There should be mention of measures that will be promoted, guided and supported in conservation areas for carbon reduction measures so that solar, wind and biomass are feasible in such areas.	The relevant paragraphs in this section could be widened to incorporate issues to do with the management of recycling sites, the including of grass and hedges in carbon sinks and a new line relating to listed buildings and conservation areas.	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp697					The evidence of climate change has been thrust upon us recently. Building 6000 family homes on Green belt land will: A) encourage growth of the carbon footprint by people having to commute to Birmingham, Tamworth and Lichfield and other places to work, by car. Adding further congestion on the roads and more pollution. B) destroy farm land which is full of wildlife and employs people who grow crops to sell. This land acts as a spnge which soaks up flood water. C) remove much needed green environment which is used for leisure pursuits; cycling, walking, etc, needed to maintain a healthy population.	Leave the Green belt intact. Build on wasteland, brownfield sites and utilise empty properties. The infrastructure is already there, so will not impact on our carbon footprint, and will create a more desirable environment for the existing residents. REGENERATION IS THE BEST ENVIRONMENTAL AND FINANCIAL OPTION FOR US ALL.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp848	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	6.2 Birmingham City University does not have accurante data from 1990 and, given that the carvon reduction target is a challenging one and unachievable without the support of organisations across the City, we would question the ability of this policy to be implemented and operated from a 1990 baseline.			Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp934					I am pleased that Birmingham City Council are in favour of tackling Climate change, which all informed academics now believe to be a fact.	Building on the Green belt would seem to be at odds with tackling climate change and becoming a green city.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp998					There is a lot that is very good in this. it would also be good to require development to take account of the natural features of a particualr site so as to minimise energy use. eg orientation, landsacaping, wind, water flows, shade etc	Add statement on making the best use of site specifics to minimise energy usage	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1087	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to reducing the city's carbon footprint by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect & energy use) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity.			Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp1198	building large estates or international factory's will require additional road links and thus increase the carbon foot print large international companies tend to follow development grant subsidy and offer only short term employment as they will relocate globally if the economic carrot is sufficient..	look at using the existing land and encourage work within the city near to the existing population centers rather than easy option green belt sites	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1228	People cause an increase in carbon footprint. Planning for population growth is planning for a higher carbon footprint. That is the greatest threat to society globally. Renewable energy and reducing waste is very positive but has limited potential (and often a high amount of embodied carbon content before generation) whilst the main power generation companies have been sold off, so control of that is difficult. We will need electricity, probably from nuclear, to power trams and trains to reduce car and bus emissions..	Greater planning for trams and trains. Plan for fewer people.	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1262	Policy TP1 - This should also include retention of Green Belt protection to all lands curently designated and the protection of Country Park land . Item 6.4 , 2nd bullet point "Creating more local renewable energy." Consider how council owned land on the Green Belt could be used to grow bio-fuels (in an environmentally sustainable way)	Re Policy TP1 - include refrence to the protection of Green Belt and Country Park land. Revise any element of the plan that would damage either existing land areas. Re Item 6.4 , 2nd bullet point "Creating more local renewable energy." Consider how council owned land on the Green Belt could be used to grow bio-fuels (in an environmentally sustainable way) * * *

bp1368	This part of the plan is contradictory. I refer to Policy TP1 and TP7, and fail to see how the writers of this plan can claim to support the expansion of trees and woodland, yet propose to build on an existing and well established trees and woodland. Neither can I imagine how the producers of this plan intend to reduce C02 emissions and carbon footprint whilst setting out to encourage 6,000 as a minimum but more likely 12 - 18,000 extra cars to the area, as the average household has 2 cars. Regarding cycling, thats a huge amount of cycle paths, because the poor cyclist does not stand a chance against all this extra traffic, or maybe they do because the traffic will probably be at a standstill.	The plan needs rethinking. The writers need to meet with groups who really understand these issues and how to properly coordinate a policy to protect our environment.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1383	A positive section of the plan that the majority if not all Birmingham residents will agree with and aspire to. The final bullet point of TP1 recognises the importance of trees and woodland in the carbon reducing process. It is important to note that the same can be said for the entire Green Belt.	The Green Belt, crop producing or otherwise, should be recognised as a helpful factor in reducing the carbon footprint.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1399	The plan and supporting documents have not made it clear how building the Langley SUE and employment zone will help to reduce the City's carbon footprint. The infrastructure proposed will in fact increase congestion and capacity and emissions; there are also too many uncertainties associated with infrastructure and service provision much is dependent upon scale and master planning proposals (e.g.mix of development) to make this policy currently plausible. One huge uncertainty is for example: Railways are supposed to be the focus of sustainable travel in this plan, however in the opening of the Sutton park line is only considered " desirable" There are also uncertainties associated with existing services, transport and the impacts locally and cumaltively.	More detail is required on the provision of what will constitute a sustainable transport infrastructure one which is committed to reducing the City's carbon footprint or one that has focus on the real issue which is " mitigating " the impact on current air pollution levels. Uncertainty be removed from the existing service provision and to be provision for the new developments.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1514	Support			Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp1691				The proposals for housing in the green belt will not support the plan in terms of the objective to improve how we travel and get around the city because they are located in an area which is not served by rail links and not well served by bus services. The area is also too far from employment areas to facilitate walking or cycling.	Reconsider plans to build housing in Sutton Coldfield and re-prioritise provisions f housing above retail and office accommodation.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1702	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton	Whilst acknowledging the importance of reducing energy consumption and the generation of waste, the associated policies should not place an undue pressure on new developments. Most new buildings, particularly on previously developed land, achieve significantly reduced levels of energy consumption by comparison to the buildings being replaced. Redevelopment should, therefore, be encouraged from this point of view. As the Country moves out of a recession, the viability of many development scheme remains fragile. Therefore, there should not be a requirement over and above those set out in building regulations in terms of energy efficiency performance. Notwithstanding this, most buildings that will be exposed to the investment market will generally need to have decent green credentials. Therefore, the costs of improving energy efficiencies must be acknowleged and offset in any viability modelling.		Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1724				Whilst I commend BCC for their positive approach to reduce the carbon footprint, it seems to me that to build new homes and increase use of roads to/from work, School, shopping and increase use of public transport that this proposal is a little at odds with itself.		No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp1746	By building an additional 6,000 homes on the boundary of Sutton Coldfield, the need for more people to commute into Birmingham City Centre will increase. At present the area around Sutton Coldfield/Walmley is already heavily congested during both the morning and evening rush hours. Adding an additional junction to the A38 does not increase the actual road capacity, and thus does not improve the flow of trafffic.. The bus lane on the A38 was abolished many years ago in order to reduce congestion, so re-instating it will only increase the traffic and therefore the pollution. The idea of re-instating the old Sutton Park train line as a commuter railway is a good one, but there is zero funding set aside for this and it is merely seen as desirable rather than essential. Therefore, building an additional 6000 houses on Sutton Coldfield green belt land will increase rather than decrease the carbon footprint.	Birmingham City Council should make more of an effort to bring back into use all of the empty houses that there currently are across the city. In addition to this, developing on the numerous brownfield sites that stand empty will mean that the spread of additional commuters will be more evenly distributed, and they will also be served by better public transport links. All Brownfield sites should be looked at before deciding to build 6,000 in an area where the transport infrastructure cannot support it.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp1824	6.1 The plan states ensuring sustainable development and dealing with the impacts of climate change will be central to the BDP. Also that the council is commited to a 60% reduction in carbon dioxide emmissions produced by the city by 2026. I understand that Birmingham is only 15% greenbelt. I also understand that greenbelt land used for farming is reducing CO2 emmissions in two ways. Firstly there is no polution entering the atmosphere from the crops which grow on the land. Secondly as the city is able to produce food locally less food has to be brought into the city by road etc, and so less CO2 is created by the city. How then can deciding to build on a large portion of that remaining greenbelt help to reduce the CO2 emmissions of the city? Surley the re-generation of old, unused land and empty buildings with new efficient ones, would have the desired, positive effect on CO2 emmissions of the city?	Instead of planning to build on valuable greenbelt land this plan needs to address re-generation issues for our city. Indeed the country as a whole should not be considering to build on greenbelt land, which will be lost for ever, but should instead be looking at how to improve what we already have, to make better and modernize not to destroy our green and pleasant land. Remember planners look back to the blocks of flats of the 60's with much regret, we dont need another 1960 plan.	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp1893					61 & 6.2 Global temperature has hardly risen this century. It isn't at all clear that human emissions of CO2 are driving climate temperature to anything like the degree that people worried about. There is no great urgency or need to drastically reduce CO2 emissions, especially given that our modern society runs on fossil fuels. And it follows that there is no great need for Birmingham to 'lead the way', in a suicidal and impossible bid to cut emissions by 60%. If this were achieved it would cost The City hugely in terms of energy price increases, and lost business and amenity.	6.1-6.2 If The City must have a CO2 reduction target make it practical and attainable, and ensure that it is cost-effective. So-called renewable energy should only be introduced where and when it is cost-effective. Other cities in the UK and elsewhere are not going to follow Birmingham. If this isn't done, and the impossible target of 60% is attempted, the people of Birmingham will pay a huge price in terms of energy costs, and lost business. The even attempt 60% reduction is tantamount to committing economic suicide. Please delete the whole section on carbon footprint reduction until such time as this could be done practically and cost-effectively	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp2644					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp2663					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp2783		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp2887					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp2910					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp3171					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp3176					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp3186					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp3791					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp4146					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp4151					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp4930					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp5133					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp5479					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp5524	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1

bp5667				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp5783	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp5819		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Reducing the City's carbon footprint	TP1
bp26				everyone I know who works in air conditioned offices always seem to get ill perhaps the spread of viruses need to be tackled within those systems tree planting will help with the flooding surely and provide fruit and fuel			Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp94				leave the green belt alone, you should not be planning to create green spaces while you plan to build on virgin green belt land, that supports nature, clean air and well being. plant extra trees its amazing the good they do, cool the climate , clean the air , help wildlife, supports many insects etc	leave green belt alone, plant trees where possible, develop the brown field and derelict sites		Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp136				Para 6.8 is not proved, there are now clear indications that this won't happen Para 6.9 - it does not require a study to show that a city is hotter than rural surroundings. How does the taking of green belt land for industrial development fit with these aspirations to be seen as green and address so called climate change	Remove this section from the plan. Building on green belt is not quite the right thing to do to address any concerns in this area	Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp251				I refer to points 6.9 and 6.10 and Policy TP2 – Can you explain how developing green belt land for industrial development, applies to these ideals and sets out to address climate change ? This section of your plan is contradictory.	Get rid of this section from the plan. Building on green belt is not the way to address Climate Change. It seems a clear case of do as I say, not as I do, and makes a mockery of the Cities own Climate Change policy	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2

bp552			How come when it comes to human development, a detailed map outlining where this human development will occur is made available in this plan but when it comes to the section regarding non-human development there is no map, no identifiable plan and no mention of the contradiction that the human development that is being enforced in other sections of this plan are actually reducing non-human development within Birmingham.	Make clear that a contradiction exists in that other sections of this plan highlights increased human development therefore overall non-human development is going to be reduced. Additionally highlight that this decision is in accordance with the undemocratic decision to promote within this plan the growth and redevelopment of existing green infrastructure rather than promote the utility and redevelopment of underutilised existing grey infrastructure.	Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp672			The development of a 1 ha lake in the city centre near Digbeth would help in the urban cooling and heating agenda and should be incorporated into the the plans		Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp783			We have just experienced some of wettest weather and resulting floods since records began. I am not an expert but common sense says that as you cover green spaces with concrete and destroy trees that absorb gallons of water man made flooding is inevitable. The water has to go somewhere!	Follow the lead of Berkshire county council who have already abandoned plans to build thousands of new homes on flood plains. Think of the long term future of the environment and the area - leave the Green Belt alone!	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp813	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	Urban Greening is a very laudable aim and there are very good suggestions in this section but "the elephant in the room" is the proposal for large-scale development in the Green Belt. Covering open fields with concrete and bricks and mortar will do nothing to help offset the effects of climate change: the increased traffic movement will contribute to warming and hard surfaces will contribute to surface run-off. It seems especially unfortunate that much of the land under threat (Peddimore and Langley) is productive agricultural land, the only Grade 3 such in the city. Keeping farmland really is "sustainable".	At least acknowledge that the land under threat is productive arable, not just some convenient open space.	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp935			I am pleased that Birmingham City Council wish to address the issue of global Warming and climate change.	Again, building on Green belt land does not seem to fit with these policies.	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp997			use site specific natural environemnt	Add developers will be expected to respond to any site specific aspects so as to maximise the energy beneifts and minimise harm to other buildings.	Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2

bp1088	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to helping Birmingham adapt to climate change by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1152	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The policy states "Where applicable, maintain and enhance the canal network to reflect the canals role in urban cooling." which is welcomed by Canal & River Trust. We consider that one of the canals' multi-functional roles is the benefits the network can provide for urban cooling. The water and vegetation the canal network provides assists in offsetting urban heat island effect. Enhancement of the canal networks' ecological resources would be beneficial to achieving the requirements of this policy.		No	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1185			I do not understand your train of thought in 6.9 and 6.10 (with reference to TP2). How does developing Green Belt land for industrial development begin to address climate change? This section of your plan is contradictory.	Take this section from the plan. Building on Green Belt is not the way to address climate change.	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1229			Excellent objectives. So we build on the green belt? Seems incongruent.	Realign policies. Ensure new build is carbon neutral and that refurbishment reduces carbon footprint	Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2

bp1263	Policy TP2, 2nd and 3rd bullet points "Promoting and enhancing a green infrastructure network in the City (Policy TP7). Protecting the natural environment and promoting and enhancing biodiversity and ecosystems (Policy TP8)." How can the city council paln to remove Green Belt status from land in order to build houses and emploment sites given its apparent aims to protect such land? Item 6.10 "Urban greening can make a significant contribution to reducing the effects of urban heating. " So why is the council seeking to reduce the amount of green land by removing Green Belt status from significant areas of land? Concreting and Tarmacing over a large green area while claiming to want to promote green areas shows that the plan is badly thought out and instead of seeing overarching policies as a citywide matter, the paln seekls to pick and choose what policies are in effect in different areas.	Re Policy TP2 - this policy should actually be followed in the current plan, and Green Belt status should not be removed from any land currently designated as such. Re Item 6.10 - retain green belt protection on land and also on country parks. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of	Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1384	A positive section of the plan that the majority if not all Birmingham residents will agree with and aspire to. The third bullet point of TP2 recognises the importance of protecting the natural environment in managing the affects of climate change. It is important to note that the same benefits can be harnessed from the entire Green Belt. Cooling temperatures and absorbing rainfall. Any new Birmingham developments will add to the detrimental affects of climate change. Drives and patios should be laid with permeable paving blocks to avoid flooding risks.	The importance of the Green Belt should be built into this section of the plan. It plays such an important part in the managing of climate change and the avoidance of flooding.	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2

bp1416	The plan contradicts itself.: 6.9 - states we are a densely built urban area; 6.10 - projections for the future are that there average temperatures will rise which will have serious implications. To be mitigated by " green living spaces ", creating a green network. The proposed strategy for growth however is to remove a significant proportion of green fields from the Green Belt for both a housing development and employment zone. It is unclear how removing significant amount of the green belt will assist this policy.	A more consistent and less contradictory approach to the plans creation and its policy's within is required.	Yes	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1467	6.8 - Don't make me laugh, this isn't going to happen. 6.9 - Yes cities are hotter than rural areas. This has been known for years and doesn't need yet another study to prove it. 6.10 - All the so called predictions have been wrong so far by a significant margin. The implications are minimal. Even if what has been laid out in the document is true, building on the green belt is the exact opposite of what is needed.			Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1515	Strongly support urban greening in all forms. But the City Council needs a tree planting budget!!			Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1725	I am not sure how BCC can realistically comprehend how building on the green bet and within the vicinity of flood plains can hope to reduce and manage the effects of climate change. I thin we will be seriously at risk of potential problems as we have seen over recent months in other areas. Once the building work is done, the damage will be done. We need to ensure that any new homes- if we are to have them - are built with gardens and residents not allowed to get rid of naturally occurring abilities to reduce flood risk.		No	Adapting to climate change	TP2

bp1760			6.7 In view of the recent weather experienced by the UK I cannot believe the council are so irresponsible as to consider building upon this Green Belt land. During the recent rains there has been flooding between the Oak and Ash estate and Honebase. This is with all the land under threat of development currently as fields. Can you imagine the situation had all that land not been fields which absorb vast quantities of water and instead being covered with 1000's of houses, roads, pavements and other building which would simply have had the water running off into Minworth and Walmley. The flood risk is glaringly obvious to anyone willing to consider the relative absorbency of fields compared to houses and roads.	The flood risk of covering this land with concrete needs to be specifically investigated by independent experts taking into account the extreme weather we have experienced over the last few years .		Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1836	miss victoria bankes price	Woodland Trust	We welcome the recognition that woods and trees can make a real contribuition to climate change adaptation.	Woods and trees can contribute even more than set out in the policy. For example: Air quality - Trees further improve air quality through the adsorption of particulates from vehicle emissions and other sources – such that it has been estimated that doubling the tree cover in the West Midlands alone would reduce mortality as a result of poor air quality from particulates by 140 people per year. (Stewart, H., Owen S., Donovan R., MacKenzie R., and Hewitt N. (2002). Trees and Sustainable Urban Air Quality. Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Lancaster University)	No	Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp1888			See early comments on 6.1 and 6.2			Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp2551	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Adapting to climate change	TP2
bp5784	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Adapting to climate change	TP2

bp87	Mr Tim Turner	Chair Grove Residents Association	Mr Tim Turner	Chair Grove Residents Association	There are a large number of private properties within the older Victorian inner city neighbourhoods of Birmingham that need 'renewable retrofit' projects, but which are not likely to be improved without some scheme to provide help and incentives. It would be good to see a commitment to improve the carbon footprint of these dwellings and move them towards the use of renewable sources of energy.	A commitment to work to bring the private housing sector along with the Social housing sector in some measure.	No	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp137					Developers will be encouraged to find innovative solutions to achieve the standards set out in this policy. - How?	Provide details not just vague aspiration and subject headings	Yes	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp673					:)			Sustainable construction	TP3
bp849	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	6.14 BREEAM is a good method of assessing all round sustainability and Birmingham City University welcomes the inclusion of its requirements.			Sustainable construction	TP3
bp936					All new developments need to be sustainable as a matter of urgency. But many of us live in older properties.	More consideration should be given to householders in older properties to enable them to purchase affordable solar panels, for instance.	No	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp1090	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to sustainable construction by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Provision for adequate protection, creation and maintenance of high quality green infrastructure is required.			Sustainable construction	TP3
bp1168					BREEAM alongside Code for Sustainable Homes is a good measure however, they must be set at an appropriate level i.e. nothing less than BREEAM Excellent or Outstanding and nothing less than CSH 5 or 6. Both should have "Fabric First" aproaches. In addition to this Building for Life 12 should be adopted with a mandatory 12 green score.	Adopt the above suggestions I have made.	No	Sustainable construction	TP3

bp1230					Sustainable construction often means high initial cost and well thought out flexibility in potential use or re-use. It makes great sense but ,short term, it is not cheap so there is always danger of damaging compromise.	Ensure Standards of Build.	Yes	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp1361					These are aspirational words. There is no evidence or commitment as to how this will be implemented and monitored to ensure these are sustainable constructions. Too much uncertainty exists within this policy.	More information and commitment as to how this and any of the BDP policies will be implemented and monitored.	Yes	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp1385					A positive section of the plan that the majority if not all Birmingham residents will agree with and aspire to. 6.14 refers to BREAM and states that it 'enables developers and designers to prove the environmental credentials of their buildings. Standards for buildings range from pass to excellent.' What is the entire range of standards and should a pass be acceptable to BCC? Standards need to be high to support the high quality expectations outlined in the NPPF Core Planning Principles.	Include a commitment to the acceptance of excellent standards only for buildings. This will encourage the developers to raise their standards and commit to sustainable construction.	No	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp1703	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton		The policy should make clear the aim is to make buildings as sustainable as possible without impacting upon the viability of the development. There should not be a requirement to achieve BREEAM excellent, simply an aspiration to encourage developments to be as sustainable as possible.		Yes	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp2531	Mr David Austin	Undergraduate Project Officer Aston University			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp2552	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp2756	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp2784		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3

bp5290	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5351	Mr Peter Davies	Senior Commercial Development Advisor Severn Trent Water Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5481		Mondelez International	Mr Thomas Ashley	Planning Consultant Turnberry Consulting Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5527	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5595		Gallagher Estates & Miller Homes	Chris May	Director Pegasus Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5685		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5767	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5897	Councillor Caroline Wood	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5928	Councillor David Smith	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5947	Councillor Janet Eagland	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5955	C Jeff Sheriff	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5963	Mr Matthew Griffin	Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy) Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5964	Councillor Martyn Tittley	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5971	Councillor Susan Woodward	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3
bp5977	Councillor Terry Finn	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable construction	TP3

bp139					Just because we have CHP in Broad St it doesn't mean its the solution everywhere. This concept would lock businesses and residents into fixed energy costs that they would have no options on. It would be restrictive and counter productive. It could frighten potential investors away	Take CHP out of the plan	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp554					In response to the comment that CHP should be taken out of the plan. Why? A range of renewable alternatives are provided including CHP which can be taken up depending on circumstances. CHP is a focus since it does provide a more effiecient way of heating and providing enegy to localised environments, especially the heating aspect. Electricity production will obviously go into the grid. Additionally the more CHP units that are networked the more efficient the system becomes.	Provide some evidence of our claims to satisfy the skeptics.	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp850	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	6.19 Birmingham City University agrees that district heating is a good idea in principle but in attempting to apply this arrangement for our City Centre Campus, the difficulties of implementation outweighed the advantages of the scheme. These difficulties included: the cost of extending the network, access to our plant room, cost certainty at the early stage of design and lack of flexibility due to a single supplier.			Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4

bp858	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP4. This policy proposes that developers give first consideration to CHP and/or connection to an existing network. BCU does not believe it is appropriate that BCC stipulates how this is to be achieved since developers and their clients should be able to use whatever is the most suitable technology for their building project that achieves their requirements. Also, the policy states that where it is not feasible to incorporate technologies to achieve low emission targets in new builds, developers would be expected to contribute to off-site allowable solutions, without giving any details what this means in terms of the contribution or what such funds would be used for. Small developments would also have to consider connection to a district heating scheme but, again, this may not be their best option. BCU considers that the implementation of this scheme needs further consideration.				Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp937					i think new solutions such as these are vital to address the problem of Climate change.		No		Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp996					Require buildings to be designed to maximise the benefits from renewables, to take advantage of natural features and to avaiod harm to actual or potetnial renewables on neraby buildings eg overshadowing of solar panels.	added point			Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4

bp1042	It is very encouraging to see the BDP has stipulated CHP a prime commitment for housing development of over 200 units. Community heating schemes are an excellent way of reducing the carbon footprint of medium and large scale housing development. The use of biomass boilers, CHP and heat pumps will significantly the CO2 emissions per household. However developers will no doubt attempt to avoid the capital investment and on-going maintenance and would much prefer to install simple gas central heating systems and solar panels that can be absorbed in the sale price of the house. The BDP is not detailed in its rigorous insistence that Centralised Energy Schemes are the standard solution and outline and detailed planning permission would only be considered and granted on the condition that there is an unconditional commitment to Community heating Schemes. In this respect the BDP is unsound	1. Every development scheme of over 200 house should be considered as a single development in terms of community heating schemes. 2. That multiple developers on a single and adjacent sites must have an integrated approach to Community heating Schemes. 3. That the developers have long term commitment and strategy for at least 25 years for the maintenance and continued efficiency performance of community heating schemes.. 4. The energy centre must be designed and audited to ensure that low carbon emission energy usage e.g. biomass boilers are the primary heat generation. 5. That the energy charges to the home owner are linked directly to a primary fuel index. 6. The design principle of the community heating scheme energy centre, distribution and home controls must be to the highest standard in terms of quality, efficiency and technology 7. The maintenance cost per household are fixed as percentage of the house/flat community charge. 8. The formation of independent community led groups who assess the merits of proposed low and zero carbon energy generation for	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4

bp1043			'On sites where low or zero carbon technologies are not feasible, developers will be expected to contribute towards equivalent off site allowable solutions'. This statement is contrary to the BDP's commitment to environmental sustainability. It is effectively a get out clause to developers. Under no circumstance should developers be allowed to offset carbon reduction to other locations either in or outside of Birmingham's boundary's. This is an unsound argument for development and the BDP should be revised to eliminate this clause. The Plan is unsound because of its lack of commitment to addressing Climate Change.	The Plan must be extremely rigorous on its commitment to low carbon development. There are a wide range of carbon release reduction technologies that can be applied to every industrial, commercial and domestic development; thermal solar, photo voltaic solar, heat pumps, bio-mass and heat recovery systems. Reducing Climate Change is expensive in term of construction, building services equipment installation and maintenance, planners, developers and owners must accept that there is no cheap solution for reducing Birmingham's carbon foot print. The Plan must state categorically that unless a development can implement reasonable and realistic carbon reduction strategies it should not be allowed and the land left as green space which would aid reduction of reduction of C02 by photosynthesis . Economics cannot be a reason for addressing climate change. The Plan is unsound as it is contradictory to addressing Birmingham's carbon foot print.	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp1092	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to low and zero carbon energy generation by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity.			Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp1232			Buildings can be made to be near zero energy consumption but they are not cheap and the technology is stretched in winter. Insulation and heat pumps are key. Innovative alternative energy sources should be encouraged by central government policy.	Introduce best practice where it is in the domain of the authority to do so.	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4

bp1386					A positive section of the plan that the majority if not all Birmingham residents will agree with and aspire to. 6.23 refers to further guidance on low carbon and renewable energy generation. It continues to say that the further guidance will be contained in an SPD. What is SPD? This is contrary to engaging with the local community. Does the use of the word 'will' mean that this element is not available for consultation?	Give some explanation when using acronyms.	No	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp1407					There are too many uncertainties within the plan with regards to infrastructure provision funding and implementation and monitoring to make this a viable policy with regards to low and zero carbon energy.	Uncertainty removed from the plan. Provide evidence that in fact it will reduce city centre emissions by 20%.		Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp1704	Mr Ben Hooton	Partner BH Planning and Development LLP	Mr Ben Hooton		It would be helpful if the Plan outlined what is needed to connect to one of the existing CHP facilities in terms of physical connections and cost. This remains new ground for many developers and further information may help to encourage developers to consider this option. This policy does need to stress that any connections to existing or proposed facilities is not mandatory, it is encouraged where viable.		Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp2532	Mr David Austin	Undergraduate Project Officer Aston University			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp2553	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp5302	Mr Lawrence Chamboko	Research & Policy Officer COFELY DISTRICT ENERGY			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp5528	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4
bp5597		Gallagher Estates & Miller Homes	Chris May	Director Pegasus Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Low and zero carbon energy generation	TP4

bp140			Bio energy doesn't reduce carbon where it is burnt there is just an offset against where it is grown with no consideration of transport CO2 levels Electric cars whilst carbon free at immediate point of use are not carbon free due to energy generation and battery costs. They are also not cost efficient for the average motorist taking whole life CO2 impact	Provide a fully costed high level plan showing the why, how, funding plan supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Low carbon economy	TP5
bp938			It would be a mistake to think that in the future, we will all be able to have electric cars.	Public transport needs to have a priority, and also ways of reducing journeys rather than encouraging them. I worry that we are encouraging the growth of Jaguar Land Rover, supplying high performance cars to developing countries which will compound the problem of Global warming. We have duel standards about all this.	No	Low carbon economy	TP5
bp966			Reinstate suport for Tysley industrial area as a green industry area			Low carbon economy	TP5
bp1093	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to the low carbon economy by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect & energy use) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity.			Low carbon economy	TP5
bp1233			Are we presuming low carbon electricity for transport? The only reliable known source is nuclear. The use of waste is good but still makes CO2. New technologies are often slowly adopted.	Focus in reducing energy demand and conservation. Promote the use of new technology (tax incentives?)	No	Low carbon economy	TP5

bp1264			Policy TP5, 4th bulletpoint "Bioenergy initiatives such as woodfuels, (biomass) and biogas." The council should promote the use of biofuels by using the agricultural land it owns on the Green Belt for growing environmentally sustainable biofuels.	Re Policy TP5, 4th bulletpoint "Bioenergy initiatives such as woodfuels, (biomass) and biogas." The council should promote the use of biofuels by using the agricultural land it owns on the Green Belt for growing environmentally sustainable biofuels. * * *

bp223	The Walmley area (Springfield Road and adjacent green belt land) currently floods when we have either a heavy downpour of rain, or slow persistent rainfalls. I have qustioned in the past with the highways dept if drains are cleaned on a regular basis and told that they are and if if this information is accurate then we will have major flooding problems taking place should an additional 6000 domestic properties and retail units be approved for develpment, taking into account they will all be built on concrete footings or similar leading to an increase in flooding taking place. I would also seek assurance from Severn Trent that the local Sewerage plant can adequately cope with the additional rainwater and sewerage that will be produced should the propsed develoment take place.	Abandon all development works proposed until a thorough flood risk assessment has taken place with all relevant parties involved, including residents representation, Severn Trent Water authority and reps from the local Minworth water treatment centre.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp252	Much of the land earmarked to be developed, falls into a natural valley, as the land drastically falls from Wishaw, down to Springfield Road, Webster way and Langley Mill areas. It is common place to see floods in these fields when we have heavy rain or snow. Evidence of these water logged patches are there for the eye to see right now. The flooding is compounded by the presence of natural streams and collection of water. If 6,000 properties are to be developed on this ground, flooding is bound to happen. Two main criticisms from the flooded areas in recent months has been lack of dredging, and housing over spilling onto former green fields, leaving no natural way for water to drain, it can not get past the concrete foundations and therefore settles and builds up on the surface. Will Severn Trent cope with the additional rainwater and sewerage that will be produced should a development of this scale go ahead?	Halt proposed development until a thorough flood risk assessment has taken place.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6

bp324	We are already experiencing flooding along Springfield Road now and in the past. The drains do not cope with taking the water away and often drain covers are forced off with the amount of rain. Also flooding in Walmley Village where you have to paddle accross to the shops. How can we cope with another 6,000 houses and an industrial site at peddimore. The evidence unfortunately is there to see all over the country.We cannot afford to build and concrete over our green belt. We need to see evidence to show that Severn Trent and local sewerage can cope with the additional building.	Do flood risk assessment and show the evidence. Abandon the development until this is done. Continue to exhaust all brownfield sites. There is no need to build on green belt.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp337	In light of the recent floods in other parts of the country, I feel that building on this land would increase the risk of more homes being flooded. Springfield road is often flooded during heavy rain - surprisingly the water runs off the very fields that you want to build on!!!!!	Drainage would have to be improved to reduce the flooding risk	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp340	Flood risk in the developing areas need assessing - this is already a problem particularly in New Hall Valley	There needs to plans to address increase in flood risk due to the developments	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp402	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp439	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp443	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp448	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp466	Current drainage can not currently cope with rain downfalls. Children attending school on Walmley Ash road,already have to leap half a metre across water flowing down the Walmley Ash road when there is a sudden downfall.If we concrete over our green belt land we will see an increase in flooding.	Abandon development, until we have a full flood risk assessment and assurances that Severn Trent can cope with proposed development.		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp479	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp507	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp585	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp610	Re TP6, GA5, GA6: Potential flood risk in the area of Langley and Peddimore does not appear to have been fully investigated. The fields along Springfield Road are already flooded. The Plan states that the planned industrial area round Peddimore is low lying. In view of the floods in early 2013 and even worse this year, this is an issue that cannot be ignored or not given proper consideration.	A thorough investigation should be carried out to see what impact a housing development of 6000 would have in terms of already waterlogged fields, the same for Peddimore. Would the water end up draining off somewhere else making further problems for the area?	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp635	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp674	An urban lake created around Floodgate Street and the Bull ring could help alleviate flooding in other areas and be integrated with the canal network acting as a SUD at times of inundation and a reserve for nature at times of drought.	para 6.34 should be expanded to incorporate the creation of lakes and suds linked to the opening up of culverts.	Yes	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp711	The proposed building on the green belt at Langley and Peddimore has not been fully investigated with regard to the risk of flooding. Concreting over those fields will cause drainage problems, where is all that water to go ? Already the fields there do not cope, when it rains heavily the water runs off those fields and along Walmley Ash Lane causing the road to flood as the drains on that lane cannot cope. I have called the council out to this only two weeks ago.	Do not build on green belt land that acts as natural drainage/soakaway.		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp750	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp772	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp830	The proposed development the green belt at Langley and Peddimore can not have been fully investigated as recent events have shown that areas have been flooded and therefore a full flood risk should be completed as once tha concrete and tarmac is laid there will be less areaq for water to drain off too. It could rush down Webster Way flooding existing housing and end at the lowest point in the area Asda car park taking away the major supermarket for the area whilst the problem is resolved.	Full details of what infrastructure will be put in place to prevent an increase in the existing flooding that the area suffers should be presented before any development is approved..	No	Managing flood risk	TP6

bp834					I do not believe that the potential flood risk in the area of Langley and Peddimore has been fully investigated or addressed. The fields along Springfield Road are often flooded, along with other areas of localised flooding around Walmley. While the land is open countryside, the ground can cope with the current levels of flooding. However, building houses and associated infrastructure on the land will mean the water cannot soak away. The flooding problems experienced throughout this winter in other areas of the country are evidence that planners need to develop a more robust and considered way for construction developments to cope with high volumes of rainwater.	A complete and thorough investigation of the impact a development of 6,000 houses in the Langley area and an industrial site in Peddimore would have in terms of already waterlogged fields. Where would the water draining off to? The plan should be postponed until this investigation has been carried out, and the plans amended accordingly. In the meantime, the brownfield sites already available in the Birmingham area could be developed, to mitigate the extent of the building requirements in the 2031 Plan.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp859	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP6. Birmingham City University supports the management of surface water through the use of SUDS and by not building on flood plains.			Managing flood risk	TP6
bp893					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp902					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp939					All councils need to address the issue of flooding.	Walmley is an area with many natural springs, I think the plan to build on Green Belt Land in the area will exacerbate the problem.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1011			The Peddimore area is already suseptable to flooding and is in a low lying area. A Flood Risk assesemnt needs to be undertaken prior to the plan being approved. The use of flood risk management options will be limited at this location and the risk of future propoerty flooding is high. The pooe weather tis year has caused field flooding and road flooding in this area. The existing watercourses are not adeuate enough to cope with the current demand and as a result of the development hard surfacing, the natural drainge will be reduced placing a higher burdon on these watercourses. The Floods and Waters Act requires Councils to limit the building on flood plain or areas known to flood. The consequencies of allowing developments in flood plains can be substatiated with the extensive flooding of 2007 and again in 2014.	The plan needs to fully set out the results of an independant Flood Risk Assesement, detailing the future requirements to ensure flooding does not occour. This will need to include for balancing ponds, screens to culverts and must address the increase in water flows as a result of the reduction in natural drainge.	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1073			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1097	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to managing flood risk by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute ecosystem services (reducing flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. A recent EA funded opportunity mapping study showed where new woods could be targeted to reduce flood risk and improve water quality - http://www.forestry.gov.uk/website/forestresearch.nsf/ByUnique/INFD-97XGXX - we would like to extend this to cover urban areas including Birmingham.		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1153	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The policy justification states at 6.29 “There is also the potential for canal and reservoir breach and overtopping.” The Canal & River Trust would comment that canals may breach or overtop as a result of elevated water levels caused by excessive inflows i.e. heavy urban runoff. The policy requires that measures to increase the wildlife, amenity and recreational value of the canals will be encouraged. This is welcomed by Canal & River Trust the canals add to the biodiversity of the area and are built natural wildlife resources, albeit that they are manmade infrastructure. The canals provide water related habitats supporting protected species, fauna and flora. Paragraph 6.36 identifies a role of the canals as non-natural watercourses which alleviate flooding. The Trust does not have any specific statutory responsibilities in relation to flooding and, therefore, its responsibilities are those of an owner and operator of its canals Water levels within the canals are monitored and controlled to ensure they can operate and to detect any problems. It should not be assumed that the canals can accept surface water details such as; total area of discharge used for calculation, maximum potential discharge, rates of flow;		No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1190			The land that you have put into your plan for development falls into a natural valley. We often see floods in these fields when we have heavy rain or snow. Some are water logged now in the fields opposite my home on Springfield Road. Natural streams and springs in the area add to the build up of water. If 6,000 properties are to be developed on this ground, flooding is going to happen . A topical point being echoed throughout the UK media regarding flooding, is the lack of dredging, and the housing being being built on green fields stopping the natural way for water to drain.	Set up thorough flood risk assessment. This should have been completed before presenting the BDP.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1235			Should consider retro fitting of passive drainage systems (SuDS), notably to regeneration areas. Don't build on Green Belt..... Not just rivers but also local spots subject to flood risk	Don't build on the Green Belt. Plan for more heavy rain.	Yes	Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1240	Removing Green Belt will increase the risk of flooding as there will be less flood plains. Given the current chaotic situations in the south of the country, this should be well heeded, particularly Peddimore already identified as being within the plan as being in a basin. More housing built, reduces natural reduction of surface lying water as there are less surfaces that the water can drain through. thousands of homes will further reduce the opportunity for appropriate drainage and increase the risk of flooding.	Building should take place on brownfield sites	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1346	Further flood risk modelling is required for proposed SUE and Peddimore employment land. This is due to the level of flooding which has occurred in the green belt fields in Walmley over the last two years. Climate changes are only expected to exacerbate this trend.	A site specific flood test should occur on the SUE and Peddimore to demonstrate that it will be safe for its lifetime and without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk overall. These tests need to be passed before development occurs. Should the development go ahead, consideration given to raising the potential development area. For any development to proceed SUD's would be required to ensure the development did not exacerbate the flooding. Gully pot cleansing will also be required to ensure there are no blockages also at discharge point. Sequential and exception tests to occur	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1474	It has been pointed out to a group of objectors that a significant amount of green belt land proposed for develpment in Walmley has springs below the surface which does not appear to have been mentioned in the develpoment plan. Also, and in the past some of the same geen belt land was used for land fill tipping which again i dont think has been mentioned in the development plan.	Check out the above comments and check for accuracy and if deemed accurate carry out the additional tests required before any development starts. Once tests have been carried out allow local residents and any other Birmingham resident access to the completed reports confirming that all the land proposed for development is safe and sound for developing.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1488	Flood risk is a major consideration. I speak from experience of having an allotment at Forge Farm which has flooding problems during the winter. This will be exacerbated by building development which will restrict natural drainage and increase run off to the lowest points. I am sure Asda will be delighted when their property floods!	A proper, thorough examination of flood risk should be undertaken before any permission to change the landscape is agreed.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1551	Recent events over the winter of 2013-14 demonstrate to what extent indiscriminate building on areas that previously provided effective drainage in their wider environment can have catastrophic effects. It is perfectly obvious from the plan that totally inadequate consideration has been given to this implication of the Green Belt. Apart from the Peddimore and Walmley flooding issues discussed in other comments, the building of Harvestfields (above the "A" sites no longer considered from the Preliminary Plan submission) appeared to have disrupted drainage into Mere Green down St James and Cremorne Roads. In the recent bad weather the brook at the foot of the valley of Hillwood Road below Harvestfields overflowed its banks and onto the road for the first time local residents can recall.	No building on open Green Belt fields should be permitted without detailed investigation of the consequences to the ancient and natural drainage of the area. Preferably brown field sites of which there are many should be used for building where drainage has already been proved.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1625	The large areas of housing planned for Langley and Peddimore will create permeable surfaces which will significantly increase surface runoff and reduce lag times, contributing to flood risk when compared to the existing agricultural land use.	Use existing urban sites.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1661	Potential flood risk concerns need further analysis.	Detailed study of the potential for increased flooding risk as a consequence of the plan.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1669	Comment relating to TP6, GA5,GA6. A full flood risk assessment should be carried out on the Langley and Peddimore site. The development proposed will only take away the green belt land and thereby increase risk of flooding due to the land not being able to take away the rain water. In recent years flooding has occurred locally from the canal onto the main road. the plan should guarantee through risk assessments and strategies put in place that the canal system will not be likely to flood more so, by this urban sprawl development.	Guaranteed measures should be put in place to prove that the risk to flooding will not be exacerbated by the building on these sites.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1726	I feel that the flood risk can only be compounded in the future as previously outlined in previous comments I have made. I also concur with other comments made in this section			Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1761	I do not see how covering up thousands of acres of fields with concrete and tarmac can do anything other than increase flood risk in an already borderline area. Numerous areas around the Oak and Ash estate were close to flooding over the last couple of years and a large urban development covering up the green belt can only increase pressure on the current drainage in the surrounding area.	The plan needs to address the significant flood risk posed by this development.		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1767	NPPF (94)states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk..... The BDP plan suggests that the Langley SUE area has not been thoroughly assessed for flood risk. Flooding is a regular occurrence along Springfield Road, in the fields and on the road surfaces. Pedestrians are often saturated by cars driving through water that has not drained away. Manhole covers have been seen lifted out of place through the sheer force of water underneath. Drainage is a real issue in this area. The existing system is ineffective and should be addressed by BCC before any development is considered this would only exacerbate the problem. The Green Belt is the natural way of dispersing flood water. If the Green Belt were to be lost to block paving and tarmac drives as is typical in any new housing development then we have a recipe for disaster. The plan is unsound because it gives no real detail of how flooding will be prevented.	Provide a complete picture regarding mitigation of flood risk in the Langley SUE area. We have been presented with an incomplete document.		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1821	Peddimore fields soak up large amounts of rain water but have flooded into Walmley Ash Lane this winter causing problems for the houses there. What protection will be put in place for the existing houses there and beyond the lane once the fields have been built on. I am concerned for my property if the fields can not absorb the rain water due to the 6000 houses which are going there.	Do not build on green belt as there is enough brown field and 12000 empty houses to use instead. If the plan is passed I would want to see proper flood protection for the local area.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1825			Gardens which back onto the fields in question have been flooded this year from rainwater flowing off the fields. If these fields are built on the new houses on the fields will flood, the houses next to the fields will flood and also the houses in the surrounding area will start to flood due to the large reduction in absorbancy of the land. This is a very real problem as we have seen throughout the country this winter. The estate I live on is lower than the fields to be built on which is very worrying. Allotments, which are opposite the fields to be built on, have again flooded this winter. The surface water in places is over a foot deep.	Safeguards from flooding to existing local property MUST be included in the plan. It would be unsafe to build on land known to flood, there need to be more checks carried out reguarding this matter before building is considered. Better still move away from the greenbelt and build on brownfield land.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1839	miss victoria bankes price	Woodland Trust	We welcome the recognition that woods and trees can make a major contribution to flood risk. We would however like to see this elaborated on to ensure planting is carried out strategically.	We would like to see the inclusion of the following points: Creation of tree and woodland buffers to improve water quality • Buffers adjacent to surface waters, pollution sources or pollution pathways can improve water quality by reducing sediment, nitrate, phosphate and pesticide concentrations. • Trees on river banks can help reduce water temperature, thus helping to maintain oxygen levels. Native woodland creation to improve water quality • Native woodland creation on arable, improved pasture and urban areas can improve water quality by reducing sediment, nitrate, phosphate and pesticide concentrations. • Native woodland creation as part of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs) can reduce surface run-off and retain pollutants on brownfield sites. Restoration of Planted Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) in upland headwaters to increase water quality and quantity • Restoration of PAWS (ancient woodland sites planted with non-native conifers) to broadleaf woodland or other semi-natural habitats can reduce nitrate concentrations by up to 90 per cent and increase local		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp1870			Many areas of Birmingham are sensitive to and experience surface water flooding, In line with neighbouring Authorities (Black Country & Solihull) the above policy should be changed to ensure that all major developments or as a minimum those that would require a flood risk assessment) should reduce surface water discharge rate to the greenfield rate. This policy could be enforced by the Sustainable Drainage Approval Board who would review all major applications from late 2014 as part of their statutory role.	policy should be changed to ensure that all major developments or as a minimum those that would require a flood risk assessment) should reduce surface water discharge rate to the greenfield rate.	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1876			We already have issues with surface flooding after heavy rain, building on greenbelt land will stop drainage and make flooding a problem for the area	Don't build on protected green land	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1897			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp1994			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2053			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2054			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2065			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2078			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2133			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2189			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2282			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2307			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2326			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2343			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2458			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2466			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2557	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp2645	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2662	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2683	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2722	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2848	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2888	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp2911	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3126	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3138	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3157	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3169	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3175	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3181	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3184	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3200	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3243	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3285	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3458	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3516	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3546	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3599	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3607	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3654	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3663	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3667	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3700	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp3716	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3725	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3735	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3747	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3792	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3848	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3849	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3862	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp3922	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4008	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4015	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4023	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4031	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4043	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4048	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4057	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4085	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4103	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4112	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4141	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4328	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4484	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4516	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4527	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4585	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4655	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp4694				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4738				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4816				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4823				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4932				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp4944				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5027				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5046				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5134				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5183				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5343	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5352	Mr Peter Davies	Senior Commercial Development Advisor Severn Trent Water Ltd		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5480				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5533	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5785	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5820		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5857				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5867				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp5903				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6

bp5995					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Managing flood risk	TP6
bp95					if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore use this land plus the thousands of other sites across the city. We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country, plant trees where ever possible.			Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp142					High level ideals no detail	Provide a fully costed high level plan showing the why, the how, funding plan supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp556					How come when it comes to human development, a detailed map outlining where this human development will occur is made available in this plan but when it comes to the section regarding the expansion of green infrastructure is no detailed map showing where the green infrastructure is to be developed. Nor is there a mention of the contradiction that the development of grey infrastructure that is being enforced in other sections of this plan is actually going to reduce the scope and range of existing green infrastructure within Birmingham.	Make clear that a contradiction exists in that other sections of this plan highlights increased human development therefore overall non-human development is going to be reduced. Additionally highlight that this decision is in accordance with the undemocratic decision to promote within this plan the growth and redevelopment of existing green infrastructure rather than promote the utility and redevelopment of underutilised existing grey infrastructure.	Yes	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp675					6.43 support the mention of hedgerow! now add in permanent grassland			Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp712					So how does scrapping the green belt and building on it help in the plans for 'The integrity of the green infrastructure network will be protected from development and where possible opportunities will be taken to extend and enhance the network and to improve links between areas of open space. '	Remove building on the green belt from the plan		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp851	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	6.42 Birmingham City University supports this approach and feels that a commitment should be made to plant another tree for every one cut down.			Green infrastructure network	TP7

bp860	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP7. Birmingham City University supports the management of green infrastructure as well as maximising opportunities for the construction of brown and green roofs.			Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp942					I am totally in favour of planting trees, protecting woodland and promoting green spaces.	Green belt land should not be built on, as immediately this flies in the face of the commitments mentioned above. Although the council say they want to protect green areas, they cannot even maintain our grass verges or prevent people from parking cars on them, thus destroying the grass.	No	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1098	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing GI by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) whilst enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Adequate provision for protection, creation and maintenance of high quality GI is required.			Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1242					There are many trees in the City which is a great aset. Pity you do not see so many in the Centre. There is a danger of over management of green space. The worst action is to build on the green belt.	Do not build on the green belt	Yes	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1245					6.41 •Promotes urban quality and improves the image and attractiveness of areas. How does building on green belt land (Langley) that I currently view from my house promote my urban quality and improve the image and attractiveness of my area?	Build on land that is already totally urban but may currently have some disused buildings on it, plant some trees and add a bit of grass. You will therefore have improved that area without doing the opposite to an already green area.	No	Green infrastructure network	TP7

bp1265	Policy TP7 - The removal of green belt status to existing land is in direct contradiction of this policy. Green Belt status should therefore be retained in all cases (if not expanded).	Re Policy TP7 - Green Belt status should be retained in all cases (if not expanded). * * *

bp1468	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The Canal & River Trust considers that Green Infrastructure is a network of multifunctional open spaces and natural assets. There are a number of definitions of green infrastructure some of which encompass 'blue infrastructure and blue spaces' such as waterways, towing paths and their environs. The canals form part of strategic and local green infrastructure networks and this policy reflects this which is welcomed by the Canal & River Trust along with the proposal for the Council to, where possible, take opportunities to expand and enhance the network. We note that there appears to be commonality with the historic overland route of the Lapal Canal and the green infrastructure network. This is welcomed as policy TP7 seeks to protect the integrity of the Green Infrastructure network. Policy TP7 also supports expansion of the Green Infrastructure Network and seeks to take opportunities for enhancement, where possible. All of these components of the policy are welcomed as they are important in relation to supporting the overall restoration of the Lapal Canal in Birmingham.		No	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1516			Strongly support street trees but you need to stop Amey from cutting down mature trees because they are expensive to maintain. They are just looking at numbers not the quality of the tree cover.	Change the contract between Amey and BCC to stop them cutting down mature trees and replacing them them with 3 saplings. So your policies need to get Amey on board.	Yes	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1649			Building on the green belt will not support your above statement	Do not build on the green belt.		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1727			If you build on green belt land you contradict your suggestions as outlined in this section		No	Green infrastructure network	TP7

bp1830	miss victoria bankes price	Woodland Trust	The Woodland Trust welcomes Policy TP7. Particularly with regard to the protection of ancient woodland. We would like to highlight the importance of recognising the impact of development nearby and adjacent to ancient woodland as well as direct loss. Fore example: Chemical effects can cause changes to composition of woodland flora, reduced tree health, wildlife poisoning and loss of soil micro-organisms, affecting nutrient cycling. Disturbance during and after construction can lead to increased predation, reduced breeding success and population viability and altered hydrology or soil functioning. Development can also further isolate ancient woods, increasing distances between favourable habitats that species must cross. Factors associated with development, such as nutrient enrichment, can increase the risk of invasive species establishing in ancient woods. We would also like to see ancient/veteran and notable trees outside woodland recognised more fully. Old individual trees are an important part of our cultural and landscape heritage: ancient, veteran and notable trees resonate with the history of the landscape and form markers in the lives of individual people and communities. Ancient	Please address the comments set out above.	No	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp1872			I support the Green Infrastructure policy, but would like to add that all watercourses should have a green corridoor adjacent to them, and have a width of at least 10 meters either side of the top of the bank. Permission should be refiused to applications that fail to meet this provison.	The policy should include that all watercourses should have a green corridor adjacent to them, and have a width of at least 10 meters either side of the top of the bank. Permission should be refiused to applications that fail to meet this provison.	No	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp2563	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp2757	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp3471			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7

bp5200	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp5311	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp5340		Kiely Bros. Limited	Mr Mark Herbert	Senior Planning Consultant Tyler-Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp5539	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp5768	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp5786	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp5994	J CULLEN	Brooke Smith Planning	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green infrastructure network	TP7
bp96					if you wish to help the biodiversity of this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country			Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8

bp558			How come when it comes to human development, a detailed map outlining where this human development will occur is made available in this plan but when it comes to the section regarding non-human development there is no map, no identifiable plan and no mention of the contradiction that the human development that is being enforced in other sections of this plan are actually reducing non-human development within Birmingham.	Make clear that a contradiction exists in that other sections of this plan highlights increased human development therefore overall non-human development is going to be reduced. Additionally highlight that this decision is in accordance with the undemocratic decision to promote within this plan the growth and redevelopment of existing green infrastructure rather than promote the utility and redevelopment of underutilised existing grey infrastructure.		Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp944			I am in favour of protecting natural habitats.	That would include protecting the Green belt.	No	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp1099	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing Birmingham's bio- and geodiversity by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity (wildlife species and habitats) and helping it adapt to climate change.			Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp1154	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The canal corridors add to the biodiversity of the area and are built wildlife resources, albeit that they are manmade infrastructure. The canals provide water related habitats supporting protected species, fauna and flora and the policy justification at 6.46 recognise the benefits the canals can have for biodiversity within the city which is welcomed by Canal & River Trust.		No	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp1243			Biodiversity will occur naturally where it is allowed. People interfere with that process.	Control people. Do not build on the green belt	Yes	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8

bp1268	Policy TP8 "The maintenance, enhancement and restoration of sites of national and local importance for biodiversity and geology will be promoted and supported." The plans as prepared by the council have not followed this idea. In the document "BIRMINGHAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN. Planning for Birmingham's growing population, Options Consultation" published in October 2012 the council set out areas where it was considering removing Green Belt protection. In section 4 of the appendix this set out areas that had been considered for future development. Many of these areas of land had SINC, SLINC or SSSI designation. The fact that these were even considered for development shows how little the council considers these matters. The idea of looking at these areas should have been dismissed out of hand rather than wasting time and effort thinking of whether they could be be built upon. Area H for example, the New Hall Valley, had been designated as a country park as a planning gain when previous green belt protection was removed from land along the New Hall Valley. As such it should be wholly protected from future consideration of development. Or does it mean that when the	Re Policy TP8 - protection of such sites needs to be absolute and not just promoted and supported. * * *

bp1390	Why is there no mention of the Green Belt in this section. It is of value to wildlife, contributes to the habitat network and helps biodiversity to adapt to climate change. This section is biased and unsound.	Include the Green Belt in this section.	No	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp1400	I am in support of this policy. However I am unclear how removing a huge swathe of open space to create the Langley SUE and Peddimore employment will contribute to this policy. The city council are clearly not committed to this policy. As per section 6.7 and my comments to Q25 the removal of Green Belt land contradicts the basis of these policies when looking at environment and sustainability. It is also not consistent with planning policy chapter 9, protecting the Green Belt and chapter 11, Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.	Following on from recent climatic events, the BCC should consider their position on removing a significant part of the Green Belt to be used on development. Land that has be retained for continued agricultural development or encourage parts which are not used for agricultural use to be developed as woodland areas. Commitment that the areas are to be preserved for the future and remain permanently open. That the BCC are committed to contributing and enhancing the natural and local environment ..."Green Belt removed from the plan.	No	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp1435	I propose that the area identified for the Peddimore industrial development be considered for identification as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) or a Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation (SLINC) due to the presence of breeding red-listed for conservation concern species such as lapwing, skylark and yellowhammer, it being a regionally significantly important site for overwintering red-listed merlin and amber-listed golden plover and a breeding site for amber-listed kestrel. The site also supports many other species such as brown hare and badger.	Further information on how the decision will be taken to determine if the strategic need for the proposal outweighs the need to safeguard the importance of the designated site, or important habitat, species or geological feature and no alternative site is available which will meet the need. I appreciate the sentiment but it is widely open to interpretation.	Yes	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp1619	Loss of agricultural land will undoubtedly have an impact on the wildlife in the area of Peddimore and Langley. Since the development of housing in Walmley New Hall and Berryfields the variety of bird species has reduced e.g. greenfinches, siskins and treecreepers are no longer to be seen in this area. Housing development will reduce their habitats even further.	Use the existing urban sites for housing development.	No	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8

bp1728					The green belt and other areas of outstanding natural beauty offer bio and geodiversity. It has been well publicised recently that all the appropriate wildlife bodies have not been asked an opinion or consulted in this matter so therefore I do not know a proper consultation can have been made	Do not build on green belt land. hypocritical of any statements you are outlining.	No	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp2577	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp2758	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp5541	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp5635		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8
bp5787	Nick Hammond	Chief Executive The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Biodiversity and Geodiversity	TP8

bp27	open spaces are vital to maintain the health and relaxed attitude of this city, perhaps though we could look at opening the use of our green space as it would seem cuts to funding and proposed sell offs are threatening the green space our city has.. i would suggest a community approach for the developing of green areas as sport fields including be active and other such like, but also the constructions of community urban farms perhaps stables , tying in allotments and community health basically people want green space good food and good health work and the feeling of value, parks should be looked as community assets and the community and friends groups should be the people to develop them, reclaiming our green space	Opening up open space to community management.		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp47	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp143	Just words, no real substance	Show what assessment has been done. Prove that these targets are realistic, wanted by the residents and not some high ideal from the 'city' and prove that they are currently being achieved. Provide a fully costed high level plan showing how this will be achieved supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp230	Part of the National policies framework state that green belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances and should also check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. I am not convinced that Birmingham City Council has explored all other areas of possibilty, including liaison with other local authorities to assist with the building of additional houses required on development land thay may have available. I also think that all Brownfield development Sites should be developed before starting to build on any green belt land anywhere. I also believe that to build an additional 6000 properties and retail units on the small amount of green belt land left in Birminham will increase the urban sprawl in what is already an overbuilt area.	Delay the start of building new homes and retail units on the Walmley green belt in 2016 until all other options availble have been exhausted, including cross boundry discussions with other local authorities Ensure that all Brown Field site development has been completed before developing on green belt land.	No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9

bp945			We should protect our playing fields and parks.	Many such areas are underused due to concerns about safety. Bring back the park keeper, have someone around after school, so children can go and play football. The playing fields remain empty while children make a nuisance of themselves playing in the road and around our houses.	No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1100	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make enhancing Birmingham's open space, playing fields and allotments by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) whilst enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Trees and woods can enhance open space, playing fields and allotments by making them more attractive to wildlife.			Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1244			Good policy. Address historic reverses		No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9

bp1266	RE Policy TP9 2nd bullet point "The lost site will be replaced by a similar piece of open space, at least as accessible and of similar quality and size." No protection is given to the location the the site - what good is it land islost on one edge of the city to be replaced by another area on the other side ofthe city. A reasonable limit needs to be placed on the distance of the replacement site from the lost site (say 1 mile at the most). RE Policy TP9 "Provision of public open space" Distance are given but it is not clear if these are walk distance or crowfly distances. Although walk times are also given, such a measurement is hard to measaure on a map and walk speeds vary from person to person. Clarity needs to be given as to the method of calculating the distance. Item 6.49 "Given Birmingham's built up character and with an increasing population and pressure for development, opportunities to create new areas of open space are limited within the existing urban area. Further development pressures on the City's open space resource will be carefully considered." Given this is the case, it is illogical and contrary to policy that the council is planning to remove Green belt protection from signficant existing green areas.	RE Policy TP9 2nd bullet point "A reasonable limit needs to be placed on the distance of the replacement site from the lost site (say 1 mile at the most). RE Policy TP9 "Provision of public open space" Clarity needs to be given as to the method of calculating the distance. Re Item 6.49 - Existing Green Belt land needs to retain this protection and not be developed upon. * * *

bp1588	As a long-standing allotment gardener, I would like to register my support for Policy TP9 within the overall plan. Protection for vulnerable allotment land, even when reclaimed by private owners, is important as I know from personal experience. It is heartening to see this section carried over from Birmingham's former UDP.		No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1692	I am pleased that the provision for allotments is still being supported by the city.			Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1729	IT seems to me that you want to build on every bit of available land so not sure where you will fit in specie for allotments (which will probably be priced at a premium) or space for recreation. This appears to be a token gesture. Much of the green belt land is used for public recreation but will be ripped from under us. The green belt does not need as much maintenance as a recreation area and certain types of recreation areas can lead to gangs and crime. We do need more cemetery spaces so where is all this meant to be include in the plans? Where will our expanding population be buried - the M42!!!!?		No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1765	Do not consider removing any recreational ground. Make the existing areas as safe and appealing as possible. Provide football pitch markings, 100 metre running lanes, Cricket pitch markings and other safe and relatively cheap incentives to create a healthy and competitive youth as directed in the NPPF Core Planning Principles. Do not remove allotments. The City must be aware of the increasing importance of growing food locally with the pressures and uncertainties brought about by climate change - national and international.	Guarantee local opportunities (outside of educational grounds) for young people to use and enjoy but at the same time develop sporting skills which will give them the opportunity to take the next step to joining Sports Clubs in the Birmingham area.	No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1799	I strongly support the protection and (where possible) expansion of all green space. I particularly support the authority's recognition of in increase in demand for allotment use and protection of the 2012 Olympic legacy through playing fields.		No	Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9

bp1831	miss victoria bankes price	Woodland Trust			The Woodland Trust welcomes the inclusion of the access standard but would like to see this taken further. Proximity and access to woodland is a key issue linking the environment with health and wellbeing provision. Recognising this, the Woodland Trust has researched and developed the Woodland Access Standard (WASt). The WASt is complimentary to Natural England's ANGST+ and is endorsed by Natural England. The Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard recommends: • that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size • that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people's homes.	Inclusion of the Woodland Access Standard as set out above.	No		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1853					As an allotment holder I am pleased that the plan offers some protection to the existing sites, though as a member of Billesley Lane Allotments I am concerned what the City Council will do when the current lease with Moseley Golf Course expires.	Private allotments with full occupancy need to have the same protection as those owned by the City	Yes		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp1861					Whilst overall I think the plans are good in giving people access to open space near to where they live, I regret that allotment space is even being considered for development.	Allotment sites develop real communities and offer valuable managed open space as well as habitat for wildlife. i don't think there should be any opening for development, as once lost to building they are gone forever. Realistic alternative provision must surely be very hard to find these days	No		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp2759	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online			Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp5201	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online			Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp5319		Allegion	Mr Marcus Plaw	Associate Director COLLIERS	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp5543	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online			Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9

bp5638		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp5821		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Open space, playing fields and allotments	TP9
bp45					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp53					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp59					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp80	Mr Keith Pringle	Management Consultant Jakema Programme Management Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp97					if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore, We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country			Green Belt	TP10
bp118					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp144			National planning policy makes it clear that established Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances - This has not been proved	Prove that all other options have been considered to minimise the use of green belt. As yet this has not been achieved due to a complete lack of details in this planning submission. Detail how all non-green belt land will be used prior to future consideration of the need for green belt use. Exclude green belt land from the current plan, with the proviso, that once all brownfield land has been used, including an on going consideration of the appropriateness of the level of industrial brown field sites still being ring fenced, futher considerations will be given to the need for building on green belt land For example, under the current plans the old Cincinnati Milacron site on the Kingsbury Road would under current consideration be ring fenced for industry. As this site is approached via residential roads and is bounded by a canal, would it not be better to consider this land for housing as it is close to the already identified area in Minworth and already has suitable public transport, cycle and road link	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp175	Mrs Marie Pringle	Sales Controller McCurrach UK Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp189			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp200			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp208			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp212			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp229			There is no requirement to build on greenbelt. This land is required to balance out the houses around it to provide open space and to help decrease any extra air pollution. The brownfield land need to be considered fully and not going for the easy and lazy option of building in a fully developed area as it is.	As above.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp233	It is far from clear that 'exceptional circumstances' exist which justify building on Green Belt, the purpose of which is to prevent urban sprawl. For a city the size of Birmingham, the existing Green Belt is already at minimum.	When travelling to the centre of Birmingham from whichever direction, it is hard not to notice the large areas of space which could be developed or redeveloped, with easy access to the city centre and services already in place. I have read elsewhere that planning permission has already been granted to build more homes than are deemed necessary. These options should be explored thoroughly before ANY development of Green Belt is even considered.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp244	Why is building planned for green belt in 2016 before brownfield and vacant housing have been exhausted? These are not exceptional circumstances. If as you predict only 5,000 homes will be completed by 2031 these can be accomodated by using vacant housing and brownfield sites. It is stated that the remaining green belt will be protected but there is only 15% left anyway. Green belt is there to restrict urban sprawl. NPPF states that construction of new build is inappropriate for green belt. The plan provides for 50,000 not 80,000 houses therefore there is a shortfall, so the plan is not sound.	The plan is not complete it does not deal with the shortfall. There are brownfield sites in the Black Country. This area needs regeneration. Speak to Black Country local authorities. Use vacant housing and brownfield sites. Wait until the GBSLEP housing study is available.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp246	One of the strengths of the city is the greenbelt land, which has already been eroded. If Birmingham wishes to continue as an attractive location the development strategy should avoid encroaching on one of the cities strengths. The city prides itself on a large area of green open spaces, yet it has a large number of brownfield sites which lie vacant. They provide an economical potential for urban development and regeneration. These properties and sites would provide in excess of 10,000 homes and could see unemployment levels fall in targeted areas . It therefore remains unclear why there is a need to alter existing boundaries as with existing potential provision this does not appear to meet the criteria for' alteration based on exceptional circumstances'.	A cohesive plan for the development of brownfield sites as opposed to greenbelt land, that looks at Birmingham as a whole.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp253	By planning to encroach on a large proportion of the remaining 15% of the Cities Green Belt, is a contradiction of the Plans own vision under section 3 of the plan. I refer in particular to 3.1 where the plan mentions a green city (green should not be just about recycling). 3.2 Residents experiencing a high quality of life. 3.4 Maintaining Historical environment. How exactly do the existing proposals of this plan intend to achieve these aims, by building on green fields, and obliterating the spectacular approach to two of the cities most impressive historical landmarks, I refer to Peddimore Hall and Langley Hall, which are both Grade II Listed. Green Belt is intended to prevent urban sprawl. This plan will bring about urban sprawl. I can see no evidence of attempts to use empty housing stock and available urban sites before turning to our limited amount of green belt as an option. I live and work in Wishaw, my concern is that the plan will remove productive farmland, therefore interfere with our rural economy. This Land produces crops for the UK Cereal Industry, these proposals have a direct impact on the amount of cereal produced in the UK, and the affect on our pocket, if this food has to be imported	I suggest that the city makes better use of the empty homes that still blight our city, they amount to 12,000. It is totally unacceptable that the city should still have a large number of properties and derelict sites owned by them that they have not prioritised before considering green belt land within this plan. If the appropriate Council departments are struggling to identify these properties, they should turn to the districts residents associations who will take them straight to them. By example, we have in close proximity to the green belt in Sutton Coldfield, a school that has been demolished on Lindridge road leaving scruffy unused land, an eyesore along Brassington Avenue, ideal affordable housing site, right next to a rail and bus link and other amenities, and the empty factory and shops on Mere Green Road, which is making the area appear unkempt. I would like BCC to explain why they are not considering these options before green belt	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp289	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp300	NO GREEN BELT TO BE USED FOR BUILDING		No	Green Belt	TP10
bp332	It is completely wrong to develop on the Green Belt in 2016.The Green Belt is in existence to restrict Urban Sprawl and it's boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Preservation of the Green Belt which is only 15% of Birmingham is absolutely paramount. The destruction of the Green Belt is abhorrent. There would be a loss of habitat for much of the wildlife. where there are Barn Owls, Tawny Owls, Buzzards, Kestrels, Skylarks, Ravens and recently this year, a Red Kite sighted in the Thimble End area. There are numerous brownfield sites that are currently undeveloped which should be primarily addressed.	There should be no development taking place in 2016. With full or outline planning there are 17,000 houses, 12,000 houses are currently empty homes. When there are so many empty homes available as housing stock BCC should provide an explanation as to why the Green Belt has been first released as an alternative to building or refurbishing where the housing stock is available. This would improve the communities within the urban areas by enhancing the environment as the empty houses reflect decline and dereliction where copious quantities of fly tipped waste and litter are evident.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp334			TP10 GA5 Green belt land must not be built on - it is there for a reason and must not be used when there are other areas in the city that are already suitable for building	Build on brown belt land such as where factories and schools have already been demolished. There is a massive area of land in Washwood Heath off Drews Lane that could be used without resorting to ruin our countryside for the future generation.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp341			So why is Langley and Peddimore being considered for green belt development as there are other urban sites across the city	Justification of use of green belt in these areas	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp344			Birmingham City Council need to prove more why it has been necessary to alter green belt boundaries when all around Birmingham and the black country there are empty houses and derelict sites that are eyesores for everyone to see plus the infrastructures are already in place. These sites should be considered in their plans before encroaching on our green belt which is important for generations to come. You say the remaining green belt within the city will be protected, I say if you have your way there will not be much left to protect. Also regarding plans for an industrial park at Peddimore, you only have to look at the area and see that on nearby industrial parks there are spaces and units empty. Why build more when there is a chance that it will become an eyesore in time. Peddimore is an historical site and should remain so.	No building on Green Belt	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp367			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp393	Mr Francis Mason	Walmley Residents Association	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp403			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp414			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp431			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp432			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp440			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp449			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp460			TP 10 - there is not justification for building on the Green Belt in 2016 - it will create urban sprawl and there is only 15% left as it is.	There is housing stock still available - 12000 empty homes. Also 17000 houses with outline or full planning permission. Why has Green belt been released first with no justification?	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp461	Green belt land should only be built on in exceptional circumstances.These are not exceptional circumstances when there are still brownfield sites and vacant homes which can be utilised. As there are going to be approx.5000 homes by 2031, these should be accommodated using previous suggestion. NPPF states that construction of new build is inappropriate for green belt land. We only have 15% green belt land, this must be protected. The plan is not sound as it provides for 50000 houses, when 80000 are required, leaving a shortfall.	The plan does not deal with shortfall. Black Country needs regeneration and has brownfield sites and vacant properties. Wait until GBSLEP housing study is available.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp480	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp493	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp499	This is the last Green Belt in Birmingham and is used for the health and well being of the citizens on Birmingham. We can not build on the land	The land should be used for green land not buildings	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp511	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp517	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp525	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp534	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp539	Green belt land is only to be considered for development under exceptional circumstances. Given the derelict housing stock numbering tens of thousands, which could be redeveloped more quickly and easily (and without blighting the landscape), I fail to see the very special circumstances that make this proposal viable. As it stands, I cannot fathom how the planners could consider this Plan in line with current legislation.	The Plan should be scrapped altogether and a new plan using areas already available with consent for development granted used instead.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp553	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp559	I am deeply opposed to the plans to build on the green belt land near Walmley. Our green belt is precious and, if wiped out by this development, will never return. The plan to build on green belt land is wrong on so many levels, including the effects on the health and wellbeing of the local residents, and the additional burden on the local infrastructure. It is already extremely difficult to get a doctor's appointment because the local surgery cannot cope with the current population. I dread to think of the effects the additional population will have on Good Hope Hospital and the local schools, nurseries and nursing homes. The daily commute into Birmingham gets more difficult all the time and our local roads can barely cope with the current volume of traffic. There is already local flooding on the council allotments in Minworth as the drainage system needs attention; this can only worsen if the surrounding fields are built upon. Please don't sell out at the expense of the local residents. What next? Concrete over Sutton Park?	Preserve what little remaining green belt land we have, for future generations, and confine the development to brownfield sites.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp562	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp567	There are plenty of other housing opportunities within the Midlands area in general and so there is no need to change the green belt circumstances. What exactly is being classed as an exceptional circumstance here, the undemocratic imposition that Birmingham population is to grow. This is not exceptional nor is it sustainable. Obviously the sustainability Appraisal is a manufactured piece of corporatism for the benefit of those that will profit from more human development and these select individuals probably don't even live in Birmingham.	A more independent feasibility and sustainability report are required to show who is actually going to benefit from increased human development and the loss of even more green infrastructure compared to the alternatives of housing increased populations elsewhere within underutilised brownfield sites in the Midlands in general.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp584	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp587	The green belt land should not be built on, there have been no exceptional circumstances outlined to justify this.	The brown belt land should be built on before the green belt is even considered. There is plenty of brown belt land in Birmingham which has the potential for housing, why is this not being utilised??	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp597	The plan does not demonstrate that there are exceptional circumstances which justify building on the green belt and therefore the proposal should be removed.	The proposed green belt development should be removed from the plan.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp599	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp631	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp638	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp643	Sutton has already had large housing developments both in the Walmley area and Four Oaks (Duttons Lane). What we have learnt from this is schools are over subscribed, doctors / Dentists etc are all but impossible to join. Hospital already busy, struggling to cope. Infrastructure is struggling (roads falling apart - pavements left to crumble etc etc). Roads are busier. The area is struggling to cope with the current population, more people, more children, more cars will make matters worse. Green belt should be left alone, build on brown field sites and let's be honest Birmingham has enough of these site and derelict sites to build on. We cannot keep concreting the green belt, have you learnt nothing from the recent floods, water need to go somewhere, area in the area already flood in heavy persistent rain, the drainage system cannot cope. Number of police have been drastically reduced, due to recent cuts, and even with the recent announcement of 450 extra officers, more people, more crime, more pressure on an already stretched area. Same goes for the ambulance service and fire brigade, just how far can these shrinking areas be stretched. Even the council has had to cancel the green collection, due to cuts in budget,	Sutton to leave Birmingham. Leave the green belt alone. Address the issue of the thousands of empty and void houses in the area. Put people first, not a money making machine.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp658	Building on green belt land is the easy, cheap option but ignores key issues such as road congestion, schooling, hospitals/doctors' surgeries, etc. There are so many derelict / rundown areas of Birmingham that urgently need redevelopment but because this is a more expensive option it is ignored so inner city areas become more rundown and empty while on the outskirts of the city we lose more of our precious green belt land. It is time for more creative options to be adopted as building on green belt is storing problems for the future. The more that green belt is built upon, the more likely that flooding will take place; the further people will have to travel increasing congestion and pollution; the more crowded local schools and hospitals/surgeries will become.	Look for better options nearer the city centre where infrastructure already exists but where regeneration is urgently needed.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp680	There has already been significant developments within Sutton, in areas such as: Four Oaks, Bishops Manor, Walmley, Holland Park, Boldmere. This increased population has already made a significant impact on transport links, increasing the average travel time in and out of Birmingham City Centre. Without the introduction of new/ increased transport links (rail and road) the current systems would simply collapse under the increased volume. The proposed population increase would also have a significant impact on the education system, schools within the Sutton area are already over subscribed, this is putting additional pressure on the education system in this area. The secondary schools within Sutton perform above the city and national average, however the additional pressure these schools will be under will no doubt see thus change, affecting the quality if education provided to residents within the area. This issue is also mirrored within the health care system, with many doctors and dentists already unable to support new patients. This does not take into account that there will be additional strain on emergency services, such as Police, Fire Services and Good Hope hospital. All of the above is	I believe that this development should not go ahead, or at the very least cut the proposed development by 75%, to manage the impact on the environment and local amenities.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp701	Green belt should be left alone, build on brown field sites	remove the proposal to build on the green belt	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp713	The proposal to build on the green belt only helps developers who will make alot of money out of this. Birmingham CC is sacrificing our green land for money. Why does Birmingham have to build more houses, who decides that Birmingham needs to be bigger, why not concentrate on making what we have better. There are NO exceptional circumstances which allow BCC to change the green belt. It seems wrong that the councillors from the other side of the city can decide on major changes to Sutton Coldfield not taking into account the views of local people and councillors. The local information on this issue has been very poor, no consultation with local churches, schools, no information to the council tax payers in the sutton area by the council. I have received nothing from them and only know about the issue because of local people taking the time and money to produce and send out information. Every home in Birmingham should be told by BCC. To change green belt for industrial use is criminal, who wants this ? The council own this land so who benefits ? have they been inpartial in this ?	REmove all changes to the green belt from the plan and look to be more creative with regard to housing and industriaal developments using existing empty properties.		Green Belt	TP10
bp729	There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the development of green belt land, when there is so much derelict land, and so many empty premises in the city which should be utilised first. No explanation has been given as to why the green belt land would be released first. This will lead to urban sprawl and there will be no green belt for future generations to enjoy. Of course, the greedy developers would much prefer the easier option of digging up empty fields, as there would be no derelict buildings to demolish first (eating into their profits). BCC should not sell out to the developers in a short-sighted attempt to solve the current shortage of funds. If they do, then this generation and future generations will suffer as a result. Voters have very long memories, and will not forgive the unnecessary destruction of their green belt.	Develop all brown field sites first, and preserve the little remaining green belt for future generations.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp744			The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. There is no justification fo building on the GreenBelt 2016. The Greenbelt should be preserved as there is only 15% remaining in Birmingham	There are 17000 houses with planning whether it be full or outline. There are 12000 empty houses. BCC should explain the release of greenbelt as an alternative to development of urban sites when housing stock is available. Brownfield site should also be developed, as I travel throug Birmingham there are 100's of Brownfield sites that could be developed. However it probably comes down to ease of just taking away a bit more of the Greenbelt.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp748			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp760			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp769			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp771			I object to the plan because it has taken the enormous step of considering building on what little is left of Birmingham's Green Belt when the plan is incomplete. Why is the council planning to build on Green Belt when when plans are already approved for house to be built on brownfield sites and these have not been started? How can we trust the council to protect the remaining Green Belt when all they have done over the years is to eat it up as and when they feel the need? Enough is enough.	The council should provide full information so that the public can see if building on Green Belt is really unavoidable. I also believe that any decision to build on Green Belt is delayed until the GBSLEP report is published in spring 2014. There should be more detail on the use of brown field sites and how Birmingham's existing housing stock can be used more efficiently.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp792			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp814	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	We do not accept that "exceptional circumstances" justifying loss of significant areas of Birmingham's Green Belt exist (please see our comments on Soundness).		Yes	Green Belt	TP10

bp825	The case has not been presented to demonstrate that all other options have been fully explored such as existing brown field site. Birmingham City Council is prepared to allow developers to make excessive profits by taking the easy option which will result in a significant loss of environment and amenity to future generations purely because the current council want to play politics with Central Government. There are not any exceptional circumstances which allow BCC to change the green belt and it is wrong that the councillors from other areas of the city can decide upon such a major change to Walmley and Sutton Coldfield in order to protect there own areas. Where is the evidence that any industry would consider moving into the area. Previously multinationals who have looked before are long gone as it did not make economic sense to them. As owners of part of the land where is the independent view on what is best for the whole of Birmingham coming from? If the council wishes to destroy the green belt then they should put the matter out to a public enquiry that is fully communicated to all residents of Birmingham to ensure that real democracy is taking place and the view of all interested parties are	A review of all options should be completed and then communicated to residents so that a it can be seen that there is no other option than using green belt in the Sutton Coldfield area if Birmingham wishes to increase its housing development.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp838	The purpose of the Green Belt was to provide breathing space around our cities and to prevent urban sprawl. The laudable aims of this initiative seems to have been diluted over the intervening years since its inception in many places. It is time to say enough is enough, once built on, it is gone forever. The exceptional circumstances used to justify this latest plan are nothing more than a lazy solution to housing expansion. Developers are much more inclined towards virgin land than brown field sites since there are no expensive measures to take prior to starting building work. It would be an act of vandalism to build on the site which is proposed.	Green Belt land should not be released until all other options have been explored.There are 17000 houses with full or outline planning, 12000 empty homes within the Birmingham conurbation and this should be considered as an alternative before any Green Belt land is released.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp876	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp894	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp903	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp911	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp946	i am opposed to building on our Green belt land.	Do not build on Green belt land.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp964	Policy TP10 - Green Belt Green Belt is a Government policy for controlling urban growth. The idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of Green Belts are their openness. Taking away a part will reduce this openness. The supply of land set aside for agriculture, and included in Green Belts, is a limited and decreasing resource. It is the prime mover behind "sustainability" and, although it may not be crucial to our food supply at present, it will so be in the future. In addition to the direct loss of food production and amenities that happens when Green Belt is developed, the environmental threats must be fully evaluated before any change of use decision is made. Particularly relevant at the moment, although the areas under consideration may not be immediately threatened by flooding, any development will lead to increased surface water run-off and foul water both of which will	1. The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6, and other sites on the perifery of Sutton Coldfield, should be abandoned. 2.Comprehensive reviews and development of Policies TP10, TP16, TP34, TP35, TP36, and TP37 to be carried out to identify suitable alternative and more appropriate development areas within the City.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp1012	The utalisation of the green belt in Walmley is not justified, changes to green belt status should be in exceptional circumstancies and this presently is nut justifiable. The plan does not set out the rational for using Green Belt before considering other options such as Brown field sites	The use of Brown field sites needs to be fully explored first. Considertaion should be givento smaller developments that would not have such a major impact on one community.		Green Belt	TP10

bp1022	The Green Belt policy was created by Government to prevent urban sprawl. The Green Belt was meant to be protected from development. It is important for our health and well-being, and to preserve the character of villages such as Walmley. The Green Belt is a limited resource, which may be needed for food production in the future. There is already waterlogged land, blocked drains, and flooding in some areas. This can only get worse if the land is built on. It's not rocket science - more concrete means more water run-off, and a greater strain on the current drainage systems, which already cannot cope. Of course the developers will play down any such issues and say there is not a problem. They will not be there to deal with the aftermath. They will have taken their money and run. The Green Belt should be protected for future generations. There is no justification for considering destroying it. Once it's built upon, it will be lost forever.	Abandon all plans to develop the Greenfield sites. Review all brownfield sites to ensure that all are utilised in priority to the Green Belt. A major rethink is required concerning the already overloaded local infrastructure - particularly transport links between Sutton Coldfield and Birmingham City Centre to ease the daily rush-hour gridlock.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1025	Given the amount of land available closer to the city centre - and the permissions already granted to developers, it is difficult to see that 'exceptional circumstances' exist.	Don't alter the Green Belt Boundaries, and don't build on it.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1028	I would draw attention to the Written Ministerial Statement below from Local Government Minister Brandon Lewis published the 17th January 2014 which appears quite explicit:"In my written statement of 1 July 2013, official report, column 41 WS, I noted the government's intentions with regard to the importance of the protection of the green belt. The government's planning policy is clear that both temporary and permanent traveller sites are inappropriate development in the green belt and that planning decisions should protect green belt land from such inappropriate development. I also noted the Secretary of State's policy position that unmet need, whether for traveller sites or for conventional housing, is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development in the green belt. The Secretary of State wishes to re-emphasise this policy point to both local planning authorities and planning inspectors as a material consideration in their planning decisions."In my opinion, the reasons put forward by BCC do not constitute anything like " the very special circunstances" that are	Identify and develop all non-Green Belt opportunities first. i.e. Brownfield sites, empty housing stock, planning applications currently being processed. Complete work with neighbouring authorities to identify opportunities for development and complete building work prior to building on the Green Belt. In particular, The Black Country is known to be desperate for regeneration of significant areas of non-greenbelt land.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1037			Firstly, having read over the Government's 'National Planning Policy Framework', the fundamental aim of green belt policy is to "check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas" by keeping land permanently open, "preserve the setting and special character of historic towns" and to "assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land". What the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension and Peddimore proposal's do is anything but consider this. A mass development of 6,000 homes would only further reduce important green belt, separating three urbanised areas; Birmingham, Tamworth and Lichfield. It would not "restrict urban sprawl". Sutton Coldfield is also recognised for being an affluent and historical town, which is leafy and rural, and steeped in charm. Building a development of this size on what little green belt Sutton Coldfield has left (a substantial chunk of the 15% of Birmingham's remaining green belt), will only serve to diminish the "special character" of the town, thus reducing its unique appeal to visitors and residents. One thing this proposal does not take into account is the "recycling of derelict and other urban land". Brownfield sites	After some rudimentary investigation I have come to understand there is an existing housing stock in Birmingham of no less than 45,000, which clearly Birmingham City Council must consider exhausting first before even thinking about building on any of Birmingham's green belt. I feel it is only right that Birmingham City Council inform the city's residents as to why they have planned to build on the green belt as a first choice. Please could this be detailed to me?	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1053			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1065			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1089			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1101	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to Birmingham's greenbelt by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Green Belt	TP10

bp1109	I feel that the plans to build a proposed 6K houses on Sutton Coldfield Green Belt are unjustifiable. If further areas of green belt are removed then it won't do it's job in preventing the urban sprawl. This only 15% of the green belt remaining, I feel this proposal isn't workable when there are 17,000 houses with full or outline planning and also a large number of empty houses within Birmingham Council.	To scrap the plans to build on Sutton Coldfield green belt To use empty houses or build houses in areas which already have planning permission.		Green Belt	TP10
bp1119	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1131	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1160	Re TP10, GA15. Established green belt areas are set aside by Government to prevent them being built upon and these areas should only be used in exceptional circumstances ie when all other options have been exhausted. This is clearly not the case. There are many areas of brownfield sites which are lying around empty just waiting for re development. This is not such an attractive proposition to the developers as land has to be cleared, sites are smaller and most obviously the sale price of properties in Sutton Coldfield would be greater than say inner city re-development. However these places are probably where housing is most needed and would also be affordable housing.	Do not use Green Belt before utilising brownfield sites, build houses in smaller pockets rather than en masse impacting on local communities for example already overloaded road links, schools and medical facilities.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1164	"There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and such development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist. Development proposals, including those involving previously developed land and buildings, in the Green Belt will be assessed in relation to the relevant national planning policy. "Surely the above sentence negates building on greenbelt areas around Sutton Coldfield. There are nioexceptional circumstances. Birmingham City Council can take advantage of the governments Empty Homes programme. In the Midlands there are an estimated 72,000 Homes that are empty. What has Birmingham CC done to bring these into use. Source : http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg	These are not exceptional circumstances as the Empty Homes programme has not been utilised to bring the 72,000 empty homes in Birmingham back into use, and therefore the Green Belt should be maintained. In fact I would like to see forests be created on the Green Belt.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1180	Currently there are no exceptional circumstances that support the release of green belt land for development. It is not yet necessary to amend the green belt boundary therefore national planning policy should be adhered to and alternatives in the form of brown field sites should be used for development.	Investigate the use of brown field sites for industrial and residential development.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1196	I am unable to grasp how the proposals of this plan to build on Green Belt and block the view of two of the city's historical landmarks, Peddimore Hall and Langley Hall, which are both Grade 2 listed could possibly meet the aims of your vision 3.1. GREEN BELT is there to stop urban sprawl. This plan will create urban sprawl. I cannot see evidence in your plan to consider using empty housing stock and urban sites before turning to Green Belts as an option. The plan will destroy productive grade 3a farmland. This will damage the rural economy. This land produces crops for the UK cereal industry, so the plan will have a direct affect on the amount of cereal produced in the UK plus an affect on our pocket, if this food has to be imported.	I would like the City to consider other options such as empty houses and commercial property, and urban and waste sites before turning to Green Belt.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1207	NPPF states that 'Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances.' I would like to know what exceptional circumstances there are. This is not made clear in the BDP. Until all Brownfield sites have been used, I believe the Green Belt of which we only have 15% should remain untouched . Climate change means that every piece of open land should be considered valuable to the City as a future site for growing food. We can no longer rely on food from other countries with global climate change.	Use all Brownfield sites and remove the Green Belt from the BDP.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1231	The Green Belt was created specifically to prevent Birmingham continuing to sprawl across the countryside and eventually meet up with Lichfield and Tamworth. The proposal to build on Sutton Coldfield Green Belt completely contradicts this. Only 15% of land in Birmingham is currently Green Belt. The NPPF says Green Belt boundaries should only be changed in "exceptional circumstances", is this really an exceptional circumstance? It is just the usual pressure for new housebuilding which has existed for 50 years.	There are large areas of brownfield land across Birmingham and the wider West Midlands which should be developed first. Increasing the population density in inner-city areas will mean improved shops and amenities for the local residents. The Green Belt should only be built on as a last resort, it should not be the first area earmarked for development.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1248	Do not build on the Green belt. It is NOT necessary. Moreover if you do, you then are in conflict with many of your other stated objectives.	Do not build on the Green Belt. Consider alternatives 1. Do NOT plan for such a large increase in population. Discourage that. 2. Do NOT make so much provision for retail and office space which may well not be needed with changing practice. 3. Do make better use of brownfield sites - where regeneration would be environmentally beneficial 3. Do consult with adjacent authorities to obtain a coherent and agreed regional plan.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp1267	Policy TP10 This is a remarkably short section - but given that the city council is seeking to remove Green Belt protection from significant areas of land it is not surprising that the plan should seek to down play the importance of Green belt protection. There are numerous sections and policy statements within the draft plan which aim to promote or protect green spaces and the natural environment. The policy section on Green Belt should include references to these other sections so that it is clearer to readers how the protection and retention of the Green Belt is vital to support other areas of the plan. In contrast the section merely makes cross reference to policies GA5 and Ga6 which aim to remove Green Belt protection from land. Item 6.57 "National planning policy makes it clear that established Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances and only when a local plan is being prepared or reviewed. As outlined in Section 3 and policies GA5 and GA6 it has been necessary to amend the Green Belt boundary to meet the needs of both housing and employment development." As this paragraph points out, Green Belt designation should only be removed under exceptional circumstances	Re Policy TP10 - this should be rewritten and expanded to ensure that adequate cross reference to other relevant sections is included, to demonstrate for future readers how vital the Green Belt is to support a wide range of other policies to protect and improve our natural environment, counter climate change etc. Re Item 6.57 - remove any plans to reduce the Green Belt and instead give it greater protection. No exceptional circumstances have been proved. * * *

bp1319	The council is attempting to remove Green Belt protection from land using very flimsy excuses. The steady reduction of Birmingham's Green Belt is a continuing theme each time the council submits its long term land use plan. The only people it probably comes as a surprise to are the people who move into the new homes built on former Green Belt and who mistakenly believe that they will continue to live near a rural area. The council is appearing to take only small chunks out of what little Green Belt remains. However, a key part of defining Green Belt is its having a definite and defendable boundary. By taking the chunks out that are proposed, the council is breeching the defensible line of the Green Belt set out in the last review, thereby opening the floodgates to wholesale loss of Green Belt land. The loss of any part of the existing Green Belt land puts at risk the remaining land even though the council might wish for it to be defined as such. Developers owning land in the remaining Green Belt will seek to remove any residual protection. The council therefore needs to protect all the Green Belt by refraining to change the status of any part of such land.	No change should be made to the areas of land designated as Green Belt (or other designation providing protection from development). * * *

bp1357	The requirement for additional housing and industrial sites in Birmingham does not need to and should not alter the current green belt boundary to the city. The requirement for additional homes and manufacturing / industrial sites can easily be maintained within the current boundaries of Birmingham by using available brownfield sites. There are enough areas of land to easily accommodate the required housing to fulfill the proposal (old QE hospital, areas of Bromford housing estate, Lyndhurst housing estate an numerous other brownfield sites in Birmingham), an example is how Pype Hayes was redeveloped successfully by Birmingham council. There are numerous other manufacturing sites which are completely under-utilised and would accommodate the requirement for industrial sites. These include the Minworth industrial park, the old Cincinnati works on Kingsbury road, the Hub area of Witton (old IMI works), as well as recent industrial parks which have had warehousing & industrial units sitting empty ever since they were built (junction 6 industrial park & the Hub in Witton). Please remember, Dunlop motorsport were offered alternative accommodation within Birmingham yet chose	Do not build on greenfield sites and retain the current greenfield boundaries. Alternative brown field sites are available now which can easily supply the space required for the additional housing, and planning already exists for the additional housing required without additional housing on green belt land. If more people need to live in Birmingham, let them enjoy the countryside not some artificial parks created by developers to justify carving up the countryside.	Green Belt	TP10

bp1362	There is no requirement for green belt land to be built on to support additional housing or industrial sites. There are enough brownfield sites within Birmingham to easily accommodate the housing requirement, and enough empty properties to allow redevelopment & regeneration of current housing stock. There are also large areas of industrial land not used which has suitable access and footprint to supply the requirement for industrial land (Minworth trade park, Cincinnati industrial site, DuPont industrial site and Birmingham Hub). There are current large industrial units available which have stood empty within Birmingham for years, these areas should be looked at first (Birmingham Hub & Junction 6 indistrial park), as well as mny small industrial units in the Birmingham areas which are under utilised. There is no need to destroy green belt in order to build housing and industrial sites, the answer is already there but requires imaginative planning and development.	No changes to the green belt boundary and redevelopment of current brown field sites and housing in the Birmingham area. More thought should be applied to the areas that already exist and not destroying the areas of countryside all current and future residents of Birmingham can enjoy.		Green Belt	TP10
bp1363	I do not think that the Green Belt should be built on before utilising brownfield sites. It would be better to build houses in smaller numbers rather than the tens of thousands proposed which will have a negative impact on the local infrastructure. The roads, schools and medical facilities will not be able to cope and are almost at full capacity now.	Do not build on the Green Belt until all the inner city brown belt sites have been utilised.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1365	There is no justification for building on the green belt when there are brownfield sites which should be regenerated first. There are also a very large number of empty properties which should be brought back into use before the greenbelt is even considered for building on.	Greenbelt should not be built on, brownfield sites should be redeveloped instead.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1425	The planning framework is very clear on protecting the Green Belt, NPPF paragraph 83, the framework states that the boundaries should only be changed in " exceptional circumstances" . There is no evidence provided by the BCC to justify or state with confidence that these are " exceptional circumstances".This is due to the decision to build on the Green Belt being based on insufficient information and contravenes national policy. The Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl. Birmingham has very little Green Space remaining. Please refer to my comments in Q4, which in summary state that " the Strategy for Birmingham is not considered the most appropriate strategy as reasonable alternatives have not been considered". 1.The BCC have failed to cooperate "constructively, actively and on an on-going basis" to a sufficiently advanced degree to make the plan mature enough for examination. The SA declares in its non-technical summary that there is uncertainty over where a very large proportion (30,000 units/houses, roughly 37%) of Birmingham's identified housing need is to be located. This significant shortfall clearly does not satisfy a requirement that the plan be positively prepared to meet objectively	Green belt removed from this plan as " exceptional circumstances " cannot be proved.Green Belt land should be removed from the 2031 plan and for any future plans. Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan for releasing green belt land for development be considered correct. The remaining Green Belt in Birmingham protected to prevent Urban sprawl. Building on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF and therefore should be removed from the plan.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp1446	I would contend that you have not provided sufficient evidence or argument to allow any development within the peripheral green belt land. It was designated as such to specifically prevent city sprawl. The city plan must focus on the re-development of brownfield sites within the city to provide for the additional homes and industrial development.	The Government must give extra support to Local Authorities to acquire privately owned land lying unused or in very poor condition to allow for additional brownfield development within the inner City area. It's clear there are large areas of land in extremely poor use that could be put to use as homes of commercial/industrial development - assuming that there is insufficient land owned by the City Council that could be used for this purpose. The proposal to develop existing green belt land must be removed from the draft plan.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1450	.."There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and such development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist. Development proposals, including those involving previously developed land and buildings, in the Green Belt will be assessed in relation to the relevant national planning policy. ".. So the proposal is to build 6000 homes on green belt? Do you not consider this to be inappropriate development? What is the point of green belt if it is so easy to remove it from green belt?	Stop development on existing green belt land.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1455	The policy provides that the use of the Green Belt should be as last resort, that urban sprawl should be avoided. This plan is unnecessarily expanding the urban sprawl and given that Birmingham has such a small amount of Green Belt left it represents a substantial reduction. There are inconsistencies within the plan around the amount of brown field sites and empty properties available and any reassurance that these will be exhausted before using the Green Belt. The overall demand for housing is also unclear so I strongly object to any agreement or early development on the Green Belt until evidence is clear that it is needed and is of a last resort.	Proper investigation into the demand for housing and potentially a freeze on any urban expansion into the Green Belt until this can be truly validated. Full investigation into the brown field sites and existing property development and the ability of surrounding authorities to soak some of the demand before any agreement to the Green Belt being proposed.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1464	There is no justification for building on green belt land whatsoever. The plan does not justify the need to build on the green belt around Sutton Coldfield from 2016. The green belt exists specifically to prevent urban sprawl and this plan simply extends urban sprawl into the countryside whilst ignoring the opportunities that exist within the urban area to make better use of land and existing buildings. These opportunities exist everywhere you look in the city and it is completely wrong to continue to develop further and further out into the countryside when so many other opportunities exist without building on green belt land. The 15% of green belt land within Birmingham's total area is very precious and must be maintained and saved from development. There is no justification and no exceptional circumstances that currently exist for this to be approved. There are lots of other solutions being implemented around the world to the issues we face and our answers are out of date and simply environmental vandalism.	BCC must explain and fully justify why the green belt land has been targeted. It is not justified that building starts in 2016 when there is a pipeline of 17000 houses in the city with full or outline planning permission in place. It is not justified that building starts in 2016 when there are 12000 empty/unoccupied houses in the city. BCC needs to explain why green belt land has been released and the green belt boundaries proposed to be changed as an alternative to developing other opportunities such as developing urban land pockets and reusing/redeveloping existing buildings for appropriate use. BCC needs to explain why existing housing stock opportunities are being ignored in favour of releasing green belt land in the plan.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1481	The National Planning Policy Framework stipulates 82. The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. If proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should: ● demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate; ● set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary; ● show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development; ● demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with Local Plans for adjoining areas; and ● show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the Framework. The Birmingham Development Plan at present fails to address these points	The Birmingham Development Plan should be amended to address these aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework.		Green Belt	TP10

bp1489	I fail to see how a proposed project of this size and complexity can be anything other than damaging to the Green Belt and goes against the Government Strategy of protecting the environment from uran sprawl	Develop brownfield opportunites which are not detrimental to the Green Belt/	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1537	Do not build on green belt land use brownfield sites or demolish derelict properties and redevelop the land not only will we have no green spaces you are destroying wildlife and there natural habitat	Do not amend the green belt boundary use many of the empty houses in Birmingham and brownfield sites	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp1538	It most certainly is not necessary to amend the Green Belt boundary. This has all been proposed on the basis of questionable forecasts about population growth, an obsession with growth, and the notion that Birmingham is responsible for providing jobs and homes for everyone who happens to live there, or may live there in the future.	The Plan should acknowledge that current circumstances are not exceptional, and withdraw any plans to build on Green Belt land.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1541	Subject: Planning Housing in inappropriate Greenbelt areas A1 & A2 Birmingham 2031 I am writing to advise you of my objection to the areas referred to A1 and A2 in the Birmingham housing consultation 2031. These areas are adjacent to Hillwood, Lichfield & Weeford Road in greenbelt land. It is a very bad idea to propose housing in the rural land for the following reasons. • The land is Greenbelts and should not be built upon. • The land has no infrastructure to build upon, meaning the investment, disruption and impact to the area would not meet the sustainability requirements of the development plan, damaging the area for future generations. • There are not enough amenities in the area to cope with the additional population for doctors, schools, council services provision, sewage, watercourse management, drainage to prevent rainwater run-of estate flooding, general utilities, shops, post offices, public transport. • There are insufficient employment opportunities. • There is not provision for the additional traffic, and impact to the local roads around Hill Village, Watford Gap and Mere Green and Canwell. This area already suffers from traffic hotspots for a large proportion of the day, and is already bad	The land is Greenbelts and should not be built upon. It is against current law, and only attempted to be circumnavigated in the interest of the remote council. Once this area is defaced – it is lost forever. Please concentrate on non-greenbelt, and brownfield / re-development opportunities where there is much opportunity for improving things for all.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1543	My comment relates to TP10,GA5 Green belt land should be respected as land which is left as either agricultural or natural , i.e. not built upon. This is so that the health (both physical & mental) of people living next to geen belt land is maintained. There is sufficient housing stock at present which needs to be filled,or upgraded before urban sites are considered.	A thorough stock -taking of empty properties, brown sites etc. A proper census to determine the population of the area and its future needs.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1553	I am concerned that the City Council plans to use greenbelt land for development when there are empty houses and vacant brownfield sites within the city boundaries. This would seem to me to be lazy planning and taking the easiest option.	All plans to use greenbelt land should be cancelled until all empty properties and vacant land is used.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1559	Green belt should not be built on until brown belt land has been used.	Don't build on the green belt in Sutton Coldfield - it is not justified.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1567	Can the bcc not see what a big mistake it would be to develop here. They need to spend time and money on areas that need it. Concentrate on repairing mistakes from the past. Redeveloping estates. Updating current homes in poor areas.	Take the plans elsewhere !	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1571	TP10 GAS There are lots of sites around Birmingham where houses could be built without using the green belt. Cut down more trees and more flooding will take place. I know of two sites around Sutton where schools have been demolished and the land left abandoned for years. Houses could be built on them.	Use all the other derelict land around Birmingham first and get all the unoccupied dwellings up to scratch and lived in.		Green Belt	TP10

bp1580	In a Written statement to Parliment 17/01/2014 Brandon Lewis MP"'inappropriate development in the green belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances.Having considered recent plannong decisions by councils and the planning inspectorate, it has become apparent that, in some cases, the green belt is not always being given the sufficient protection thatwas the explicit policy intent of ministers. The Secretary of State wishes to make it clearthat, in considering planning applications,althougheach case depends on its facts, that the single issue of unmet demand, whether foir traveller sites or for conventional housing, is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt and other harm to constitute the 'very special circumstances' justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt"The NPPF para 89 states- a local authority should regard the construction of new buildings as innapropriate in Green Belt - it lists exceprions , which do not include housing or industrial developments.	BCC should utilise all available brown field sights, together with unoccupied houses to provide housing within the city before developing Green Belt sites	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1590	This plan will increase urban sprawl - why is Green Belt being targeted so early (potential development in 2016) when other brownfield sites are still available	the 17000 houses already with outline or full planning permission must be completed first, concurrently also refurbish the approximately 12000 empty properties throughout Birmingham. Make use of urban sites - green belt should be a last resort. However. I would say that I would support an eventual limited development of the proposed location ONLY if it was developed with designated usable open spaces (something akin to New Hall Valley or some kind of parkland usable by locals), as although the current green belt is nice to look at, it is not usable. A compromise could be an option	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1598	The core planning principles state clearly "..protecting Green Belts...." Paragraph 17, NPPF Chapter 9 paragraphs 79, 80 and 81 within the planning policy indicate development to be restricted for example on land designated as Green Belt. Paragraph 83 "Green Belt boundaries altered only in exceptional circumstances through the preparation or review of the local plan. At that time authorities should consider the Green belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period" 1. If you apply it in context of Chapter 9, then the policy is about protecting green belt. That the "authorities should have regard to their intended permanence". "Capable of enduring beyond the plan period". The plan does not follow this policy. The paragraph 82 states "altered in exceptional circumstances ".. 2. The local plan has not demonstrated that these are exceptional circumstances. Information is missing. The data presented requires a full examination as there are inconsistencies in the detail between BCC documents on forecasted population growth. GBSLEP Spatial growth information is still in	The city council need to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances which justify building on the green belt (which if it occurs will be inviolable). The city has only 15% green belt remaining; the cities boundary should be preserved and made permanent. Where will urban sprawl end if we don't draw a line that at which point we are considered "Full"? Birmingham has very little green belt remaining and as a city we will be at capacity in 2023 using all housing stock unless they seek alternatives using the duty to cooperate. Therefore it should be mandated that there is no more release of the Green Belt. We are already a city which is 85% densely populated therefore 15% should remain permanently as Green Belt. The city council to adhere to planning policy as per chapter 9, paragraphs 51,52,79, 80, 81,83 and 89.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp1611	There are no 'exceptional circumstances' for the use of Green Belt land at Langley and Peddimore since there is housing stock available within Birmingham.	Urban sites are available in Birmingham and these should be developed first. What is the justification for using Green belt land?	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1618	Policy TP10 – I do not support the revision of the Green Belt boundaries as outlined in policies GA5 and GA6. I believe that all non-Green Belt land should be fully developed before development on Green Belt land should even be considered, let alone implemented. The National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, March 2012) states that "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl". Building 6,000 new homes and using 80 ha of land for employment and the associated infrastructure for both these developments would create additional urban sprawl. It also states that "The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence". Any proposal to remove land from the Green Belt for urban development is in direct opposition to these characteristics. It also states "Local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land". The Birmingham Development Plan should therefore be	Ensure that every opportunity to develop all non-Green Belt land in Birmingham is taken before considering any plans to develop Green Belt land. Undertake additional discussions with neighbouring authorities to identify other non-Green Belt areas that would benefit from regeneration through the provision of additional housing stock and associated infrastructure with the support of Birmingham. Replace proposals for urban extension with proposals to enhance the use of the Green Belt land. Ensure the timetabling of planning activity is such that it does not reach a "point of no return" before the results of the referendum to establish a Sutton Coldfield Town Council are known and, assuming it is agreed, implemented. Identify some areas in which measures to improve public access to and use of the Green Wedges and Green Belt will be developed.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1657	These comments relate to TP10 and GA5. Justification has not been provided in this plan for building on the Green Belt. This plan makes a mockery of the term Green Belt. The land was designated as green belt in order to prevent urban sprawl, whereas this plan will actually create it more so!	Birmingham City Council should explain to the people affected by these plans why green belt land is being considered to develop an urban site on, when there are 12,000 empty homes available that could be utilised instead.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1662	The Green belt should be kept to stop the growth of the town; there has to be a barrier to prevent urban sprawl which exacerbates the problems of congestion and pollution which BCC is trying to reduce. At what point will the encroachment of green belt land stop before urban areas merge completely?	Use brownfield land to build houses. Design housing that uses land more efficiently - flats for those who do not want gardens; larger numbers of smaller houses to meet the needs of the growing number of single person households and smaller families.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1675	Birmingham has precious little Green Belt remaining, and it should be preserved, not used as an easy, more profitable option to build on. Brown field land should be carefully assessed before making any plans for building on Green Belt land.	Further detail provided by the planners on why Green Belt land has been selected ahead of re-development of urban land. Existing empty houses should be utilised/renovated for use before making blanket decisions to build thousands of houses in an unsustainable development that is being rushed through without proper consultation.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1683	Green belt land refers to an area that is kept as an open space. The main purpose of the green belt policy is to protect the land around larger urban centres, and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife. Building on this green land will not only destroy the habitats of smaller animals, but also larger mammals, for example; horses, donkeys and farmers. As there are currently 12,000 empty homes within Birmingham and a further 17,000 sites with permission granted, building here would be unjust.	As BCC's plan is only 61% complete, it does not address the requirement to build on green belt land. BCC should therefore utilise existing 12,000 empty houses and brown field sites within Birmingham.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1687	It is not necessary to propose building on Green Belt land - this is not a matter of 'exceptional circumstances'. It is to be considered for the real reason it is here - why ruin a vital and beautiful environment, thus depriving us and future people? It needs to be retained and protected - regarded with gratitude as a legacy.	Remove any proposals to build on Green Belt land. Re-energise and bring tired areas back to life. Value the character of Sutton Coldfield and the voice of its local people.		Green Belt	TP10
bp1697	Why have all avenues not been exhausted to develop existing land and or fully utilise empty/derelict homes throughout Birmingham. There are countless thousands of homes that are currently uninhabited in addition to a similar amount that already have been granted planning permission to be built upon prior to it constituting 'exceptional circumstances' for the Green Belt to be used for building purposes. Also industrial sites could be purchased and reassigned or converted for residential purposes. The local roads in the area would be unable to accommodate the marked increase in traffic flow and would likely cause extended delays and congestion.	Abolish plans to use the Green Belt for Residential purposes and preserve the already diminishing percentage of this valuable resource.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1712	The report / planners failed to provide evidence of exceptional circumstances upon which the development should proceed. Therefore the green belt should be left untouched.	Cease planned development asap	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1730	The green belt was put there for a purpose - to avoid urban sprawl. If you build homes here, we will be verging on merging with Tamworth and the surrounding area.The green belt is also valuable farm and arable land. I shop at our local farm shop which is right on the edge of where you propose building. What would happen to this thriving business not to mention the animals and livestock. They would be out of business!! JOB LOSSES not gains and you are stating that the homes are need to create jobs. Nature - The areas on which you are proposing to build have a rich and diverse habitat. What would happen if we lost this due to concrete and steel.? We would start to loose species and our children and future generations worse off for it. The local climate would change with potential increase in fumes and pollution not to mention flooding. The land we are talking of is valuable to walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders and nature lovers. Exercise and learning about our environment is important for all of us. Where would we go if we loose this land? How will our children learn about nature and enjoy the opportunity of a walk in the countryside? People would be less likely to go out and sit at home, increasing risks of obesity		No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1747	Policy TP10 states "There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and such development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist"The plan put forward does not make a case for very special circumstances. Green Belt land exists to prevent urban sprawl, and as Birmingham only has 15% Green Belt land remaining there is more of a case for keeping and protecting it than there is an exceptional case for building on it. Building on this Green Belt land will encourage rather than prevent urban sprawl.	Birmingham City Council should justify what the exceptional circumstances are that mandate building on this Green Belt land rather than examining the current brownfield sites that exist throughout the city. In addition, there is a lot of empty housing stock available - this should be brought back into use before any consideration can be given to developing on Green Belt land.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1757	The Green Belt is vital to provide ecosystem benefits to the city and surrounding areas, so it is good to see that 'There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and such development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist.' It would be helpful to describe what these 'very special circumstances' would be. I would like to see development on the green belt take place once all other options have been exhausted	Include the following statement in Policy TP10: Development of the Green Belt will only take place once all other avenues for providing housing have been exhausted e.g. brownfield site developed, targets in the Empty Homes Strategy met.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1766	The BDP is unsound for the following reasons:- 5.56 & 5.57 in the BDP refers to the release of land from the Green Belt for housing development. The NPPF Core Planning Principles clearly state that Green Belts must be protected... reuse land that has been previously developed(brownfield Land) NPPF (Para 83) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances..... City Deals Wave 1 (GB & Solihull LEP) 2012, Section 3 - Developers‟ difficulty in raising affordable loan finance and potential purchasers‟ difficulty in accessing mortgages and deposits against new homes means that developers are less willing to take risks with city brownfield sites and are therefore increasingly attracted to previously undeveloped land outside Birmingham's boundaries. The LEP document from the GOV.UK site clearly states that developers are attracted to Green Belt on a purely financial basis. This is not an ‘exceptional circumstance’? The BCC Housing Targets 2011-31 Technical Paper (Para 6.5) states that 2016-2021 will see housing delivery taking place on the land removed from the Green Belt. NPPF (Para 51) Local planning authorities should identify and	Remove the Green Belt from the BDP plans. The evidence shows that there is enough land until 2023.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1782		There is only around 15% of green belt left in this area and as stated in 6.57 this should only be used in exceptional circumstances. Therefore I am concerned that this land is being released before the numerous brown field sites have been utilised and which are in desperate need of regeneration. As I understand it there is also land with full or outline planning permission currently unused. Empty homes statistics (http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg) indicate that there are around 72,000 empty homes in the region which should be explored before destroying this land and depriving future generations.	To include a clear plan to bring a high percentage of the empty homes back into use. This would negate the need to revise the boundaries in such a dramatic way. Include clear plans to bring brownfield sites back into use rather than opting for the easier more appealing option to housing developers.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1784		The intended HS2 line is proposed to be built on the green belt land which is in very close proximity to the vast area of land which is being made available for development in amending the Green Belt boundary (albeit that the HS2 line would be outside of the Council's area of responsibility where it passes close to the boundary amendment). Therefore, given the infancy of the HS2 project, it would be impossible to know what environmental impact such a massive undertaking would have on the wider area and therefore I am concerned that this would invalidate any information and assumptions made in formulating the plan for the Langley (housing) and Pedimore (employment) developments. Personally I would like to see these plans put on hold and re-evaluated once the HS2 line is complete and operational.	Consideration of the impact that HS2 might have on the Green Belt land that would be reclassified in any boundary amendments. With a clear indication that where this impact would be impossible to decipher that any decisions would be put on hold pending completion of the HS2 line.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1786				There is only around 15% of green belt left in this area and as stated in 6.57 this should only be used in exceptional circumstances. Therefore I am concerned that this land is being released before the numerous brown field sites have been utilised and which are in desperate need of regeneration. As I understand it there is also land with full or outline planning permission currently unused. Empty homes statistics (http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg) indicate that there are around 72,000 empty homes in the region which should be explored before destroying this land and depriving future generations.	To include a clear plan to bring a high percentage of the empty homes back into use. This would negate the need to revise the boundaries in such a dramatic way. Include clear plans to bring brownfield sites back into use rather than opting for the easier more appealing option to housing developers.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1804	Mr R Orme	Mrs Philippa Kreuser	CT Planning	Given the Local Planning Authority appear to be short of land to accommodate some 29,000 homes, the proposed revisions to the Green Belt Boundary on the Proposals Map appear inadequate to provide for Birmingham's predicted population growth for the Plan period. Further opportunities should be sought to maximise the release of Green Belt land within Birmingham's own administrative boundaries before looking for other Districts to cater for Birmingham's future growth. Land at Blake Street/Ryknild Close (marked red on location plan 3990.99 – submitted under separate cover) located in the Green Belt at Hill Hook comprises some 1.5 hectares of agricultural land which could supply at least 30 dwellings at a build density of 20 dwellings per hectare. The site is located in a highly sustainable location; some 100 metres to the east of the site is Blake Street Railway Station where regular train services provide links to Birmingham, Lichfield and Redditch. Lichfield Road in the vicinity of the site is a public transport road providing services to Lichfield, Burton-on-Trent and Sutton Coldfield. The site is located within 500 metres of Little Aston Neighbourhood Centre where shopping	Given the Local Planning Authority appear to be short of land to accommodate some 29,000 homes, the proposed revisions to the Green Belt Boundary on the Proposals Map appear inadequate to provide for Birmingham's predicted population growth for the Plan period. Further opportunities should be sought to maximise the release of Green Belt land within Birmingham's own administrative boundaries before looking for other Districts to cater for Birmingham's future growth. Land at Blake Street/Ryknild Close (marked red on location plan 3990.99 – submitted under separate cover) located in the Green Belt at Hill Hook comprises some 1.5 hectares of agricultural land which could supply at least 30 dwellings at a build density of 20 dwellings per hectare. The site is located in a highly sustainable location; some 100 metres to the east of the site is Blake Street Railway Station where regular train services provide links to Birmingham, Lichfield and Redditch. Lichfield Road in the vicinity of the site is a public transport road providing services to Lichfield, Burton-on-Trent and Sutton Coldfield. The site is located within 500 metres of Little Aston	Yes	Green Belt	TP10

bp1815	The Birmingham Development Plan is unsound for the following reasons Population Growth It also attempts to show by unsound population growth figures, based on the Office of National Statistics which will only project to 2021, that the Population of Birmingham will be so large it will be forced to build on the Green Belt. It completely ignores the rate of building on the Brownfield Sites, refurbishing unused homes and the conversion of commercial and industrial buildings plus the existing approved planning permission will provide 45,000 homes. There is an average population growth until 2021 of 9,000 people per year which equates to approx. 4000 homes per year which is well within the 45,000 homes already available without building on Birmingham's Green Belt. There is no doubt using Birmingham's own figures there is no need to build on the Green Belt at all for 10 Years at least. Demographics Over the next ten years demographics of Birmigham will change as the housing requirements of the older generation change. At present the majority group of out right owned homes is 55-65 year olds although we are now entering the maximum impact of the baby boomers of the 40's and 50's the housing	The Birmingham Development Plan in proposing to build on the Green Belt exposes a fundamental truth that Birmingham cannot afford the BDP under the present financial strategy. There is no doubt we need to improve the living, working and housing of a substantial number of people in Birmingham. Financial gain through building on the Green Belt will not only be inadequate it will not compensate for damage to the sustainability of Birmingham as a whole. Realistically the only way to implement the BDP is to adhere rigorously to developing Brownfield sites by increasing the revenue income by increasing the community charge in areas of prosperity and wealth on a sliding scale depending on house value. Whilst using centralised funding to support solid sustainable development in Brown field sites. The present Plan is unsound and needs to be redefined by alternative funding strategies.	Yes	Green Belt	TP10

bp1820	Greenbelt land is there for an extremely good and important reason. It should remain sacrosanct. Once it starts being eroded then it will continue to be eroded and we will end up with one huge urban sprawl stretching from Birmingham through to Lichfield and Tamworth. All Brownfield sites and under utilised existing sites should be absolutely fully exhausted before building on green belt land is even considered. I believe it is totally unacceptable to be talking about building on green belt land (that has been consciously preserved over many many years, for good reason) based on a projected population growth that may never happen. Nobody knows what the future brings. Population fluctuates. Indeed, if the greenbelt is built on then those affected in the existing residential areas may well choose to go and live elsewhere anyway! My fear is that all this planning for building on green belt is based on projections that may never come to reality and we will have destroyed good agricultural land and Sutton Coldfield as we know it (and indeed other areas affected by proposed green belt development), all for no reason - and to see empty business units etc blotting the landscape.	Shelve all plans to build on green belt land until a) all brownfield etc land has been fully regenerated to accommodate the additional housing needs, and b) the projected population rise is much nearer to becoming a reality. Even then, all other avenues should be explored before building on green belt land. It is there for a reason and to my mind that reason has not changed. It should remain sacrosanct.	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1828	In relation to TP10 & GA5, development upon the Greenbelt should be abandoned. As illustrated in Chapter 9 of the National Policy Planning Framework, the fundamental aim of Green Belt areas is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping the land permanently open. Developing on Green Belt land will not prevent but create urban sprawl. Green Belt areas are also designated as such in order to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Developing upon Sutton Coldfield's Green Belt will diminish the special character of this town. The NPPF further states that Green Belt boundaries should not be altered except in exceptional circumstances. These exceptional circumstances listed provide limited justification to the proposed Green Belt developments, especially since the recycling of derelict and other urban land has not been given substantial weight as an alternate development option.	The recycling of derelict and other urban land should be considered first and foremost before development upon Green Belt land. Explanations as to why these areas have not been considered for development should be provided. It seems illogical and unjustified to address the issue of a growing population by developing upon Green Belt land before addressing the derelict areas of the city.	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp1845	The consultation document itself points out the green belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances - there is still not enough justification to warrant that this is an exceptional circumstance - particuarly as Walmley is already full and there are urban sites available across Birmingham.	Build on urban sites to protect our green belt areas	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1852	I believe there are several alternatives open to the council without having to touch the greenbelt, i strongly oppose this plan and believe this will have a detrimental effect on all infrastructure currently in place.	Consider all alternative means, empty homes, brown belt land etc..	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1874	I beleive that all brown site land should be fully utilised to stop the urban spread of Birminghams suburbs thus allowing those within Birmingham to feel part of the community and not feel in limbo between being in Birmingham but closer to say Tamworth or Lichfield. Once all other options for housing are exhausted than I believe the green belt should be reevaluated in wider consultion with the councils of the other areas that ajoin it to assess if the houses would be better being built within their brown site land so the green wildlife corridors can still exist and are advantagoeus to all those that ajoin them.	As above	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1887	The Green Belt is to be retained and protected, for the sake of us and future generations. It is neither wise nor practical to overpopulate an area, it loses balance.	Please remove any proposals to build on Green Belt land. Thank you.		Green Belt	TP10
bp1898	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1919	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1923	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1939	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1952	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1957	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp1965	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1969	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1971	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1980	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1991	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp1992	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2003	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2005	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2023	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2044	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2056	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2061	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp2079			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2092			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2117			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2126			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2129			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2138			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2142			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2145			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2160			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2165			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2172			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2184			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2196			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2204			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2216			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2238			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2247			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2253			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2262			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2266			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2272			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2278			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2285			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2299			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2302			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2313			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2319			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2322			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2332	Vale Dale	Head Housekeeper New Hall Hotel & Spa	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2336			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2344			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2352			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2363	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2373			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2380			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2382			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2389			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2398	Mr Darren Clueit	Container Control Co-Ordinator @ BMW	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2418			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2420			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2429			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2446			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2452			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2460			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp2469			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2483			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2486			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2495			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2512			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2525			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2546			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2559			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2565			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2572			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2601			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2607			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2612			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2618			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2623			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2626			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2640			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2649			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2657			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2665			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2671			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2677			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2686			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2695			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2704			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2706			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2726			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2738			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2745			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2760	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2798			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2807			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2846			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2854			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2857			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2868			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2872			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2876			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2884			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2898			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2912			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2915			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2922			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2931			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2935			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2950			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2954			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp2963				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2970				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp2985				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp2997				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3003				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3007				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3008				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3014				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3021				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3024							Green Belt	TP10
bp3028				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3036				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3042				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3048				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3051				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3068				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3070				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3075				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3077				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3079				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3085				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3096				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3099	Mr Colin Griffiths	Satnam Investments	Satnam Planning Services Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3104				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3107	Mr Colin Griffiths	Satnam Investments	Satnam Planning Services Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3110				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3125				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3139				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3147				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3160				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3164				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3168				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3174				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3178				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3182				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3190				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3204				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3217				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3223				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3228				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3244							Green Belt	TP10
bp3250				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3260				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp3264				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3269				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3273				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp3277			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3287			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3288			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3307			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3325			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3332			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3334			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3343			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3348			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3355			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3361	Mr Ray Harris	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp3367	Mrs G A Pestridge	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3373	Mr Paul O'Connor	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3379	Mr Robert Smith	Roughley Neighbourhood Forum	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3385			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3391			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3397	Mr David Pestridge	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3407			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3413			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3417			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3425			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3438			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3446			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3451			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3455	Mrs Sue Fenoughty	Executive Member of BAEE (UK) Editor Environmental Education	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3462			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3469			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3483			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3497			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3508			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3518			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3522			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3533			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp3547				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3559				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3571				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3576				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3588				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3590				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3597				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3606				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3609				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3618				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3626				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3627				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3638				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3647				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3668				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3681				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3682				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3692				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3693				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3701				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3713				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3721				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3728				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3731				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3733				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3739				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3749				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3767				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3769				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3774				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3777				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3780				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3788				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3793				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp3795				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3809				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3810				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3816	Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3823				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3824				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3834				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3838				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3850				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3853				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3863				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3872				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3874				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3877				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3878				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3886				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp3889	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3891	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3895	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3903	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3904	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3905	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3911	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3913	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3925	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3938	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3940	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3946	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3953	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3954	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3959	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3960	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp3965	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3966	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3971	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3974	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3977	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3981	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3990	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3995	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp3999	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4005	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4016	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4024	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4032	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4036	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4037	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4042	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4052	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4058	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4061	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4068	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4070	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4073	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4079	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4084	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4094	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4102	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4114	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4116	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4136	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4155	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4160	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4167	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4170	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4175	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4180	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4185	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp4190	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4195	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4200	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4205	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4210	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4215	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4220	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4226	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4231	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4235	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4241	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4246	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4255	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4258	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4263	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4269	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4282	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4287	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4291	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4293	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4312	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4322	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4326	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4329	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4338	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4339	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4346	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4354	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4373	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4384	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4390	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4394	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4402	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4408	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp4422	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4426	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4429	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4444	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4449	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4455	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4460	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4470	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4472	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4477	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4485	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4499	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4502	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4511	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4529	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4534	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4540	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4551	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp4557			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4569			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4586			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4594			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4605			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4623			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4627			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4640			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4646			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4656			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4681			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4695			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4696			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4718			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4720			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4723			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4732			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4734			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4743			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4747			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4749			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4755			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4757			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4762			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4766			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4780			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4790			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4794			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4810			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4818			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4828			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4837			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4846			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4850			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4859			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4866			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4869			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4876			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4882	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4888			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4903			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4912			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4921			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4933			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4945			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4952			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4958			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4962			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp4971			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4976			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp4998			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5001			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10

bp5008					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5015					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5028					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5033					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5047					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5056					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5064					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5065					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5072					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5077					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5114					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5135					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5143					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5149					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5163					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5172					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5177					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5184					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5190					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5215					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5225					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5237					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5246					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5255					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5262					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5282					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5291	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp5307					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5312	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp5344	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5358					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5367					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5371					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5377					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5394					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5397					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5440		Severn Trent Water Ltd	Mr Michael Askew	Senior Planner Lambert Smith Hampton	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5442					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5450					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5458					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5463					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5467					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5476					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp5482					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5491					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5499					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5515					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5525		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp5540					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5545	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5564					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5571	Paul Campbell	Director Richborough Estates Ltd	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5617					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5636					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5652					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5654					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5664					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5678					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5682					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5692					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5701		Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin	Partner Deloitte LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp5704					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5714					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp5718					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5724					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5731					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5738					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5743					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5750					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5844		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5852					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5859					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5871					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5879					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5896					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5899					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5900					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5913					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5914					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10

bp5916					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5923		Acocks Green Neighbourhood Office			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5936					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5982					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp5993					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Green Belt	TP10
bp6011	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Green Belt	TP10
bp6021					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Green Belt	TP10
bp28					why no commonwealth games application then ?			Sports facilities	TP11
bp145					The City was given first class facilities in Sutton when taken over. These are now 2nd class facilities and over priced. Demonstrate how these worthy words are gonig to be delivered	Provide some costed details and rationale on how the city can achieve this in the future for a larger population when it cant achieve it now. The planned growth in Sutton will swamp the current second rate facilities	Yes	Sports facilities	TP11
bp301					ANY FRANCHISE USING PUBLIC SPORT FACILITIES SHOULD SUBSIDISE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE BUILDING	LAND OWNED AND PROPERTY OWNED BY THE PUBLIC SHOULD NEVER BE SOLD BUT LEASED, ALWAYS TO REVERT BACK TO THE PUBLIC.	No	Sports facilities	TP11
bp706					With reference to para 6.64, disappointed that protection is not to be afforded to the stadia and facilities that attract so many visitors to the city, as well as being beneficial to residents.	Whilst accepting that a blanket statement regarding protection of such facilities would be too onerous on resources, perhaps the comment could be amended to categorise particular sports and/or locations, or if this is too detailed for this stage of the consultation, provide a statement to the effect that each case would be considered on its own merits and assessed by virtue of public opinion.	No	Sports facilities	TP11
bp733					Birmingham has an excellent existing motorsport facility at Birmigham Wheels. The documents seems to be silent on how this facility will be developed or replaced as part of the plan.	The plan should consider how the existing Birmigham Wheels site is to be developed as a motor sport venue or what the plans are for a replacement.	No	Sports facilities	TP11
bp947					Firstly, not everyone is interested in sport, for instance, some people prefer dance, yoga, pilates, or walking as modes of exercise. Secondly, if sport is so important, why are our swimming pools being closed down, and also the Ackers centre is now under threat, a wonderful facility in a deprived area.	Include other forms of exercise in plans for facilities, and don't close down our local facilities.	No	Sports facilities	TP11

bp1102	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing Birmingham's sports facilities by enhancing their setting and providing places to undertake formal and informal outdoor sport by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity		Sports facilities	TP11
bp1155	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The canals and towing paths accommodate a wide range of recognised watersports, e.g. canoeing, sailing, etc., and informal recreational activities, e.g. dog walking, jogging, angling, etc. The provision of and improvement to recreational facilities is welcomed to encourage use of the canal network. A variety of users access the formal and informal facilities the canal network provides for outdoor activities.	No	Sports facilities	TP11
bp1254			Good policy. In addition to supporting what is there, there is a need to reverse the damage of Thatcherism.	No	Sports facilities	TP11

bp1270					Policy TP11 Sports facilities, 4th bullet point "Facilities within the City's schools that can be used by the community provide a useful contribution towards the recreational and leisure requirements of the City and this will be encouraged." Schools are more and more becoming Academies, moving from local authority control to that of central government. There will therefore be less and less facilities owned by "the City's schools" simply because the city will have less schools under its control. This move to Academy status is therefore an important challenge to the council which it does not appear to recognise. Instead the plan seems to think it can place greater reliance on schools.	Re Policy TP11 Sports facilities, 4th bullet point - the council needs to rework the plan, with specific reference to how it will deal with schools moving out of its control and into Acdemy status. Rather than simply assuming that schools will be able to provide more facilities the council needs to look into how such facilties may be lost. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in	Yes	Sports facilities	TP11
bp1731					The general comments in this section are hypocritical. Many sports facilities are in poor repair and overpriced - Wyndley in Sutton to name but one. Other centres are being closed altogether. A free outdoor alternative is for these of us who like to walk or ride or run. However, this is also in jeopardy through building on the green belt land		No	Sports facilities	TP11
bp2412	Mr Bob Sharples	Senior Planning Manager Sport England			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sports facilities	TP11
bp3019	Mr Philip Bond	The Tenants of Birmingham Wheels			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Sports facilities	TP11
bp5321		Allegion	Mr Marcus Plaw	Associate Director COLLIERS	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Sports facilities	TP11
bp146					The historic town of Sutton has, over the years been gradually destroyed by successive over expansion. This will be the last nail in the coffin	Put a specific clause in saying Sutton Coldfield is not included in this need to protect historic environment	Yes	Historic environment	TP12

bp404	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp426	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp471	Comments relate to TP12, GA5 and GA6. Please note this. The plan will greatly reduce the value of such local historic sites as Langley Hall and Peddimore Hall.	Further study on how to prevent this.	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp570	I think a distinction needs to be made between viable historic preservation and unviable considering the plan is supposed to be tackling sustainability issues. Just because a building looks old or has some historical importance does not mean it is useful and may actually be an obstacle to a more integrated redevelopment of a locality. If necessary flatten and make way for something more sustainable in the long term.	Make a distinction between viable and unviable historic preservation on the basis of utility.	Yes	Historic environment	TP12
bp602	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp676	TP 12 should be strengthened by the addition of a word or two for the local authority to provide a list of potentially suitable climate mitigation or carbon reduction methods that would be considered for listed buildings and conservation areas	Strengthening the wording of TP12	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp714	How does BCC proposal to build an industrial park around listed buildings on Peddimore equate to the statement ''''•Great weight will be given to the conservation of the City's heritage assets. New development affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset or its setting, including alterations and additions, will be expected to make a positive contribution to its character, appearance and significance. '''' How does a 80 H industrial park make a positive contribution to these heritage sites.	Remove building on green belt at Peddimore from the plan,	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp751	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp773	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12

bp816	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	The stated aims and objectives are very laudable and deserving of support. Unfortunately in the current financial circumstances of the council, and the drastic cuts to the Conservation team, it seems that little can be achieved in reality. With reference to 6.73, as stated elsewhere we are still waiting for the definitive version of our High Street CAAMP which has been repeatedly put back through lack of staffing. Our other two conservation areas have not had an up to date revision at all.	Include a statement of intent to augment the Conservation team when circumstances permit. Include some recognition of the role that can be played by local individuals and groups in raising awareness of the city's heritage.	Yes	Historic environment	TP12
bp895			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp948			This sounds great, but so many of our great buildings in the city have been neglected, how will the council save them now? Rookery House in Rookery Park Erdington, a lovely Italianate building has been neglected for year. Finally moves are afoot to develop it, but into what?	Will making a list of buildings really help save them? More concrete action seems to be required.	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp968			Some of the phrasing is stronger than that contained in the NPPF. In genreal I support this thoguh the requirements for providing informatin on historical sites could perhaps include as appropriate			Historic environment	TP12
bp1103	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing Birmingham's historic environment setting and contect by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Historic environment	TP12

bp1156	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The Canal & River Trust welcomes the reference in the policy to the historic importance of the canals. We consider the canals are built heritage assets representing a unique working heritage of industrial architecture, archaeology and engineering structures. The quality of the historic waterway fabric and environment should respected and strengthened by development. There are a number of listed canal structures and Conservation Area designations within Birmingham. However, the protection and enhancement of the canal's distinctiveness should not prevent the waterways potential for being fully unlocked or discourage the use of the waterway network.		No	Historic environment	TP12
bp1271			Policy TP12"Historic environment The historic environment, consisting of archaeological remains, historic buildings, townscapes and landscapes, including locally significant assets and their settings in addition to designated and statutorily protected features, will be valued, protected, enhanced and managed for its contribution to character, local distinctiveness and sustainability. Great weight will be given to the conservation of the City's heritage assets. New development affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset or its setting, including alterations and additions, will be expected to make a positive contribution to its character, appearance and significance."This policy recognises the imporance of protecting (and enhancing) landscapes. Why then does the plan seek to remove Green Belt protection from land around Birmingham? Green Belt protection would be a key part of implementing TP12.	Re Policy TP12 - this policy ought to be actually implemented in the plan by preventing any land having Green Belt protection removed from it. The policy appears to be good, but is the council merely to pay lip service to it or actually carry it out? * * *

bp1356	Policy does not follow planning policy. The decision is not considered justified as the BCC have yet to demonstrate that it has explored every alternative strategic option before developing on land surrounding the historic buildings/settings in Sutton Coldfield such as Peddimore Hall, and Langley Hall. It is unclear how the BCC can state with clarity that building on the Green Belt and around such historic settings is justified as details on the most appropriate strategy,considered against reasonable alternatives is missing.	The BCC to cooperate "constructively, actively and on an on going basis" to a sufficiently advanced degree to make the plan mature enough for examination and one that demonstrates that all reasonable alternatives have been considered. As per my comments in policy TP10 the Green belt be removed from this plan and any future plans as " exceptional circumstances " cannot be proved that building is required on the Green Belt. Green Belt in Birmingham protected to prevent Urban sprawl and preserve the settings of such historic buildings. Plan to adhere to planning policy.	Yes	Historic environment	TP12
bp1429	The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black and Worcestershire Branch) on behalf of the Inland Waterways Association is concerned that Policy TP12 whilst recognising the historical importance of Birmingham's canals then restricts their protection to those that are listed or in a Conservation Area. The policy should recognise that many parts of Birmingham's canal network falls outside this restriction and if the policy's commitment to protection of this historic environment is to be fully comprehensive it should encompass the whole canal network.	The final paragraph of Policy TP 12 should be amended to encompass the whole canal network.	No	Historic environment	TP12

bp1430	Mr Tim Bridges	Conservation Adviser Victorian Society	We are pleased to read the statements in 6.12 regarding the value of the historic environment. It is stated in English Heritage's 2013 document 'Heritage Counts';"In the last year, the sector has produced compelling new evidence to show that the historic environment, whether as a powerful draw for visitors, or sensitively adapted for a variety of economic uses, is central to a healthy, growing economy. England's built heritage construction sector is estimated to account for some £11bn in GDP. The study, commissioned by English Heritage and the Heritage Lottery Fund, estimated the economic impact of maintaining and repairing historic buildings in England, demonstrating that the built heritage construction sector is a highly significant contributor to the national economy, directly supporting approximately 180,000 FTE jobs."With these clear statements regarding the benefits to the local economy of conserving and enhancing the historic environment there needs to be a firm commitment from the Council to maintaining and augmenting the conservation team to implement and develop this work..	We particularly note - and are pleased to read - the content of statements 6.73 The City Council will review or prepare character assessments and management plans for conservation areas and other areas of particular local significance to supplement existing policies for protection and enhancement. Historic Landscape Characterisation will be used to inform and understand the contribution of the historic environment to the city's character and identity. and 6.77 Where appropriate and feasible, opportunities will be sought to bring heritage assets at risk, as identified in English Heritage's Heritage at Risk Register and by the City Council itself, into sustainable economic use that retains their significance. and would like to see some explanation within this plan as to how this is to be implemented, bearing in mind the huge reduction in conservation staff over recent years.	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp1631			The Langley and Peddimore developments will impact negatively on the historic houses at Peddimore Hall and Langley Hall as well as the public footpaths which allow access to these sites, thus diminishing their value	Not allow developments in the rural areas; use existing urban sites.		Historic environment	TP12
bp1677			Local sites of historic value, e.g. Peddimore Hall, Langley Hall (both grade 2 listed) will be diminished by the plan.	Further examination of impact on historical environment prior to moving ahead with the plan.	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp1732			Sutton is in the process of trying to get back it's 'royal' status. Where has BCC been in trying to support this? Where has BCC been over the years with already ridiculous developments that have not come to fruition and loss of historical interest throughout the town - nowhere. hypocritical and only applying this to the inner city of Birmingham BCC will not do anything outlined here as far as I can see..		No	Historic environment	TP12

bp1748		Building proposing the building of a large industrial site at Peddimore, the statement "Great weight will be given to the conservation of the City's heritage assets. New development affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset or its setting, including alterations and additions, will be expected to make a positive contribution to its character, appearance and significance." is greatly contradicted. How will this development make a positive contribution to this historic area, or to the Grade 2 listed Langley Hall?	Remove the building of this large industrial area from the plan.	No	Historic environment TP12
bp1768		City Deals, Wave 1 - July 5th 2012 Proposal 3 - 'If we are to meet our growth potential we also need a good supply of employment land which is available and commercially developable. Birmingham's current supply, for example, will run out in 2023.' If this is the case why is the Peddimore Green Belt site being used for commercial development? It clearly states the supply of land is available until 2023!	Leave the historic site of Peddimore out of the BDP.	No	Historic environment TP12
bp1838		As a resident of a Grade II listed building, Old Langley Hall, and a chartered member of CIWEM (Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management), I am very concern by the BBC's proposal over the protection of the historical building within the Green Belt. I believe the proposal breaches the NPPF (Page 30 paragraph 126, 129, 132 and 133) stating "Local planning authorities should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.. .... in doing so they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance" ...."Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting ..... substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional". "Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent". I believe BCC proposals directly affect the visual amenty and the contribution made by the setting of Old Langley Hall. The plans clearly undermine and reduce the historical value of	The Council must demonstrate that it has explored every alternative options before developing on land surrounding this historic building/setting as, once lost, it cannot be replaced. And if there is no other alternatives (which I currently don't believe), plans have to be made to minimised as much as possible the historical, environmental and ecological impacts of new developments.	Yes	Historic environment TP12

bp1995				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp2052				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp2075				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp2123				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp2148				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp2281				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp2305				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp2315				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp2345				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp2785		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3127				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3140				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3259				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Historic environment	TP12
bp3664				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3794				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3851				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3864				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp3900				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4017				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4025				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4033				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4059				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4111				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4362				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp4414				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Historic environment	TP12

bp4819					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4884	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp4946								Historic environment	TP12
bp4999					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp5048					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Historic environment	TP12
bp5202	Ms Emma Hancox	Council for British Archaeology			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5345	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5484		Mondelez International	Mr Thomas Ashley	Planning Consultant Turnberry Consulting Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5640		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5769	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5808	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5837		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5858					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp5869					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Historic environment	TP12
bp29					more effort to encourage residential recycling composting and re using of resources,			Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp572					Does the prevention of waste include utilising stagnant energy in the system such as underutilised brownfield sites. As such sustainable utility is preferable to sustainable growth since growth usually creates a lot of waste.	Concerns about waste whether it is unwanted or underutilised goods, packaging, food, brownfiled sites should be given more mention in this section.	Yes	Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13

bp677			This section should be expanded to include acceptable destinations and miles for the disposal of waste outside Birmingham and on encouraging on site garden composting and local reuse eg freecycle and swap shops rather than municipal efforts.	This section should be more substantial and deal with the interconnectivity issues.	No	Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp949			We wouldn't have so much waste if products were not so over packaged.	Be harder on companies that over-package their products. I also think that companies whose waste litters our streets should be fined, thus provoking them into rethinking design, advertising about disposal of waste, and maybe encouraging returnable bottles as we used to have.	No	Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp1257			Birmingham could do more on recycling	Learn from adjacent authorities.	No	Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp1638			These issues should have been resolved back in the 1980s when recycling first came to prominence ; what have you been doing in the interim?			Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp2578	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp2761	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp5303	Mr Lawrence Chamboko	Research & Policy Officer COFELY DISTRICT ENERGY	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp5434	Mr Tony Lyons	Principal Planning Officer Warwickshire County Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13
bp5547	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable management of the City's waste	TP13

bp147			Who will fund this. There are many 3rd party facilities making a very good income on investment on recycling. A lack of clarity on funding	Detail who will fund this	No	New and existing waste facilities	TP14
bp573			At present it is BCC policy to disallow Birmingham citizens to purchase unwanted goods taken to recycling facilities. Obviously this is not sustainable.	Incorporate opportunities to purchase unwanted items taken to recycling facilities.	Yes	New and existing waste facilities	TP14
bp950			Birmingham certainly seems to lag behind other areas in terms of managing waste, so glad to hear improvements are to be made.		No	New and existing waste facilities	TP14
bp5223	James Cook	Planning Manager (North) Veolia Environmental Services (UK) Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		New and existing waste facilities	TP14
bp5435	Mr Tony Lyons	Principal Planning Officer Warwickshire County Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		New and existing waste facilities	TP14
bp5965	Mr Matthew Griffin	Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy) Staffordshire County Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	New and existing waste facilities	TP14
bp1105	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing the setting for new waste facilities by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Location of waste management facilities	TP15

bp1818			The BDP is unsound because it appears to be selective in commenting on the presence of Historic or Closed Landfill sites. I have serious concerns that there is no consistency in commentary in Section 5 - Spatial Delivery of Growth. It is my understanding that before1974 there was no regulatory control of tipping areas therefore there would be little or no information on what was allowed to be tipped into land fill or surface dispersion rubbish 'tips'. The proposal for building on Green Belt Land and Brownfield sites should pay particular attention to historic landfill sites and all proposed development sites should indicate historic landfill sites. For example on Bordesley Park 5.72 and Eastern Triangle 5.95 landfill activity is clearly identified. The Government Environmental Landfill Website shows these sites. However the same website also shows a historic Land Fill site near Ox Leys Road it shows 'Null' for Licence. Ref Historic landfill (Grid reference: X: 415,304.71; Y: 295,681.73) The BDP is unsound as it does not appear to have an even handed approach to the explanation to the community of the presence of historic and closed landfill and waste disposal areas.	1. All landfill sites should be identified and marked on any proposed development plan. 2. All historic waste disposal sites that are within development plans should be surveyed and samples taken for analysis for contaminates. 3. Unless there is a 100% guarantee of the safety of the historic landfill site there should be no building within 250 metres or more depending on government guidance. 4. Any development on any historic landfill site should be made known in writing to any prospective purchaser/ occupier.	Yes	Location of waste management facilities	TP15
bp2579	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Location of waste management facilities	TP15
bp2762	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Location of waste management facilities	TP15
bp5304	Mr Lawrence Chamboko	Research & Policy Officer COFELY DISTRICT ENERGY	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Location of waste management facilities	TP15
bp5549	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Location of waste management facilities	TP15

bp5805	Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Location of waste management facilities	TP15
bp108	KFC (GB) Limited	Mr Steve Simms	Director SSA Planning Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp148				What are details of PA and Warwick Economics study	Include details of the study in this planning submission	Yes	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp405				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp497				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp518				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp566				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp608				Re TP10, TP16, GA5, GA6: How can the Plan meet objectively assessed development requirements for employment when the information on the distribution of economic growth in the greater Birmingham and Solihull areas will not be available until Spring 2014? An employment area will increase capacity on the roads and increase congestion, particularly the A38, with a knock on effect into Walmley and Birmingham, yet there appears to be no clear transport infrastructure plan.	A clear and concise economic growth strategy should be in place before decisions are made on the siting of large employment zones, such as Peddimore together with a fully funded sustainable transport infrastructure. The road links in this area are already congested and under pressure so alternatives are needed. Decisions on employment will then dictate where housing is most needed. Has BCC considered that other areas in Birmingham might be more suitable or even adjoining the M6 toll?	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp642				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp728				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp755				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp770				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp797			Peddimore is not the right place for this development. Brownfield sites should be utilised fully before green belt land. Why do we need 80ha? Where are all the employees going to come from, and how will the local infrastructure cope? The roads are already congested.	We need the developers to commit to putting the infrastructure in place before any other development starts.	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp896			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp904			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp951			I presume this refers to Green belt land, again I think this development is unnecessary considering the large areas of waste land in the area.	Do not include green belt land in these plans.	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp969			The underlying analysis is extremley broad brush.	Greater emphasis on monitoring and support for smaller growing companies as well as the retention of cheaper premises that are neccessary for buisness start ups.		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1055			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1072			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1091			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1106	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing portfolio of employment land and premises by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp1272	Item 7.5 "The portfolio of land set out in Policy TP16 is intended to meet the needs of all types and sizes of businesses and will ensure that desirable employment development is not lost due to a lack of site availability by ensuring that supply leads demand." By stating "by ensuring that supply leads demand" it is clear that the plan is seeking to designate more land for employment demand than is actually required. This was demonstrated cleary historically with the Peddimore site when the council claimed it was needed for a micro-chip factory when in fact it turned out there was no such demand. If the council is going to undertake this policy of having more land available than there is actually demand for, this needs to be justified in greater detail. It is not clear how much more land is being offered for development than is is actually required. This needs to be explained and made public. The removal of Green Belt protection requires exceptinal circumstances, yet it is demonstrated in this paragraph that this land is being offered due to a requirement for the council to offer more land than is needed. (This is a very strange definition of "exceptional".) Unless the council is able to define exactly how they aim to ensure that	Re Item 7.5 If the council is to follow a policy of providing great supply of land than is demanded, the relationship between the two should be clearly defined and explained (e.g. should there be a fixed percentage excess or a fixed area excess, and in either case what value would that be). This could then be fully examined by the public and its veracity established. Otherwise a policy of providing more land than is needed is not justifiable and this should be removed. The existing policy also demonstrates that the plan for the Green Belt protection to be removed from land at Peddimore is not justified - the council claims this land is needed for development but the plan makesit clear that the council is seeking to have excess land desnged for development. Hence Peddimore should remain as Green Belt. * * *

bp1409	It is not clear why Peddimore is part of employment land pipeline. The policy reads only that there is swathe of open land that could be used but with no clear economic justification for its use in this area of Birmingham. There are no details of the business investment pipeline which warrants releasing this land from the Green Belt. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.	The plan to be consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF and green belt removed from the plan.	Yes	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1540	There is no need to use green belt land for employment land, as the city has plenty of underused office and commercial space.	The Plan should not involve any building on green belt land. It should focus on supporting redevelopment of current underused office and commercial land.		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1733	I concur with all comments made by other objectors		No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1769	City Deals, Wave 1 - July 5th 2012 Proposal 3 - 'If we are to meet our growth potential we also need a good supply of employment land which is available and commercially developable. Birmingham's current supply, for example, will run out in 2023.' If this is the case why is the historic Peddimore Green Belt site being used for this development? This comment clearly states the supply of land is available until 2023! If Birmingham doesn't have the space for a large site then let the opportunity go elsewhere. It isn't all about money! As long as a site can be found somewhere in the country and the benefits from international business are realised that's the important thing. Sutton Coldfield does not have an unemployment problem. If workers have to travel from far afield then that goes against the principles of the NPPF, increases the carbon footprint and causes increased congestion in an area that is already under terrific traffic pressure. For this reason I believe the plan is unsound.	Leave the 80ha of land in the Green Belt.(Policy GA6) Ensure the employment opportunities are provided where there is a need.	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1899	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp1911	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp1940			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2024			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2050			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2057			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2067			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2080			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2168			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2171			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2219			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2280			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2337			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2346			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2358	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2377			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2387			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2394			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp2409	Stacey Green	Development Plans Officer Redditch Borough Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2425			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2454			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2462			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2491			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2517			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2569			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2576			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2655			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2682			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2691			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2743			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2750			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2763	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2847			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp2880				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp2971				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3052				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3258				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3270				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3281				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3284				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3308				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3349				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3561				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3652				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3669				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3723				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3736				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3751				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3785				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp3814	Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp4101	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4108	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4119	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4143	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4289	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4340	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4371	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4411	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4450	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4456	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4491	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4648	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4820	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4860	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4877	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4893	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp4922	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp4947					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5016					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5034					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5049					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5249					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5346	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5380					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5386		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5451					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5468					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5505					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5550	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5558	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5604	Ms Rebecca Mayman	Wyre Forest District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16
bp5615		AXA Real Estate Investment Management	Mr Paul Rouse	Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Portfolio of employment land and premises	TP16

bp149					Basis stated as good public transport links - current state or future state?	Include details of how people will make public transport journeys from regional investment sites to all proposed residential building areas. Including journey times and number of changes	Yes	Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp702					No need for new retail units to be built on green field land while there are existing units lying empty in the area. All brown field sites should be fully developed before building on any green belt land. Current infastructure in place will not adequately cope with additional transport, congestion and pollution being created if the project goes ahead. Already massive traffic congestion taking place in Walmley and Sutton Coldfield during peak hours and to add to it without adequate infastructure being in place is totally unnaceptable.	Abandon plans to build any retail units on any green field sites until all existing brownfield sites in and around the Birmingham area have been fully develeloped.		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp952					Again, presume this refers to Green belt land. It should not be built on.	Remove green belt land from the plans for development.	No	Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp1110	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing regional investment sites by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect & energy use) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp1288					Nice sounding rhetoric. Meaningless without substance. What ,where, when?	Clarify proposal	No	Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp1770					I agree totally that Birmingham should create this type of high quality employment site within an urban environment that is close to areas of deprivation and high unemployment. This concurs with NPPF policy.		No	Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp2764	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp2786		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17

bp3131					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp3144					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5292	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5551	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5616		AXA Real Estate Investment Management	Mr Paul Rouse	Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5618					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5794	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5798		Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp5801		Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Regional Investment Sites	TP17
bp109		KFC (GB) Limited	Mr Steve Simms	Director SSA Planning Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Core employment areas	TP18
bp150					The main areas for development (Para 7.13) are mainly low skilled job opportunities. How does this fit to the strategic aims of high value jobs	Go and think again	Yes	Core employment areas	TP18
bp953					Still don't see how Jaguar Land Rover contribute in any way to a green policy working towards reducing global warming. Unless they are designing low pollution public transport at their works?	All firms coming into the area should be committed to green policies.	No	Core employment areas	TP18
bp995					The emphasis should not just be on the retention of large sites for redevelopment but also on the retension of small scale and affordable business units where they do not conflict with surrounding uses			Core employment areas	TP18

bp1112	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing core employment land by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect & energy use) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Core employment areas	TP18
bp1296			So why Peddimore?	Drop Peddimore.	Yes	Core employment areas	TP18
bp1360			It is unclear why North East Birmingham requires both a 80 ha. employment zone and regeneration of prologis park which is 32.5ha. Sutton. With specific reference Peddimore, it is unclear why this is part of the employment land pipeline. The policy TP 16 reads that there is swathe of open land that could be used but there is no clear economic justification for its use. There are no details of the business investment pipeline which warrants releasing this land from the Green Belt. Coldfield is not classed as a deprived area. These sites are not located to or close to the greatest area of need. National Planning Policy is very clear: 1. Green Belt Serves five purposes one of which is to check the “unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas”. Source: NPPF 2. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as “inappropriate” for the green belt….” Source: NPPF The plan is not consistent with national policy.	An understanding of why the land on Peddimore needs to be released to the employment land pipeline. Visibility of the business investment pipeline to justify its release. Land release to be removed from the plan until all reasonable alternatives have been considered; when the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities. The plan to be consistent with national policy.	Yes	Core employment areas	TP18
bp1771			I agree with the plan to redevelop the existing, established employment areas. How will the use of freight and rail by companies be monitored and rewarded by BCC in their attempt to meet the set target for a reduced carbon footprint?		No	Core employment areas	TP18
bp1912			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Core employment areas	TP18
bp2631			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Core employment areas	TP18

bp2765	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Core employment areas	TP18
bp3807		Revelan Group Plc	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Core employment areas	TP18
bp5335		NATIONAL GRID	Mr Mark Jackson	Associate Director - Development Consulting DTZ	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Core employment areas	TP18
bp5339		A & J Mucklow Group Plc	Mrs Gail Collins	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Core employment areas	TP18
bp5390		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Core employment areas	TP18
bp5446	Miss Sally Miles	Director CgMs Limited			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Core employment areas	TP18
bp5552	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Core employment areas	TP18
bp5809		Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Core employment areas	TP18
bp110		KFC (GB) Limited	Mr Steve Simms	Director SSA Planning Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Protection of employment land	TP19
bp954					This must be the most impenetrably worded section of your document so far. You would not win any prizes from the plain English society. If you are saying you can change the use of land if the need arises, then that sounds like a good plan.	Put it in plain English!	No	Protection of employment land	TP19
bp970					see previous comment on the protection of existing smaller scale employment sites. It is also crucial that attempts to market such sites are strictly addressed. Birmingham recently accepted a land owners assertion that a site had been maeketed without there being any interest - while te evidence from the applicant showed that there had been interst and that the land could not have been considered as prime employment land as the owners would have refused any offer.		No	Protection of employment land	TP19
bp1300					If the precept allows for "attractiveness" as a criterion then greenfield sites would be preferred by developers to brownfield sites, unless there are other incentives or considerations.	Consider remedial action(s) to maintain existing employment land.	Yes	Protection of employment land	TP19

bp1894					Having read this section again, I hope this is not a poor excuse for not using Brownfield sites in the city for development i.e. labelling them as poor quality employment land, thus justifying the need to build on Green Belt land.	Query studies that do not have development of Brownfield Sites as a priority. I would like to know who or what body this Warwick Economic Study is, how independent of the council and government they are, and why other studies are not being considered as well.		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp2766	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp2787		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp3811		Revelan Group Plc	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Protection of employment land	TP19
bp4883	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5447	Miss Sally Miles	Director CgMs Limited			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5553	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5609		Tesco Stores Limited	Ms Jennie Baker	Senior Planner Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5619		AXA Real Estate Investment Management	Mr Paul Rouse	Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5656		West Midlands Harp Planning Consortium	Mr Christopher Burton	Tetlow King Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5810		Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Protection of employment land	TP19
bp5822		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Protection of employment land	TP19
bp41					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20

bp971			Many of these centers are in danger of economic failure due to cahnges in shopping patterns and recent massive scale of approvals of out of centre / edge of centre supermarkets within their catchment area. There is likly to be a need for positive and more flexible planning policeis to help them cope with these changes in the near future. this will require centre specific plans		No	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp1115	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing regional down to local centres by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect & energy use, reducing flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp1301			Retail habits are changing fast and the need to expand office space is questionable. You do need creative centres however, but possibly in a different format and on a different scale to that envisaged	Plan for changing habits	Yes	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp1517			The retail figure for Sutton is unrealistic. With the opening of John Lewis and the refurbed Mail Box the policy should recognise decline not growth.	Delete any growth of retail from Sutton Town Centre and plan for decline with other uses including housing.		The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp1672			Strongly support the decision to prioritise the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre for retail and commercial development. This will help capitalise on a huge potential for growth, and maximise the currently underutilised asset and purchasing power of this centre and its hinterland.		Yes	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp1734			Infrastructure, changes in shopping habits and people are still going through a time of austerity and I do not feel these things will not support this plan		No	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20

bp1772					In the past Sutton Coldfield had a selection of niche shops. Individuality and specialism is required in the town centre. Say no to the large, well known, high street names. Provide those with interesting, different and unique ranges of goods the opportunity to succeed and bring some character back to the centre. Fight back against internet shopping with improved shopping experiences. Ditto for other shopping centres.			The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp2767	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp2788		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp4885	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp5554	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp5610		Tesco Stores Limited	Ms Jennie Baker	Senior Planner Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp5626		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp5834		c/o Turley (Harvest Partnership)	Ms Susie Rolls	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp5836		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The network and hierarchy of centres	TP20
bp151					Asda Minworth is currently traffic jammed and car park full at peaks and we wont need more stores - doesn't make sense. Suggest the palling department hasn't visited the areas under consideration	Go and talk to major providers and get the planners to do the assessment properly	Yes	Convenience retail provision	TP21

bp994					New developments should only be supported where the Councils retail study identifies that there is suffienct retail demand for them not to harm existing local shopping centres. This policy is incredibly weaker than previous drafts	Reintroduce policy from previous draft to restrict new provision of large stores to the areas where there is a clearly idnetified gap in provision. It would now seem that this is nowhere.	Yes	Convenience retail provision	TP21
bp1303					Convenience stores should simply respond to demand. No big issue		No	Convenience retail provision	TP21
bp2789		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Convenience retail provision	TP21
bp5293	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Convenience retail provision	TP21
bp5611		Tesco Stores Limited	Ms Jennie Baker	Senior Planner Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Convenience retail provision	TP21
bp678					Support local funding initiatives to encourage independent retailers for their establishment period. See the example of Brixton market.			Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp977					When considering redeveloment proposals mephais should be given to the protrection of existing affordable shop premises as well as ensuring that approved redevelopment schemes are phased so as to enable existing shop keeprs to move to new local premises before their shop is demolished	new policy		Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp1304					Specialist providers should be encouraged but not just more of the same		No	Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp1640					Exactly.			Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp1674					Boldmere local centre is an ideal high street investment opportunity showcasing the way that retail, cultural and social initiatives can be brought together in an integrated way, to help re-shape the high street of the future, making it a community hub for a wide and innovative range of new uses for a modern flourishing suburban high street.		Yes	Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp1773					Yes - make shopping an exciting experience again. Offer low rates to new businesses, encourage individuality, encourage artists and crafts people to share units. Bring uniqueness back to Birmingham City Centre.		No	Small shops and independent retailing	TP22

bp1793	Mr Jon Lord	City Centre Neighbourhood Forum			TP22 is not deliverable as it would require restrictive planning conditions to prevent smaller units into larger units which would then need to be actively enforced which is resource intensive. Moreover, uses such as A2 uses would need to be restricted in the city centre retail core to enable A1 independent uses to thrive. There have been repeated instances where A1 retail has been crowded out by sterile A2 uses such as banks and bookmakers and payday loan companies. On this basis, streets including Corporation Street, Cannon Street, New Street, High Street and Union Street should be identified as being restricted to Non A2 uses to encourage a vital and attractive environment. Where it does not detrimentally impact on the amenity of residents, A3 uses could be considered acceptable in these areas.	TP22 would need to include a reference to the use of restrictive planning conditions to prevent smaller units being changed into larger units which would then need to be actively enforced which is resource intensive. Moreover, uses such as A2 uses would need to be restricted in the city centre retail core to enable A1 independent uses to thrive. On this basis, streets including Corporation Street, Cannon Street, New Street, High Street and Union Street should be identified as being restricted to Non A2 uses to encourage a vital and attractive environment. Where it does not detrimentally impact on the amenity of residents, A3 uses could be considered acceptable in these areas.	Yes	Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp5555	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp5980		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley				Small shops and independent retailing	TP22
bp308	Unknown	Mitchells & Butlers Retail Ltd	Mr Marcus Plaw	Associate Director COLLIERS	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp679					Moseley has a wide range of restaurants and takeaways but this has added to the vibrancy and attractiveness of its night time economy and international appeal and not been a planning problem.	mention of niche economy of Moseley		Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp1116	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to promoting a diversity of uses in centres, creating/reinforcing a sense of place by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23

bp1305					A key aspect in sustainability is diversity and flexibility of buildings to accommodate changing use.		No	Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp1518					Support diversification in Sutton Town centre			Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp2011					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp2499	Ms Rose Freeman	Planning Policy Officer The Theatres Trust			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp2790		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp5556	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp5823		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Promoting a diversity of uses within centres	TP23
bp48					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Tourism and tourist facilities	TP24
bp1118	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing Birmingham's tourism and culture facilities by creating/reinforcing a sense of place and by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Tourism and tourist facilities	TP24
bp1157	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust			The Canal & River Trust welcomes the reference in the justification of the policy to the canal network as a tourism asset. We consider the canals are important tourism visitor destinations and attractions in their own right (attracting day-trippers, overnight stays, domestic and foreign visitors, and weekend and short breaks), as well as providing links to key markets, other visitor destinations and attractions (such as waterside parks, pubs, galleries and museums).		No	Tourism and tourist facilities	TP24

bp1275					Item 7.40 "Birmingham is a top visitor destination attracting millions of people a year to experience the range of cultural, leisure and recreational activities." This is a very bold statement that really needs to be substantiated. Any guide book for the UK/England will give relatively little space to Birmingham. Whilst Birmingham would get tourists visiting it it can hardly be defined as a "top" destination. Having lived and worked abroad, I have regualrly found that people overseas do not know about Birmingham. This statement takes an over-confident view of Birmingham's real position as a tourist attraction. Item 7.41 "Tourism is an important contributor to the City's economy, which has grown significantly since the late 1980s. Birmingham already plays host to many cultural and music events" In the last few years the Birmingham Chamber Music Society has had to close after something like 50 years owing to a steady decline in its audience. The relocation of the Birmingham Central Library will also lead to the loss of a major concert hall without a like for like replacement. This reflects an actual decline in the city's position as a host to music events. 7.43 "The City has a wide range of	Re Item 7.40 - The plan needs to take a more realistic view of the limited attractiveness of Birmingham at a tourist destination. For example one benefit of the proposed HS2 is often cited as not being the ability to get to London quicker but to get out of Birmingham much faster. The council should realise it needs to take a strong proactive role in improving Birmingham's reputation and not simply try to tell the public that everything is wonderful. This section of the plan therefore needs to be reviewed and rewritten. Re Item 7.41 - The council should realise it needs to take a strong proactive role in improving Birmingham's reputation and not simply try to tell the public that everything is wonderful. This section of the plan therefore needs to be reviewed and rewritten. Re item 7.43 - Make attractions like Think Tank free or at the very least affordable. * * *

bp14					Sutton Coldfield has one of the highest employment rates in the country and the main occupation types are professional and managerial. If you authorise employment for skilled or manual workers in the A38 corridor you will get congestion people will not walk, bus or cycle for an hour a day each way.			Local employment	TP25
bp444					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp793					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp852	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	7.45 Include the issue of retaining graduates from the City's universities by creating appropriate employment opportunities.			Local employment	TP25
bp978					I support this approach		No	Local employment	TP25
bp1120	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to supporting local employment and providing training opportunities by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Local employment	TP25
bp1309					Employment engagement is best served by appropriate education and adequate infrastructure.		No	Local employment	TP25

bp1410			By locating an employment zone in the North East of Birmingham will not make employment opportunities accessible to the local population.Neither will it help address Birmingham's high levels of unemployment and worklessness in the city centre. It may well encourage more private travel from out of Birmingham into the cities boundaries or across town from the city centre to the north east of the city. The sustainability of the development is also questionable when you consider the increase of private transport and It is unclear due to the uncertainties of the connectivity infrastructure whether this location will really provide opportunities for local people to gain access to work. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF and chapter 4 as it is also not promoting sustainable transport.	The plan to be consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF. Only when all reasonable alternatives have been considered and " exceptional circumstances" are proved and the BCC can demonstrate effective joint working on cross boundary priorities can the decisions made within the plan and also for releasing green belt land for development on Peddimore be considered viable. A relevant/coherent/cohesive strategy for Birmingham should be developed where all reasonable alternatives have been considered and based on a vision developed by both the accountable council and local people and communities. One that has input from the GBSLEP and looks at the wider strategic issues for growth and economic recovery. Detailed traffic assessments are required to appraise the suitability of the road infrastructure in the vicinity of the Peddimore employment zone. More detail to be provided on the to be requirements which should access the current infrastructure issues and with those of the development. A plan in place which	Yes	Local employment	TP25
bp1735			One of the main occupation types in Sutton Coldfield are professional and managerial. If you authorise employment for skilled or manual workers in the A38 corridor you will get a huge increase in congestion. Already people do not walk, bus or cycle for an hour a day each way - they use their car. This then will impact on the carbon footprint etc etc		No	Local employment	TP25
bp1774			This approach supports the NPPF policy. Provide employment where it is needed.		No	Local employment	TP25
bp1954			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp2410	Stacey Green	Development Plans Officer Redditch Borough Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp2684			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp2717			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Local employment	TP25
bp2810			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp3245						Local employment	TP25
bp3297			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp3298			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp3309			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25

bp3549					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp3715					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp3796					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Local employment	TP25
bp3920					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp4086					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp4122					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp4817					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp5050					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Local employment	TP25
bp5807		Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Local employment	TP25
bp5894					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp5985	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Local employment	TP25
bp2					Sustainable environments means the impact that human activity has on the environment. I hope that in the final draft consideration will be given to the needs of maintaining the natural environment despite housing need. Particularly in view of recent weather conditions and the possibility of this continuing in the future, notice should be taken of where it is suitable to develop housing and other buildings. The need too for availability of local leisure pursuits, such as walking, and maintaining the natural environment for the benefit of all.	There should be more recognition made that environment such as outlined above will be maintained in future plans.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5					My objection for any new housing would be to protect Green Belt land at all costs. When all Brown Field sites have been redeveloped and all existing empty housing is occupied then and only then should any Green Belt land be considered. There exists acres and acres of Brown field sites within the Birmingham area and thousands of unoccupied houses, both council owned and privately owned. I live in Walmley, which is a small urban village within Sutton Coldfield, and to have the Green Belt in our area (the Lyndhurst Estate) threatened by the possibility of thousands of new houses being built on it is abhorrent. The proposed build would double the size of Walmley and therefore total destroy its character, sense of identity and place.	PLEASE DO NOT BULD ON GREEN BELT!	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp481					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26

bp549			Any further development of housing should be on a brown filled site not on the green field sites such as near Walmley, Minworth. There aren't the supporting roads, technologies at the moment in these areas, these need to be upgraded just to cope with present demands.	No plans to develop on a green field sites.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp688			A sense of pride in our neighbourhood will not be encouraged if the access to facilities such as hospitals, doctor's surgeries, schools and leisure opportunities are made too difficult by overcrowding on roads, car parks, in local shops and schools.	Provide the infrastructure BEFORE building the housing estates.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp798			1. There is no detail the plan to explain how our current infrastructure will be improved. 2. You refer to a "strong sense of place". The proposed development would change Walmley beyond recognition and spoil it's character.	1. We need more detail about how all these aspirations are going to be achieved - including a commitment from BCC and the developers to improving the infrastructure first. 2. Do not develop green belt land. Restrict your plans to brownfield sites.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp958			access to shops, schools, leisure facilities and health professionals is what is required from the plan yet although there will be amenities nearby the proposed Walmley site they will be too full to accomodate new pupils/ patients etc.	the changes to the facilites and transport links need to be in place first. green belt land should not be built on. develop all brown field sites first and use them to their full potential then in 10 years time re assess the need for more housing and ammenities.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp980			These principles should be applied when considering applicartions for large new service facilities that remove easy access from local neighbourhoods - particulary wlking access. It should be made clear that this applies to proposals for new hospitals, schools, public access offices places of entertainment and supermarkets etc	New section within the policy	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1122	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to creating/maintaining sustainable neighbourhoods in Birmingham by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26

bp1186		There is no mention in any of this document about the impact on School places, the capacity of the Health Services or the sheer weight of traffic on our over-stressed transport infrastructure. This is very poor thinking. In addition, comments in this document consistently refer the planners back to the points that projections of population growth are at best flawed and at worst actually non-existent - what peer review of this 'evidence' has been done? It appears to be a repeat of the worst excesses of the Spanish property expansion which has left a shocking landscape of ghost towns. Finally, there is no real evidence of an audit the run-down brown-field sites or serious exploration of the opportunity to invest and improve the worst areas of our fine city, rather than destroy what little is left of our Green areas.	This plan is looking to house another 150,000 people - how many of these are children and hence how many new schools do we need to build? What investment is proposed to improve the longevity of the road surfaces to avoid endless traffic jams? There are already serious and costly traffic jams on the major trunk roads in the Sutton Coldfield area which these plans do nothing to mitigate.	Yes	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1195		any additional development should require the infrastructure to be put in place prior to any additional housing. walmley village, Penns Lane , walmley road and surrounding roads are already grid locked during rush hour because of the large movement of children coincident with the work rush hour because of the narrow roads and number of schools.	look to devlope within the city on land that is already provided for such as brown field sites befor expanding out further.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26

bp1276	Policy TP26 - this sounds very nice but is too vague to be of much practical use. The statements are sweeping e.g. " ... within easy reach", "A strong sense of place .." but have no actual definitions. Developers will run rings round these. The lack of substance shows that the council has little commitment to these ideas, and has not deemed it worthwhile to spend much effort on it.	Re Policy TP26 - this needs to be more detailed and definite in the objectives and how these are measured. This should be an extrensive section, not seven bullet points and six paragraphs. Actual standards need to be set. * * *

bp1621	There is absolutely no need for new housing to be build on Green Belt land and I totally object to this proposal. Brown field sites hould be redeveloped first along with the re-development of run down/boarded up houses that are already in existence. As a Walmley resident - these plans will decimate the community we have, cause people to leave as we are struggling to cope now with the congested roads, lack of good public transport, no train station, overcrowded schools, full to capacity drs and dentits and long waits for appointments at Good Hope Hospital due to the huge demand on these services. What is the Council thinking of with these plans? How can you even consider such a plan with such a negative impact on the environment and the local residents?		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1659	Lack of local amenities means that people will always need their cars.		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1736	I do not feel I can add any additional comments to those already made by myself in previous sections or by my fellow objectors. Do not build on green belt. consider the infrastructure first.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1775	Is Birmingham experiencing a period of rapid population growth? The ONS figures show that the population rate of increase is on a steady decline and for this reason the plan is unsound.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26

bp1823	8.1 The plan states that the type and condition of homes, together with the quality of the immediate surroundings is one of the most improtant factors affecting the quality of life. We bought our homes in the existing immediate surroundings of the greenbelt which as you correctly point out yourselves ''is one of the most important factors affecting the quality of life''. We paid premium prices for these houses and we also pay a high level of council tax compared to the size of house we have, due to the surroundings we chose. What right have you to then remove this area from the greenbelt and directly cause such a detromental change to the quality of life for the existing local people? 8.4 The plan states that the city is experiencing a period of rapid growth. However the figures used to create this plan are pre 2010 and now out of date, the estimate being around 10000 homes over reality, deeming the plan not now relevant and this makes the plan un sound and not fit for purpose.	Again I ask where is your duty of care to the existing local people affected by this plan? New data is needed to re assess the growth of the city. How can planning be made using old and out of date information? This plan is not sound and is not fit for purpose. How embarrasing would it be for the government to adopt a plan which is not actually sound and viable. Remember the Northern Relief Road?? How empty that road is.. How pointless and wasteful was that destruction to green space, wilde life and quality of personal life. Don't repeat that mistake! Surley the Birmingham Plan should be about regeneration of the old, unused and empty spaces in Birmingham, not the destrution of the 15% remaining greenbelt land.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1840	Ref 8.1 This is an aspirational statement without substance and cannot be guaranteed (TP26). For sustainability neighbourhoods, the Infrastrucure and facilities need to be efficient and sufficient i.e. adequately serviced and sized for existing need and any future requirement or to meet proposed changes.(TP27). The current provision is inadequate and promised Improvements off the back of existing Infill Housing in the Walmley area is yet to be provided.	A review of the existing sustainable requirements should be made and presented as part of the Plan.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26

bp1856					8.1 tp26 'Convenient options to travel ...by public transport TP38-TP40 with reduced dependancy on cars' I do not see anyone getting anywhere conveniently if there are another 6000 houses built at section c. The roads here are over full now. Turning right out of Delmore Way or Anton Drive to join Walmley Ash Road is just a distant memory now. Infact turning left is getting difficult. The road layout will just not cope with the proposed extra 6000 houses. Busses are another issue as my teenage daughter and her friends contend with every school day. They often walk home from John Willmott school as the busses either dont show, drive past full or simply drive past and dont stop even when empty seats can be seen. I would not call that convenient and that is how it stands now, before the 6000 houses have been built and the extra large industrial site is built.	rethink the plan as this is just unsuitable for the small town of Walmley to cope with. Do not build on green belt. Regenerate areas which already have infrastructure able to cope.	No	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp1913					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp2580	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp3702					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5268		PegasusLife Limited	Mr Benjamin Taylor	Senior Planning Consultant Barton Willmore	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5417		City and Provincial Properties Plc	Mr David Smith	Turley Associates	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5560	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5625					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5658		West Midlands Harp Planning Consortium	Mr Christopher Burton	Tetlow King Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp5687		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	Support the Policy	None		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26

bp5824	c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd) Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Sustainable neighbourhoods	TP26
bp6			Walmley and the surrounding area is already congested with traffic, not just at peak times, so the existing infrastructure would have to be massively expanded to accommodate the proposed new build. Any build on Walmley's Green Belt could not be supported by jobs as there is very little opportunities for commerce/industry in the area. Any new build would not be in keeping with the history of the area especially with regard to Peddimore Hall. It is a manor house in Walmley, Sutton Coldfield. It is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and a Grade II listed building.	PLEASE DO NOT BUILD ON GREEN BELT!	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp37			I have written to you before in connection with the Birmingham Development Plan 2031. I have already voiced my objections via your website and the local petition, and again on this website last year. You must not go ahead with the building of a possible 10,000 more homes in the Sutton Coldfield area for many reasons. Sutton does not have the infrastructure to cope with any further building of dwellings. The schools in Sutton Coldfield both Primary and Secondary are already oversubscribed even to the fact that Whitehouse Common School are already trying to increase the size of the school – this is even before further houses are built. It is already a struggle to try and get appointments at our Doctors surgery without the addition of a possible 40,000 more people (an average of 4 people per household!) and you already have to wait months for an appointment at Good Hope Hospital. The accident and emergency department at the hospital already has problems trying to cope without additional families moving into an already over-crowded community. The roads around Sutton Coldfield are jammed everyday with the vast quantity of cars that already pack our highways. I live literally 5 -10 minutes away from Sutton,	Not to build on any green belt land at all. Brown field sites only must be used.	No	The location of new housing	TP27

bp39	I object to the plan on the grounds that established Green Belt should not be built on until all steps have been taken to develop brownfield areas of the City. There is much derelict / underutilised property in the NW of Birmingham. These areas should be developed first, before expanding into Green Belt and leaving ugly undeveloped brownfield sites littered around the City. I understand that current plan does not provide the 80,000 homes that are expected to be required anyway, so why isn't every effort being made to develop existing land before destroying the Green Belt?	The plan must be developed to cover the full 80,000 homes that are needed. The current plan only provides for c.60% of this requirement and cannot be properly considered until the means for making up the shortfall is determined.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp86	Housing should not be built on the green belt land around Sutton Coldfield. The green belt is there for the current generation and future generations to enjoy by visiting or passing through. It is a haven from the built up and at times highly polluted area of central Birmingham. Sutton Coldfield has been neglected over the years. It has a run down shopping centre. The train line into birmingham has its limits and is packed to the hilt every morning and evening. There are waiting lists for doctors and ddentists. Building more houses will compound these problems and if people can afford it they will move away and take their skills to another city or town. Every piece of brownfield land should be built upon before the green belt is touched. We know it is easier for builders to build on green belt and they weald great power. Of course they want to make the most profits but their interests should not come first.	The green belt land should continue to be protected.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp98	if you wish to help this city then do not build on the green belt. There are many brown field sites that are sitting as an eyesore across the city. We need green spaces to breathe. I do not believe that all brown field sites have been taken ito account. You should post a map with all brown field sites marked for building , then we can tell you of those you have missed. Using green belt is a lazy option and against planning policies for this country.	as above		The location of new housing	TP27

bp152	Be accessible to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car. Demonstrate this Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided - define what this will be	Be accessible to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car. Demonstrate this Show the all the assessment carried out including infrastructure needs, current capacity and usage together with future needs assessment together with the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp482	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp529	Housing should not be built on the green belt land around Sutton Coldfield. The green belt is there for the current generation and future generations to enjoy by visiting or passing through. It is a haven from the built up and at times highly polluted area of central Birmingham. Sutton Coldfield has been neglected over the years. It has a run down shopping centre. The train line into birmingham has its limits and is packed to the hilt every morning and evening. There are waiting lists for doctors and ddentists. Building more houses will compound these problems and if people can afford it they will move away and take their skills to another city or town. Every piece of brownfield land should be built upon before the green belt is touched. We know it is easier for builders to build on green belt and they weald great power. Of course they want to make the most profits but their interests should not come first.		No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp686	In TP27 it is stated that "any proposal for residential development should be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place BEFORE the new housing is provided." This is the first priority for any plan if it is to be acceptable to the present community in Walmley.	Reduce the number of houses in the Walmley greenbelt area until roads, hospital and schools have been provided for the number of new residents.	No	The location of new housing	TP27

bp698					Building on greenbelt cannot be justified whilst brownfield sites are left to decay and spoil our city. What is the justification for leaving so many brownfield sites unused and abandoned, especially near to the city centre? Surely this could be sold as prime land to developers for housing, offices etc. Building on the greenbelt whilst providing a short term fix in terms of new houses will leave us with more problems. Roads, schools, amenities etc cannot cope with the proposed increase in population in these already congested areas. Take for example the centre of Mere Green, Sutton Coldfield. There are disused shops, a factory, unused open spaces. Where is the investment to help our communities that are already in existence? You want to build more houses but vision is needed to put proper facilities and infrastructure in place to support the communities living in them.	Use brownfield sites first before building on any greenbelt. Ensure that every effort is made to use investigate and eliminate brownfield sites before greenbelt. If greenbelt has to be used, insist that the proper infrastructure and amenities are provided before construction of housing starts. This includes roads and transport links.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp731					All of the brownfield sites should be redeveloped in priority to Green Belt land, which used to be considered untouchable. Green Belt land is valuable and should not be wasted in this way, simply because BCC is currently short of cash. This plan is short sighted and does not consider the welfare of the local residents and future generations. If BCC concentrate their efforts on the brownfield sites, this will enhance the urban environment and improve the quality of life for local communities, thereby attracting businesses and creating new jobs.	Remove all plans to develop Green Belt land and concentrate on renovating the brownfield sites and improving the local infrastructure.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp774	Ms Rachael Bust	Chief Planner/Principal Manager The Coal Authority			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp854	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	8.10 Birmingham City University supports this policy for the use of brownfield sites such as the soon to be vacated BCU City North Campus at Perry Barr.			The location of new housing	TP27

bp1124	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing the setting for new housing by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			The location of new housing	TP27
bp1165			There are an estimated 72,000 empty homes in the MIdlands, source http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg Birmingham CC must use the Governments Empty Homes programme to bring these into use. In addition to this, a huge site in Longbridge is being developed. There are pockets of Brownfield in Birmingham that have not been developed. Canalside's are yet to be fully developed as well.	Explore Brownfield development and used the governments Empty Homes programmme to bring the 72,000 properties that are empty in the region to back in use. http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg The Greenfield sites should be protected.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1173			Building on Green Belt is flawed for 2 reasons : 1) Brownfield land and areas of regeneration in Birmingham is plentiful. This can be demonstrated through falling/lower house prices in some areas of Birmingham: http://www.proviser.com/regional/towns/birmingham/property_prices/compare_current_prices/ 2) There are 72,000 homes empty in the Midlands of which 30,000 are long term empty: http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg	The plan should concerntrate on 1)Brownfield Sites, 2)regeneration of poorer areas of Birmingham 3) Bring Empty Homes of which there are 72,000 in the Midlands back to use.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1176			This scale of housing should not be built on the green belt land around Sutton Coldfield. The green belt is there for the current generation and future generations to enjoy by visiting or passing through. The cross city train line into Birmingham is running at capacity already and has packed trains every morning and evening. By building 6,000+ houses will compound these problems.	Please rethink the scale of growth you are proposing in the Sutton Coldfield area. This strategy aims for sustainable growth across the whole city. Why not build a smaller number of houses North, West, East and South of the city? This would allow all parts of the city to absorb population growth		The location of new housing	TP27

bp1178	Location, location, location. Whilst I understand the need for increased housing capacity as the population increases, care needs to be taken as to the proposed figures. These figures are mere forecast and strict and proper planning needs to coincide with supply and demand. As has been mentioned time and again, the main hub of development is the city centre. Employment and housing should be concentrated in the city centre. Add to that the thousands of empty homes and derelict buildings littled throughout the region. The greenbelt should not even be considered as a potential for housing development. We should preserve what is left of our green fields in the ever growing metal jungles we now work and live in. As we currently stand, Sutton Coldfield may have the ground capacity for added housing but will not be able to cope with the increased population and vehicles on our crowded roads and services (including schools and hospitals). Building on the Green belt may be cheaper in the short term, but the destruction of our beautiful green lands will only push the local population away.	Remove Sutton Coldfield from potential housing or industrial development. There are thousands on empty homes and derelict buildings.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1218	The City Council should exhaust all brownfield sites and become an exemplar to other Authorities in regenerating abandoned area of the city. The priority to ensure that new development is adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided is to be welcomed although there is little evidence that this policy has been enforced in development around Walmley and Harvestfields in Sutton Coldfield.	Deletion of all proposals relating development of the green belt	No	The location of new housing	TP27

bp1277	Policy TP27 The location of new housing, 2nd bullet point "Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided." Whilst this is welcomed, particularly with regard the threat of additional housing development on Green Belt in Sutton Coldfield which will need significant infrastructure to support it. However how will this be paid for? Previous history has shown that infrastructure is scheduled to be added after the development, allowing for the developers to pay for this out of their profits, the result being that infrastructure is often left out or delayed till the absolute latest point. Policy TP27 The location of new housing, 3rd bullet point "Be accessible to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car." This imples that the plan takes no regard of accesibilty of new housing to cars. Whilst the plan may want to encourage the use of other modes of transport to cars, car use is still critical to the vitality of any new development. The aim should be to encourage alternative uses not exclude car access. The plan seems to forget that vehicular access is necessary even for people who only use public transport or walk - delivery vehicles, refuse vehicles, ambulances,	Policy TP27 The location of new housing, 2nd bullet point - further explanation needs to be included in the plan to explain how the addition of infrastructure will be funded. Policy TP27 The location of new housing, 3rd bullet point - this should be reworded to ensure accesibilty by car (and other road vehicles) is still seriously considered. Public transport should be something that people should be choose to use, not forced to use. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27

bp1292	Policy TP27, sixth bullet point. This should be revised to refer to the Green Belt, not the revised Green Belt as no revision has been justified.	Policy TP27, sixth bullet point. This should be revised to refer to the Green Belt, not the revised Green Belt as no revision has been justified (and hence no revision should be made). * * *

bp1408	TP27 states " Should be ...adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided"."Be accessible to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car"."Be sympathetic to historic, cultural or natural assets". The policies within this plan are not consistent with this policy and these statements leave too much uncertainty and too little detail as there is much use of the word " should " within the plan when it needs to be " will " for the plan to be sustainable.	The city council should ensure the above are mandatory and not just a comment that they " should " be in place. This is for obvious reasons to ensure any development zones are sustainable Otherwise it renders all the platitudes of sustainability within this plan and planning framework as lip service.	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1412	Using the detail in this policy bullet point 8.10 " 80% of all new homes provided over the plan period will be built on previously developed land "Using the simple equation of 80% of a housing need of 80,000 equals 64,000 will be met by brownfield sites. This leaves a shortfall of 16,000 not 30,000?	Please provide clarity on what your calculation is based on and what it is a calculation of. At the moment the figure does not correlate with those presented in the supporting documents. The figure is presumptive .	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1465	I object to the building of new homes on the green belt in Sutton Coldfield. It seems ironic that Birmingham City Council are closing services in Sutton such as the Registry Office and the Magistrates Court and then producing plans to add thousands of more people to the are that would potentially need to use those services. Services in Sutton are already under pressure. Doctors surgeries are crowded and schools are oversubscribed. More houses will only increase the pressure and the supposed plans to improve these services is too vague and will never amount to anything. The situation on the roads is even more dire and this plan will make things worse by adding significant extra traffic. The only reason Birmingham may have an extra need for housing is due to the failure to control immigration. The council should be focused on improving the quality of life and standards of living for existing residents. If extra housing is needed, then brown field sites in other areas can be used, along with the many empty boarded up houses that exist across Birmingham. Sutton has always been viewed as a cash cow by the Labour controlled council. The council does not listen to the people of	No building on the green belt in Sutton Coldfield/Walmley.	No	The location of new housing	TP27

bp1478	It is stated that that new residential development should be sympathetic to historic, cultural and natural assets however the fact that a greenfield site is being used while brown field sites are still not being exploited suggest that this requirement is not being met. In addition it should be considered that hs2 development is being progressed within a few miles of the proposed greenfield development sites. Its should be considered that 2 such aggressive and destructive developments in such a small catchment zone is a pernicious attack upon the welfare of current local communities	Do not build on the proposed Greenfield site.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1529	I object most strongly to any new housing development in Sutton Coldfield especially on any green belt land the council of Birmingham to which i have never wanted to be part of should look at all the brownfield sites and houses that are empty further to this there is not the infrastructure to support the housing that will come particularly in Walmley which is already over crowded i know the council will say they will put the infrastructure in but we all know this will not happen	Dont build houses on any green belt land in Birmingham particularly in Walmley which is already overcrowded use brown field sites and already empty housing	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1544	All new housing provision should be located on previously developed land. Green field sites should be protected at all costs, as we owe this to future generations.	All housing provision should be located on previously developed land. This is the only truly sustainable way of protecting the city's green spaces for future generations.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1603	The planning policy states “Sustainable means ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations” The current residential development is not adequately serviced and provision identified within the plan has too many uncertainties for it to be a viable and sustainable solution for both existing and the new infrastructure. The SA document also indicates this for the transport provision. I have commented in more detail in policies about health, education and connectivity. It is unclear how a proposed 6,000 housing development and a 80 hectare employment zone will ensure “…better lives for ourselves “, as per planning policy.	The current proposal to be consistent with BDP policy TP27 which states any new residential development "Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided". The green belt not released for development as it will and can only mean worse lives for future generations if it is released for development.		The location of new housing	TP27

bp1650	Until exhaustive use of brown fields sites are complete, green belt should be kept as that, green belt. There are significant parts of Birmingham surrounding area where regeneration for housing purposes would enhance the city rather than using valuable green belt land. It would be helpful to fully understand where the minimum of 80% of new housing will be built on already developed land.....as per point 8.10.	A full scoping exercise to understand the current empty housing within Birmingham and the full regeneration of those empty units together with clear details of the redevelopment sites where the plan states 80%+ will be utilised prior to green belt being developed upon.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1664	The proposed development of housing on the Sutton Coldfield Green Belt is unacceptable, in both scale and nature. While it is welcome that 80% of the housing required will be developed on existing brownfield land, and that brownfield land will be prioritised as the most immediate location for housing development, the proposal to breach the existing defensible Green Belt boundary mush be rejected. Green Belt designation was made precisely to stop the very kind of urban sprawl that will result if the Birmingham Plan is accepted. While building on green land may be required, this should be on green land outside the boundaries of the Green Belt, for example in the parts of the economic sub-region where new town and garden city development would offer a more attractive, ecologically and environmentally more sustainable option. The Duty to Cooperate needs to be pursued much more energetically to unlock these preferable alternatives to Green Belt development	Greater focus on the more attractive potential for sub-regional development of new towns and garden cities outside the Birmingham administrative boundary.	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp1737	I have commented on this in previous sections. All brownfield sites and empty homes and projects should be considered. USE OF GREEN BELT SHOULD BE A NO. DOES NOBODY IN BCC APPRECIATE THE NEED TO KEEP GREEN BELT AND RURUAL LAND TO WHAT IT SHOULD BE FOR.? PREVENT URBAN SPRAWL AND FOR FUTURE AND CURRENT AGRICULTIRAL USE. NOT TO MENTION THE VALUABLE PREVNSTION OF FLOODING IT HAS.		No	The location of new housing	TP27

bp1776					For the following reasons the BDP is unsound. The NPPF Core Planning Principles clearly state that Green Belts must be protected... reuse land that has been previously developed(brownfield Land) NPPF (Para 83) Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances..... City Deals Wave 1 (GB & Solihull LEP) Page 17 - Developers‟ difficulty in raising affordable loan finance and potential purchasers‟ difficulty in accessing mortgages and deposits against new homes means that developers are less willing to take risks with city brownfield sites and are therefore increasingly attracted to previously undeveloped land outside Birmingham's boundaries. (lifted as it is written and punctuated from the LEP) The LEP document clearly states that developers are attracted to Green Belt on a purely financial basis. This is not an 'exceptional circumstance'? The BCC Housing Targets 2011-31 Technical Paper (Para 6.5) states that 2016-2021 will see housing delivery taking place on the land removed from the Green Belt. NPPF (Para 51) Local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings..... There are 12,000 empty	Guarantee that all building will take place on Brownfield sites until every available space is exhausted.	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp2074	Cllr Adrian Delaney	Birmingham City Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp2359	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp2581	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp2791		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp3480	Susan Green	Planning Manager - Local Plans Home Builders Federation			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp3703					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27

bp3813		Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	The location of new housing	TP27
bp4840					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp5320		Allegion	Mr Marcus Plaw	Associate Director COLLIERS	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp5529		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The location of new housing	TP27
bp5772	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp5991					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The location of new housing	TP27
bp153					What are these numbers based on. Who will build them, how will they be funded, how will purchases fund the purchase, where will the people work, how ill they get there. Where will children go to school - WHERE IS THE PLAN	Firstly create a plan, this document is not a plan and the city should be ashamed to suggest it is Show what assessment has been done. Provide a fully costed high level plan showing the why, the how, the funding plan supported by at least high level assumptions in short a business plan	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp703					Why plan to start bulding 6000 domestic dwellings on Green Belt land in Walmley when their are Brownfield sites already available which could accomodate approximately 45000 properties. Once Green belt land has been used for developing its gone forever and if in 5 -10 years time its proven that the 80000 homes predicted as required is not correct and has been overestimated by 15000, then as well as having an overcapacity of housing, we have lost the green Belt	Abandon the proposal to build any housing on green belt land until all brownfield sites have been fully developed. Revisit the information used to assess the housing need and check thats its upto date and accurate and not outdated information. Check immigration statistics for accuracy as it may be that the projected increase in immigrants requiring housing could be inaccurate and out of date.		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp959					the plan states it wants to 'provide high quality and affordable homes to integrate with communities' the way to do this in my mind is to have a number of small developments on existing brown field or run down accomodation sites and these new families, homeonwers and tennants will easily integrate into the existing infrastucture of amenities and transport links rather than having to create entire new villages and communities. it appears that the plan is saying it wants to provide one ideal and then sets out to create a different scenario.	don't build masses of houses on green belt land. build smaller pockets of development on areas already requiring redirection/ re development as these will more easily integrate with existing communities.	No	The housing trajectory	TP28

bp982	Past history and current income levels suggest that this is highly optomistic. It also requires building at a density that is unlikly to provide new housing that is atractive to aspirational purchasors which has the danger of further undermining large parts of Birmingham as areas where people aspire to live	Reduce the numbers to refelct lower density levels in approportiate places to enable more market attractive homes to be built	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1291	It is claimed that 6,000 homes are needed on Green Belt. This is slighly less than the total requirement for the last two years of the planning horizon (3,090 dwellings per annum x 2 years = 6,180 dwellings). Therefore no land needs to be released from the Green Belt until almost the very end of the planning period. Allowing construction time, this would not be required until about 2028, yet the plan is intending to remove the Green Belt protection now (there is no evidence of any delay). Based on the data provided by the council it is clear tat any change to Green Belt status can be delayed at least 10 years rather than enacted in the immediate future. It certainly adds further evidence to disprove the idea that there are exceptional circumstances to remove Green Belt protection. By delaying any change in Green Belt status it will be possible to determine if the demand is actually as projected and whether Green belt is actually required.	The aim should be to remove any requirement fro the removal of green belt protection from any land, but if this is still deemed to be justified, it should be delayed until such time as it is actually needed - which according to the evidence presented in ht eplan should be around 2028. * * *

bp1413	Using the figures within this policy and supporting documents it is unclear why building is to commence on the Green belt in 2016. There is a supply of housing stock which will fulfill the housing need up and until 2023 before any building needs to commence on the Green Belt. This is evidenced in the Big City Deal Wave 1 and Housing Targets Technical Paper. Therefore building does not not need to commence until at least 2023. There is no strategy within the BDP to explain why building on the green belt should commence in 2016 before all other housing stock has been exhausted. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.	The plan to build on the Green Belt starting in 2016 is against planning policy. Exceptional circumstances have not been proven that building on the green belt should commence in 2016. Green belt to be removed from the plan until exceptional circumstances are proven. Green belt to be removed from the plan for development from hereon as Birmingham does not have the capacity for growth and new creative strategies are required to accommodate future growth. A plan to be presented which is consistent with planning policy.	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1545	Policy should not be based on unreliable forecasts about future population growth.		No	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1584	What is the rational behind starting to build on Green Belt sites (in 2016) before all the brownfield sites have been developed, unoccupeid homes renovated, houses bought for investment/unused used, planning applications not acted on. Green field land once gone cannot be reinvented. The current housing stock is reported to be 45000, this must be used first. Brandon Lewis MP stated July 2013 'the single issue of unmet demand, whether for traveller sites or conventional housing is unlikely to outweigh harm to the green belt'	Do an accurate audit of available land/homes etc to see if the housing need can be met without using green belt land for the next ten years, then reassess housing need in 2021.	No	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1591	The supporting documents to the BDP indicate that in 2016 building will commence on the Langley SUE.Upon reviewing the Big City Deal Wave 1 it states in proposal 3 “If we are to meet our growth potential we also need a good supply of employment land which is available and commercially developable. Birmingham’s current supply, for example, will run out in 2023 “ Reviewing the figures in the Housing Targets Technical paper this confirms there is no need to build on the green belt until least 2023 if you consider how much available housing stock is available.	Before any release of the Green Belt is considered then a full financial audit to occur on how effective and efficient the statistical data used for this plan is to warrant the decision. These figures to be reviewed with the local community (per planning policy that planning is a “collective exercise”) to ensure they have confidence in any decision made. No consideration to build on the Green Belt should occur until 2023. The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraphs 51,52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF.	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28

bp1628	The Housing Targets Technical Paper states that building will commence on the green belt in 2016. This is despite the BDP evidence documents clearly indicating release of the green belt would not need to occur until 2023. It is noted it is unclear what the timelines are to build on the employment area in Peddimore. Previous plans have been affected by the Developer's difficulty in raising affordable loan finance; potential purchaser's difficulty in accessing mortgages and deposits against new homes means that developers are less willing to take risks with city brownfield sites …" Source Big City Deal Wave 1 Proposal 3.	The plan to build on the Green Belt is not consistent with planning policy, in this instance paragraph 51, 52, 79,80,81,83 and 89 of the NPPF. The BCC need to provide assurance that the release of the green belt is not due to and to satisfy the issue the Developer faces.	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1660	Constraints are needed on buy to let landlords. They charge high rents; avoid taxes; fial to maintain the properties; and destroy communities.		Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1738	It is disturbing when he government are trying to bring immigration down and yet the evidence with which you have apparently based you figures has apparently been linked with the impact of immigration in mind. Surely this should be born in mind and figures re-calculated. Who is to say that these homes we be built and then stand idlelly empty!!. What a waste of our beautiful green belt land that would be.	Consideration of a whole new conurbation	No	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1777	The Birmingham City Council Housing targets 2011- 2031 Technical Paper shows that there are issues with immigration figures and this coupled with the current Government's commitment to reduce immigration into Britain results in fewer homes needing to be built. The same paper gives the information that the proposed housing target is only 61% of the minimum need. The NPPF requires local authorities to work together under the duty to cooperate to meet development targets which cannot be met in their own area. I have seen no evidence of this duty being carried out in the BDP. This renders the plan incomplete and therefore unsound.	The suggestion that the Green Belt should be used to build on should be taken out of the plan. Present a complete plan for consultation.	No	The housing trajectory	TP28

bp1843					Ref 8.3. If guidelines are met there should be no need for any development to commence within the 'Langley Sustainable Urban Extension area' as early as 2016 as detailed in other plan detail. Brownfield sites should used up first and Infrastructure/Facility considerations met in advance of any development. (TP28). The figures used to construct the trajectory forecast are based on ONS growth projections which are now known to be based on assumptions using data which is Flawed and out of date. This needs revisiting.	Review ALL base data used to support the Plan.	No	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp1914					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp2360	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp2408	Stacey Green	Development Plans Officer Redditch Borough Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp2769	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp2792		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp3326					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp3408					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp3428					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp3439					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp3479	Susan Green	Planning Manager - Local Plans Home Builders Federation			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp4531					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28

bp4588					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp4596					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5178					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5294	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5313	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5322		Allegion	Mr Marcus Plaw	Associate Director COLLIERS	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5328		BDW Trading Limited	Mr Stephen Stoney	Technical Director Wardell Armstrong LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5364	Mr Trevor Eames	Secretary Solihull Ratepayers Association			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5517					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5534		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5544					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5598		Gallagher Estates & Miller Homes	Chris May	Director Pegasus Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5732					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5825		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The housing trajectory	TP28
bp5845		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28
bp6012	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The housing trajectory	TP28

bp154			Where are the details of how the houses will be accommodated in the define areas, what type of housing, what density	Provide at least some high level assumptions	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp303			TP29-TP30 THE EFFECT ROOM SIZES AND PARKING CONSIDERATIONS NOT BEING TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT TP29- TP30 MANY COUNCILS HAVE COMPLETED IN DEPTH STUDIES INTO ROOM AND HOUSE SIZES AND ONE,CROYDON, POINTS TO THE NEGATIVE IMPACT ON :- EDUCATION,WELL BEING, THE LINK TO ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR, ILL HEALTH. ROOM SIZES HAVE DROPPED BY AN AVERAGE OF 4SQM	TP29-TP30 AS THE POPULATION GROWS WE NEED MANY MORE STARTER AND AFFORDABLE HOMES. A SUGGESTION OF AT LEAST 60% BIRMINGHAM SETS NEW HIGH STANDARDS OF HOUSING AS DID THE CADBURYS IN THEIR DAY. CONSIDER STILT HOUSING TO STOP CARS BEING PARKED ON VERGES. COMPULSORY PURCHASE FOR HOUSES BEING NOT USED FOR ONE YEAR OR DERELICT PROPERTY.	No	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp983			emphasise local market conditions and the need to create housing that helps retain higher income groups and which provides housing that poeple would choose to live in. Recognise that there is a need for larger family housing as well as affordable housing and flats.	Cahnge policy to say that specific proposals should be justified against local hosuing needs and demands studies where they exist and that minimum densities should be identified as part of these studiesor of site specific briefs.. Drop the mention of a minimum density of 40 PH	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp1126	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to supporting the mix of new housing by creating/reinforcing a sense of place and delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp1219			City Planners need to be inventive and not allow lots of little boxes to be built with inadequate parking and recreational areas.	Statements that the City Council would insist on quality innovative design for any future housing.	No	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29

bp1297					It is not clear what the propsed residential development on Green Belt east of Sutton Coldfield will be. According to the report "Transport Evidence Base: Scoping and Methodology Report", September 2012 one of the advantages of the PRISM model being used to assess the impacts of the plan is that "What makes PRISM unique and original is that the individual traveller is the decision-maker. Forecasts take into consideration not only overall changes in population, employment and infrastructure / service provision, but also the changing composition of the West Midlands travelling public."It therefore follows that in order for PRISM to be correctly used, it must have the correct information input on the future population of any area, and hence there must be some detailed infomration on the compostion of the expected population. This infomration should be made public.	Make public the assumed population composition of the additional population for the major residential development east of Sutton Coldfield. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp1315					Future demographic profiles become increasingly uncertain with time. Great care should be taken not to compromise either the quality of living space or the environment by arbitrary devices or uncertain data.	Housing densities should be guidelines and the need for green belt land at least deferred as long as possible. The case for the latter is not proven now.	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp1546					i agree with the above aims.		No	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp1779					Two and three storey buildings with garage space on ground floor is a sensible solution to the parking problem.		No	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp3481	Susan Green	Planning Manager - Local Plans Home Builders Federation			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5269		PegasusLife Limited	Mr Benjamin Taylor	Senior Planning Consultant Barton Willmore	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29

bp5295	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5314	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5325		Rubery Holdings Ltd	Mr Nigel Gough	Director - Town Planning and Development Department CP Bigwood	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5331		Consortium of Landowners/House Builders & Promoters	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5354		Miller Homes	joanne hedgley	Planning Director Pegasus Planning Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5375	J Coleman	William Davis Ltd	Mr Alasdair Jones	Director Marrons Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5419		City and Provincial Properties Plc	Mr David Smith	Turley Associates	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5561	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5599		Gallagher Estates & Miller Homes	Chris May	Director Pegasus Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5630		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5688		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5826		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp5846		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29

bp6006	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp6013	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	The type, size and density of new housing	TP29
bp155					Have developers been approached on the assumption - provide details	Looks like gerrymandering of area to fit Labour party needs. Basis for this should be independently reviewed	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp1128	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing the setting for affordable housing by creating/maintaining a sense of place and by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Affordable housing	TP30
bp1316					Affordable housing is not cheap and should not compromise on sustainability or environmental criteria. What is affordable depends on supply, demand AND incomes. Rising population will increase demand whilst not necessarily benefitting incomes. Growth therefore may constrain sufficient supply of affordable housing.	Plan for lower growth.	No	Affordable housing	TP30
bp1533					I do not agree with the council putting there tenants amongst private house dwellings they should build council estated social housing decreases the value of a private house you have saved years for to buy	Build council estates and do not mix social housing with private dwellings	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp1778					It is understood that more houses are needed and they need to be affordable for the young to get a foot on the property ladder. How can it be guaranteed that older people with disposable incomes, getting no return on savings, are unable to purchase the new properties for buy to let purposes. If this is allowed to happen the problem is not being solved the housing stock disappears and the young are still not on the housing ladder.		No	Affordable housing	TP30

bp2771	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Affordable housing	TP30
bp2793		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp5205					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Affordable housing	TP30
bp5270		PegasusLife Limited	Mr Benjamin Taylor	Senior Planning Consultant Barton Willmore	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp5296	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp5315	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp5338		Michael Blanning Trust Housing Association	Mrs Rachel Best	Principal Planner Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Affordable housing	TP30
bp5633		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Affordable housing	TP30
bp5660		West Midlands Harp Planning Consortium	Mr Christopher Burton	Tetlow King Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Affordable housing	TP30
bp5827		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Affordable housing	TP30
bp985					The city faces major issues of having one of the oldest hosuing stocks in Europe which will incresingly need replacing. Some of these areas can be redeveloped effectivley at significantly higher densities. In this context the proposals are modest. The greatest part of the probelm lies with privately owned housing for whihc there is currenttly no efective aproach		No	Housing regeneration	TP31

bp1130	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing areas of housing regeneration by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Housing regeneration	TP31
bp1174					The above areas alongside Longbridge need development. Brownfield sites alongside canals need to be fully exploited . Empty Homes (of which there are 72,000 need to be explored) http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg	The current development of Brownfield sites is piece meal. There needs to be a co-ordinated approach as there was in the cities Attwood Green area. Greenfield sites should not be developed on under any circumstances, unless the homes can meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6.	No	Housing regeneration	TP31
bp1317					Regeneration is essential but most provide improved living conditions and cohesion.		No	Housing regeneration	TP31
bp1780					Can redevelopment include some redesigning so that a 3 bedroomed flat could be reconfigured as two one bedroomed flats? Ideal for single people starting off or older people downsizing.		No	Housing regeneration	TP31
bp861	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP32. Whilst generally supporting the policy, Birmingham City University would not support implementation by way of an SPD. This is because we believe that the provision of student housing is a market led activity requiring the maximum flexibility.			Student accommodation	TP32
bp1132	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing student accommodation by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Student accommodation	TP32
bp1318					Students could afford better accommodation if they had lower tuition fees.		No	Student accommodation	TP32
bp1663					Students should be accommodated in university provided accommodation as they destroy communities.			Student accommodation	TP32

bp2533	Mr David Austin	Undergraduate Project Officer Aston University			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Student accommodation	TP32
bp5799		Aldi Stores Ltd	Mr Rob Mitchell	WYG	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Student accommodation	TP32
bp5838		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Student accommodation	TP32
bp156					Do the travellers pay for these sites This should be shown	Demonstrate the cost benefit - how much will it cost how much will they pay. If there is no cost benefit exclude from plan	Yes	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp1293					The provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is extremely vague and whilst indicating that there is a need for such sites has not actually addressed the problem. This is in stark contrast to how the council is seeking to release Green Belt land for development of houses and industry with undue haste. If the council can afford to take this "wait and see" approach they can take the same approach on releasing Green Belt, only releasing it when it is actually required (which has still yet to be proven).	A similar "wait and see" approach should be taken with the release of Green Belt land. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible that further points will become apparent between now and any examination in	Yes	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp1320					Travellers do deserve consideration provided that they pay their way - and taxes.		No	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp1471					There is no need for more gypsy and travellers sites and there will be costs associated with operating them. (Note that this response has been edited)	No extra travellers sites.	No	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33

bp1739					Should not be considering Travellers sites in this plan. (Note that this response has been edited)		No	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp1848					This document does not highlight or give me any confidence that such sites would not adversely affect the surrounding areas, amenities or residents. Who will pay for these sites?		No	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp1882	Mr Roger Yarwood	Planning Officer Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group			The policy is completely unacceptable and does not comply with national policy. A five year provision is the minimum acceptable and the plan only seeks to make provision until 2017. The Introductory statement to policy TP33 is insufficiently clear.It says nothing about allocating sites or meeting the needs shown in a robust review of the GTAA. The first criterion is unacceptable. and does not comply with national policy. The policy must set criteria to deal with applications irrespective of "demonstrated need>"Criterion 5 is unacceptably restrictive. The fina criterion is superfluous. The final sentence is unacceptable. Sites meeting the criteria should be accepted irrespective of distribution.	Redraft the policy in compliance with national policy.	Yes	Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp2770	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp5839		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	TP33
bp483					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The existing housing stock	TP34
bp1166					How many of the estimated 72,000 empty homes in the Midlands have been brought back into use? Is Birmingham co-operating with neighbouring LA's to bring these into use? Is Birmingham using the Goverments Empty Homes programme? http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg	The Empty Homes Programme has not been utilised by Birminghamm CC fully. They need to co-operate with neighbouring LA's to bring the 72,000 empty homes back into use.	No	The existing housing stock	TP34

bp1294	More substantive proposals need to be given to explain the statement"Develop and implement initiatives which will improve the condition of both the older private sector stock and the City Council’s own dwellings."Examples need to be given otherwise this is an empty promise. Presumably the council maintains its own housing stock, so what extra does it intend or think it needs to do to for "the City Council’s own dwellings."Does this mean it is going to give money to private landlords? If so, what controls will be imposed?	More substantive proposals need to be given to explain the statement"Develop and implement initiatives which will improve the condition of both the older private sector stock and the City Council’s own dwellings."Proper controls may need to be placed on money paid out by the council to private landlords. * * *

bp1826			There should be no empty council homes.	Empty council homes should be priority for the council to bring back into use. This should be usual practice which is an on going situation.	No	The existing housing stock	TP34
bp1915			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The existing housing stock	TP34
bp5563	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		The existing housing stock	TP34
bp157			What will it cost? How will it be funded?	Provide a fully costed high level plan showing the assumptions and funding plan supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Education	TP35
bp235			According to policy GA5 its proposed that 2 new primary schools and 1 new secondary school will be built to accomodate the additional school places required should the development of 6000 properties be bult on the Walmley Green Belt. Its also been stated that schools could take between 0- 10 years to build, but when taking into account that the proposed start date for developing new properties in Walmley is 2016 then we could have a situation where a substantial number of new properties could be built and tenanted before any new schools are are built. T his situation would lead to existing local schools being expected to take on additional pupils with no where to acccomodate them unless temoporay portable classrooms are used. This surely is not acceptable when taking into account the governments commitment to improve the education system designed to drive up standards for all pupils. I am also concerned where the money is coming from to build the schools proposed because, Birmingham City Council do not have the budget to build the schools and I cannot imagine developers laying out the cost of building schools without a reasonably quick return on their investment.	Delay the building of any residential properties or schools on on any green belt until all brownfield site have been completely developed following which a revised assessment of housing requirement and schools can be completed. Its possible that the amount of houses and schools currently assesssed may be reduced following a review. Also all costs associated with the complete development project must be agreed with all parties before any works commence.	No	Education	TP35

bp271	The plan provides for 1 secondary school and 2 primary schools but delivery of the build is between 0-10years. The developers will not invest until they get a return on their investment which would mean that our already overstretched schools will be left with absorbing the massive increase in students. The plan states the provision for education is essential. The provision for education is not sustainable.	More detail on how the education needs will be delivered. Funding needs to be secured before the start of the build.	No	Education	TP35
bp304	TP35 SCHOOLS TO BE BUILT BEFORE ESTATES PLAY AREAS, RECREATION	TP35 GET THE TEACHERS IN PLACE,GET THE TEACHER TRAINING DONE, THE NURSERY .WORKERS IN AND CHECKED. WHEN THE CHILDREN GET THERE, THE LEISURE FACILITIES ARE IN PLACE. MAKE A COMMUNITY.	No	Education	TP35
bp333	TP35 GA5 Schools need to be built before housing - there are already children within Birmingham who have not started reception despite the fact they should have done in September 2013. This will only get worse if the school issue is not put first	There should be a plan to provide education for those already living in the area before more housing (therefore more people) add to the problem. Education does not seem to be a priority for this council but should be - the future of our country (as the education minister says) depends on all children gaining a good education - this will not happen if these plans go ahead without planning!!!!!!!!	No	Education	TP35
bp342	Specific plans for schools for 0-10 yrs within walking distance from these sites need to be in place before build started	Very specific plans outlined for education provision	No	Education	TP35
bp406	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp423	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp450	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp464	The plan states provision for a secondary school and 2 primary schools.However, these will be built between 0-10 years.Given that building work may commence 2016 these schools must be in place from the outset.How can our already overstretched schools possibly accommodate these additional pupils? The plan states provision for education is essential.As Birmingham City Council have no budget for building schools are the developers paying for these school builds before they get a return on their investment?	Funding for the building of schools must be secured before start of build. Green belt land development should be delayed until brownfield sites and unoccupied properties have been utilised. We need more information on how children's education needs are being prioritised	No	Education	TP35

bp465	These comments relate to TP35 and GA5 - please note this. unrealistic education plan - no exact timescales for the provision of schools just 0-10 year approximation. BCC does not have the funds for this - are reliant on the developers and they will not pay until they have made the money themselves.	Needs more information to make sure the provision is sustainable. Funding for schools needs guaranteeing and schools need to be provided within 24 months of building, and need to be within walking distance.		Education	TP35
bp494	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp512	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp519	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp535	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp555	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp563	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp578	Re TP35, GA5: The plan vaguely states that 'forecasts suggest that in 10 years' time, approx 20,000 additional school places will be required'. 6,000 new homes on the Langley Urban extension will result in an immediate need for school places. Housing in the area of Walmley has increased by thousands in the past 30 years - new schools have been promised but never provided resulting in major problems for parents trying to find school places. As BCC has no spare funds, presumably they will be reliant on developers to fund new school building - unlikely as there is not the profit in building schools as there is in building houses	Funding for schools should be in place before the house building starts. Schools should be close to the new housing to prevent further congestion on the already busy local roads.	No	Education	TP35
bp603	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp632	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp639	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35

bp720	Plan has inadequate provison for schooling, particularly in the Walmley and Minworth area where ALL the schools are oversubscribed; they cannot absorb any more intake. The proposal is for 2 primary schools (on average 2 form entry from reception to Y6 = 420 pupils per school, 840 in total) and 1 secondary (on average 5 form entry from Y7 to Y11 = 750 pupils, plus Y12&13 of about 200 pupils, is about 1000 pupils. Total school places = about 1840 If 5000 house were built, on average half of the residents would have children, on average 2 children per family; this amounts to at least 5000 children. This is a shortfall of at least 3000 school places - where will these children go to school, and where will the children of the current residents of Walmley and Minworth go to school? I feel that these schools will not be built alongside housing - there is no money in the BCC buget for this and it will not be high on the priority list for the developers. This will pressurise already overstretched local schools and put massive strain on the 'good' and 'oustanding' teaching and learning occuring in the established schools in the area.	Schools need to be developed alongside housing so not to overstretch exisiting schools. Schools need to be of 'good' Ofsted standard from the start to ensure the new local community utilise these schools and not force exisiting pupils in the surrounding communities out of exisiting local schools.	No	Education	TP35
bp722	GA5 TP35 Local schools were not included in the initial consultation. Inadequate provison for schooling included in plan for Walmley and Minworth area. Schools are already oversubscribed. Increased numbers of pupils in these schools would be detrimental to the standards of teaching and learning for exisiting pupils. The 'planned' provision of 2 primary schools and 1 secondary school will not provide enough school places for the average number of children that may inhabit the Langley build.	The Langley build should not take place - is it on green field land to be used in exceptional circumstances only. These are not exceptional circumstances. Any housing builds should first redevolop areas that have previously been used for industry/retail and have fallen into dereliction.		Education	TP35
bp752	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp767	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp826					These comments relate to TP35 and GA5 - please note this. The plan has extremely unrealistic plan for the education of additional children and any additional facilities will only be in place once the housing is in place. There are many examples of large developments starting with the plan for amenities including schools to be built towards the end of the development cycle and problems are incurred that result in them never appearing. If the council is serious about this plan make the developers start the building of schools at the same time as housing to avoid the over crowding of existing schools and the impact on wear and tear of those that will result in additional council tax money being required to bring them back up to standard.	Development of schools should be contracted with any developers to start at the same time as any housing.	No	Education	TP35
bp839					More housing will mean more children and the provision of more school places. There appears to be no firm proposals for the provision of school places. The time scale for school building will be reliant on the developers since they will be the ones who will provide the buildings. This will not happen until well after the need arises as any investment will be put off for as long as possible by the developers.	The local schools have given no input into the plan. They may have been 'consulted' but have not responded. A firm commitment to provide the necessary provision of school places should be given. This should be within the first two years of building commencing and should ensure they are within walking distance of the housing development and also cater for existing housing in the area.	No	Education	TP35
bp862	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP35. The proposals for new schools should also apply to the universities and colleges mentioned in the first paragraph.			Education	TP35
bp877					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp897					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp905					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp912					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp984	Policy numbers : TP35 Education TP37 A Sustainable Transport Network GA4 Growth Area - Sutton Coldfield Town Centre GA5 Growth Area - Langley Sustainable Urban Extension Green Belt Site Submissions - Hillwood Road, Dutton's Lane, Weeford Road, Fox Hill Farm, and Wheatmore and Withy Hill Farms . The plan, with respect to Policy TP35, does not define or meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements and it is not consistent with achieving sustainable infrastructure development. No specific strategy and alternatives have been developed for the areas under consideration. In the absence of such specific strategy it is neither deliverable nor consistent with national policy. Policy TP35 states that proposals for new schools should: Have safe access by cycle and walking as well as by car. Have safe drop-off and pick-up provision. Provide outdoor facilities for sport and recreation. Avoid conflict with adjoining uses. Policy TP35 includes no specific proposals for the planning, budgetting, and construction of schools or other educational facilities within the proposed developments under Policies GA4 and GA5 and in or adjacent the other areas of Green Belt proposed for	1. The proposed developments on the Green Belt under Policy GA5 and the other Green Belt areas, should be abandoned. 2. A comprehensive educational infrastructure plan developed for Sutton Coldfield and its environs. 3. Policy TP37 must be developed to reduce the effect on the transportation system of existing educational facilities in the region and to minimise the negative effect of future educational developments.	Yes	Education	TP35
bp986	Schools and colleges should be well integratred into their local neighourhoods. this can be done in part by design, part by scale (not too large) part by sharred use of facilities.	add to policy that schools should be well integrated into their local neighbourhood.		Education	TP35
bp1013	The Pedimore proposal allows for a senior school and two junir schools, the proposed development which is aimed at the younger families would require in the region of 12000 places, the existing school provision is not adequate and the prosed scholls is weel under capacity. To ensure children could get to a school without additioanl approprite providsion will result in more rush hour vehile movements the plan does not set out at what stage the proposed schools will be built , this could leave children without school places. Who will fund the new schools	The plan needs to demonstrate how the education requirements will be fully met and funded. It also needs to set the time frame for construction to enable the children to use the facility as the houses are filled.		Education	TP35

bp1038			TP35, GA5 (Langley) The plan mentions that the 6,000 house estate will require two primary schools and one secondary school to accommodate the increased volume of children. This in itself is unsustainable. Having worked in the education sector for more than a decade, I can tell you that this will not be enough to ensure all new pupils are catered for properly. In addition to this, the plan mentions the timeframe for building these schools is between 0 and 10 years. Obviously we are yet to learn how quickly these extra houses will be built and families housed, but unless these schools are built and fully functional, before the first houses are occupied, then the existing local schools will be burdened even more than they are already, compromising the quality of education.	I would want to see a guarantee from the developers that at least two primary schools and one secondary school (and a very large one at that) are built before the first homes are released on the market. These must obviously be within realistic 'walking' distance from the development.	No	Education	TP35
bp1058			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp1066			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp1096			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp1114			I am concerned regarding the Sutton Coldfield green belt development and its impact on the local education infrastructure. The schools in the local area are already full to capacity, building a further 6k houses in the area would be unworkable.	To abandon plans to build on the Sutton Coldfield green belt. There needs to adequate information in the plans to determine if educational places will be provided for the influx of new residents.		Education	TP35
bp1121			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp1133			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp1135	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to high quality education facilities by enhancing their sense of place/setting by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being, learning - Forest Schools) whilst supporting biodiversity			Education	TP35

bp1167	TP35,GA5 Education Langley There is no detail in the plan to show how the council will fund enough school places for the children who will live in 6000 new homes Two primary and one secondary school will not be adequate. School places will need to be provided prior to the building of these homes. This should not be the responsibility of the developers	Funding to be in place to build the required schools to ensure children living in these new homes have adequate education.	No	Education	TP35
bp1241	TP35/GA5 - Education plans are not realistic as there are no timescales for the building of new schools -there are already rushed plans to expand local schools through a lack of local planning at Council levels - there is no funding for this to be developed	Funding should be guaranteed for new schools first before any developments take place and within walking distance of new housing development near the A38	No	Education	TP35
bp1298	Ref TP10/GA5 The plans are not detailed or sufficient. Bimringham LA and City Council have no funding to provide and develop such additional school palce.s There is c chaos across the city now as hundreds of children cannot be placed, There should be guaranteed investment and specific detail available of such developed educational provision - this also means special schools, behavioural units, educational psychologists and social workers and not just a new school being agreed. it is the infrastructure to support the schools and there is no detail or funding	detailed plans and specific guarantees of schools and support provision Schools should be provided two years before first housign. Housing canot be build before ne w schools - there are already new developments at Pype Hayes and Warren Farm in Erdington and non palces available - this will exacerbate the situation. Schools must be within walking distance and significant distance away from major roads and industrial developmentns	No	Education	TP35
bp1322	The growth in birth rate is unsustainable and local and central government should seek policies to curb such growth. Good education is essential for the future of any community and that depends as much on getting good teachers who are allowed to teach, as much as infrastructure.	Provision should be planned and made BEFORE any proposed housing development NOT after it.	Yes	Education	TP35

bp1402	The policy is not consistent with planning policy. “The National Planning Policy Framework attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities.” " it will take a "... positive,proactive and collaborative approach " NPPF, Paragraph 72. The BDP policy TP27 states that the proposed new development should be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided. The plan is not consistent with national policy or BDP policy as: - Without effective consultation with local education authority and schools the BCC have not assessed the needs of the existing community. - The infrastructure plan states the provision for education is “essential”, however the current timeframe for build is between 0-10 plus years with no specific timeframe. -Funding is to be contributed by the developer. There is risk the schools will not be built straight away as any developer will not invest until the start of any return in investment. There is risk if the school infrastructure is not provided to support the new housing development: that the existing schools will have to absorb the surge in	The proposed new development should be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided. A sufficient choice of school places should be identified prior to any new development to ensure they also meet the needs of the current community. Funding should be secured in advance for the new infrastructure and not dependent on an developers return on investment. A clear delivery plan should be in place and new infrastructure in place during early development. As per the NPPF “local planning authority need to create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see” (source NPPF Paragraph 69) and not the current plan which is the preserve of specialists.	Yes	Education	TP35

bp1473	The plan suggest 20000 additional school places will be needed in 10 years time and focuses largely in it's comments around the provision of primary education places. My current secondary school was six times over subscribed for new entrants in 2013/14 and is adjacent to the development at Langley SUE. I feel therefore that the plan grossly underestimates the demand for secondary school places as well as the potential growth in new families requiring primary provision. Good quality Secondary Education that is local to where you live is vital and will help encourage cycle and walk to school initiatives that the plan pro ports to support. The plan offers no assurance in the funding or phasing of new schools. Also given the emphasis in the plan of expanding university and higher education courses based in Birmingham City Centre, if these are to be of real benefit, there needs to be better provision of public transport links into Birmingham from Walmley and Langley SUE.	More secondary school provision local to new developments in Langley SUE needs to be provided. Funding and development phasing ahead of any building must be clearly laid out in the plan so that young families are supported. Plans should also outline provision of cycle lanes and 'walk to school' routes for new block development. Investment in new public transport links into Birmingham from Walmley and Langley SUE must be made ahead of any housing development to support movement of students around the city.	No	Education	TP35
bp1490	I draw your attention to the building of Chelmsley Wood and ask if no lessons have been learnt. Schools are an integral part of the community and the schools in Chelmsley Wood were constructed by the Local Authority. The calculation of pupil numbers was woefully inadequate and schools, both primary and secondary have now closed due to falling roles. Realistically, what developer is going to take that risk! There is no provision of schools clearly outlined in this plan - parents will want assurances before they buy property, not mere promises. You only have to look around the country to see the values of property in areas where there are locally good schools to see why people choose to live there.	Schools should be within walking distance of any housing development and must EXIST before people will buy property. This lack of vision could create the largest and most embarrassing white elephant of a housing development unless this issue is addressed.	No	Education	TP35
bp1557	We are being asked to comment on a plan which is not complete. The plan should be a strategy of how to deal with a population increase of 150,000 and a housing need for 80,000. The plan only has the detail for 51,000 houses. I am unable to make an informed decision when this information is missing.	A plan should be presented to the public which is complete we can then comment on whether the infrastructure requirements are sufficient and sustainable.		Education	TP35

bp1637	With reference to 8.46 the Langley Urban extension has no exact time scale for when schools will be provided; in addition, can BCC guarantee the funding of these schools?	Funding needs to be guaranteed for schools before housing development takes place; the school also need to be planned to be immediately available at the same time as the houses would be occupied. In addition, they should be an integral part of any large housing development since they need to be within walking distance of the new homes.	No	Education	TP35
bp1654	TP35 GA5 I teach at a primary school for children with ASD (Autistic Spectrum Disorder). The city is having problems finding places for the current children with these special needs. I cannot find in these proposals any mention of provision for an inevitable increase in demand for school places for all aspects of special needs.	The plans are unsustainable and should be abandoned.	No	Education	TP35
bp1670	Where are the specific details and timelines for when new schools will be built? Once again this is an example of the plan's lack of sustainability. One cannot simply plan to add thousands of residents into the area without having a definite plan for how their children's education will be provided for.	Funding information/guarantees and exact timescales should be provided for all new planned schools. This should be in place before any development occurs. First schools need to be built within 18 months of the plan being actioned, as existing schools are already stretched.	No	Education	TP35
bp1684	5.5, GA5 Having read BCC's plan in relation to the Langley area, and working within Children's Services myself, I do not believe that 2 primary schools and 1 secondary school is sufficient to meet the requirements of 6,000 new homes. The provision within the plan is not sustainable.	The schools need to be functioning in place prior to the houses being built and a clear plan needs to be in place to address this.	No	Education	TP35
bp1740	My sons' school is always oversubscribed and even more so this coming academic year. Even with 2 more primary school this does not offset the higher educational needs in years to come with the government proposals of children remaining in education until age 18. Where will the teachers come from and the school places?? I cannot add anything more to all the comments outlined here and I support my fellow objector comments		No	Education	TP35
bp1745	Local schools are already hugely oversubscribed with the problem worsening year on. Development of the proposed sites will put a greater strain on the schools and the vague plans described to remedy the increased strain are wholly inadequate.	Abandon Sutton Coldfied development plans.	No	Education	TP35

bp1751	The plan set out for education is not realistic in any way. There are no definitive timescales in place for when additional schools will be provided, only a statement of between zero and ten years. Birmingham City council do not have any funds to provide any additional schools - they are reliant on the developers who have no legal obligation to provide such funding.	There is not enough information within the plan to determine whether or not the plan for education is sustainable. The required funding should have to be guaranteed and set aside prior to any development being given the go ahead. Schools should be provided as soon as the first houses are built and ready, and all provided schools should be within walking distance of the newly developed houses, in order to meet the commitment to reduce the carbon footprint and to reduce congestion in the area.	No	Education	TP35
bp1759	I understand that it is suggested that three schools be built as part of the new 6000 homes to be built in the green belt area of Sutton Coldfield. My reading of the policy states that schools can be built anytime upto 10 years after the first houses are constructed and these will be built by the developers and not Birmingham City council.	The developer should be made to construct a school either 2 years after the first houses have started to be constructed or one school after every 2000 houses have been built and the school constructed should be within walking distance of the houses that have been built.	No	Education	TP35
bp1829	In any new development the BCC must guarantee that schools will be provided to house the new children. The education system is under extreme pressure and existing schools are working flat out to provide the best education for all. The arrival of new children mid-term has a very unsettling affect on the other children in class and should be avoided. The BCC must ensure the developers agree to and guarantee that schools are built alongside the new houses. 8.46 states.....'these will be planned as an integral component of the new developments.' How will BCC monitor this? What steps will BCC take if this is not adhered to by the developers? Too often we hear of empty promises from developers. As soon as the land becomes available they do as they please with little or no regard for the requests of the community.	Add detailed costings and timescales for each new development. Add detail on how the new educational provision will be monitored and consider sanctions if the agreed plan is not adhered to.	No	Education	TP35

bp1857			The simple FACTS are that the current schools are over subscribed, this is not a mere opinion - the data is there for anyone to view, go ahead and try and get a place in the local walmley/penns schools, you can't, so adding thousands or even hundreds of new houses will only have an adverse effect. The school run is already bad enough with cars queueing around blocks, from a safety perspective this is a real issue.	Abandon plans to build on the Sutton Coldfield green belt unless a guarantee can be afforded for educational places and infrastructure for the influx of new residents.	Yes	Education	TP35
bp1860			TP35 and GA5 Unrealistic plan for the education of additional children, additional facilities will only be in place once the housing is in place which is unworkable. There are many examples of large developments starting with the plan for amenities including schools to be built towards the end of the development cycle and problems are incurred that result in them never appearing.	Development of schools should be contracted with any developers to start at the same time as any housing.	No	Education	TP35
bp1900			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp1941			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp1968			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp1986			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp1996			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2009			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2025			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2045			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2058			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2073			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2081			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2094			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2124			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2153			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2162			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2177			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2185			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2275			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2289			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2306			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2311			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2323			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2338			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2347			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2374			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2383			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2390			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2399	Mr Darren Clueit	Container Control Co-Ordinator @ BMW	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp2421			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2431			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2434			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2447			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2457			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2465			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2477			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2490			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2496			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2513			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2534	Mr David Austin	Undergraduate Project Officer Aston University	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2554			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2570			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2573			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2602			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2608			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2613			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2636			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2642			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2650			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2666			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2672			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2678			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2696			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2707			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2739			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2746			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2808			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2844			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2878			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2897			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp2947			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2980			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp2993			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Education	TP35
bp3053			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3128			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3141			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3155			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3246			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3251			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3255			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Education	TP35
bp3278			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3293			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3327			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3350			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp3359	Mr Ray Harris	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Education	TP35
bp3365	Mrs G A Pestridge	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3371	Mr Paul O'Connor	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3377	Mr Robert Smith	Roughley Neighbourhood Forum	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3383			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3389			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3395	Mr David Pestridge	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3409			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3430			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3440			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3484			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3523			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3562			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3567			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3577			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3584			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3631			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3634			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3643			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3648			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3655			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3660			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3671			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3688			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3694			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3704			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3740			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3742			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3750			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3752			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3781			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3789			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3797			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Education	TP35
bp3836			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3844			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3845			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3859			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3898			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp3916		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3928		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3931		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp3978		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp3994	Acocks Green Neighbourhood Office	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4009		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4013		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4021		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4029		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4047		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4055		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4072		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4081		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4096		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4105		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4120		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4126		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4138		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4238		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4264		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4266		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4270		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4274		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4277		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4298		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4299		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4301		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4304		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4323		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4331		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4357		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4365		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4372		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4382		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4395		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4413		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Education	TP35
bp4423		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4427		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4430		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4435		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4451		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4473		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4478		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4492		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4512		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Education	TP35
bp4533		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4562		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4570		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4590		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4597		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp4624				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4641				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4650				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4671				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4674				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4689				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4701				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4709				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4722				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4736				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4742				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4746				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4758				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4763				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4771				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4795				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4822				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4861				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4864				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4896				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp4923				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4935				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp4948				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5017				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5035				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5051				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5073				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5136				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5162				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5186				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5208				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5216				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5232				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5248		The Schools of King Edward the Sixth in Birmingham	GVA Grimley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5308				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5347	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council		See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5383				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5452				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5469				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5519				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5542				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5627				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5669				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5705				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5719				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5733				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5860				See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35

bp5872	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5873	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp5902	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5915	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Education	TP35
bp5917	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp6023	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Education	TP35
bp158	There is no reference to any initial work that has been carried out with regard to feasibility discussions on health with NHS. There is no cost analysis to achieve the aims defined There is no substance in how the aims will be achieved There is no cost benefit analysis	Show what assessment has been done and what initial discussion have taken place with NHS. Prove that proposals are realistic, wanted by the residents and not some high ideal from the 'city' Provide a fully costed high level plan showing how this will be achieved supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Health	TP36
bp264	Policy GA5 states that in addition to 2 no primary schools and 1no secondary school the development will include Health Care Facilities, but is not specific to what those facilties will actually be. It also states that the time frame to build is between 0-10 years, which is not acceptable when taking into account that the planned development of 6000 properties on the Walmley green belt is due to start in 2016. The health care facilties proposed should be in place at the beginning of the project development as an absolute, not somewhere between 0-10 years as stated. The current health facilties in Sutton Coldfield including Doctors Surgeries and Good Hope Hospital cannot cope with the current population we have and to expect the existing services to cope with a potential 18000 additional patients is not of fair to new or existing residents living in and around the Sutton Coldfield area.	The health care plan as it stands is not sustainable because there is no real understanding of the care required to support families that may move into the new homes planned, or existing families living in and around the walmley area. Ensure that all health care needs and infrasture planned are in place at the beginning of the development and not the end. Ensure that the budget for health care facilties and infastructure are in place and agreed prior to the start of the project.		Health	TP36

bp270	Policy TP36 promoting health care facilities but there is a complete lack of information of what provision is required and the demands that will have to be met by 6,000 homes with an average of 18,000 residents or more.Good Hope Hospital and GP surgeries are not coping now. What consultation has been undertaken with the NHS and what is the cost and achievability. The timeframe to build is 0-10years. These essential facilities need to be in place from the start of the build. We all know developers will not invest until they get a return on their investment. So, where will the funding come from? The health care facilities are not sufficient nor sustainable.	We need to know what health care facilities and funding will be provided before the development.	No	Health	TP36
bp330	No details are provided on provision of necessary additional health facilites for the proposed residential developments on eastern Green Belt land. Will this be council, government, or developer funded? When will it be provided?	This considerable increase in population should be reconsidered as inappropriate.	No	Health	TP36
bp336	TP36 Good Hope hospital is already full to capacity Gp surgeries are over subscribed	Definite funding and timescale should be in place prior to development - to not have adequate health care in the area would put extra pressure on already stretched services	No	Health	TP36
bp343	General Practices in this area are already stretched with very little recruitment for new gps available. There will need to be new General practice health centres and more funding for secondary care eg Good Hope	Plans for where the funding for health service provision needs to be in place. BCC will not be able to fund this so who is?? - NHS England needs consulting with documents outlining that they will fund it.	No	Health	TP36
bp370	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp407	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp410	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp441	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp445	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp451	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp462	There could potentially be an additional 18000 additional patients that can not possibly be accommodated by Good Hope Hospital and existing GP surgeries etc. Proposing heath care facilities within a 0-10 year timescales in unacceptable, new facilities to cope with additional demand must be in place from the outset.Developers will not invest until they have their return on investment, so where is the funding coming from?	Existing health care plan is not sustainable, we need specifics , what funding will there be and where from? The health care facilities are a priority and must be in place at the outset, the health and well being of existing and new residents is priority.	No	Health	TP36

bp467	These comments relate to TP36 GA5 and GA6. Please note this. The health policy does not clearly describe what facilities will be provided or focus on the needs of what is already an oversubscribed health infrastructure. There is no funding or exact timescales.	Need details on funding, timing and facilities. Need much more funding on impact of the increased population on the area, and guaranteed funding.		Health	TP36
bp495	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp513	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp520	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp565	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp583	ReTP36, GA5, GA6: The plan is not specific about Health facilities. It does not say when these facilities will be provided and, unrealistically, appears to assume that the developers will provide. The local Good Hope Hospital in Sutton has been struggling to meet with demand for a long time and 6,000 extra homes in the area will make this worse for existing and new residents.	The plan should state exactly what facilities will be provided and when and by whom. Funding should be guaranteed before building of new houses on the Langley extension starts. The plan should address the fact that existing facilities are already overstretched and specify proposals that will lessen the impact on the current population. At the least, a new hospital will be needed.	No	Health	TP36
bp604	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp634	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp641	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp721	GA5, TP36, TP38,TP43 The plan has inadequate provision for health and will also exacerbate further health issues. There are insufficient and overstretched GPs and other health specialists in the area. Good Hope Hospital is already overloaded for the area and caters mainly for the increasingly elderly population of area. The children's ward has closed and the maternity unit has had cut backs. A younger population is more likely to inhabit new housing and will need health services to match their needs. The position of the Langley build will not encourage people to walk distances to local services; it will 'drive' people to driving in order to access shopping, schools and work. This will vastly increase the number of vehicles on the local roads, travelling at low speeds due the increased congestion, which will in turn produce more pollution in the area, increasing asthma related issues. There will be increased risk of road accidents due to increased flow of traffic on already over crowded narrow local roads.	Ensure new GP services are developed alongside housing so that exisiting surgeries are not overstretched. Further development of Good Hope Hospital to cope with increasing demand.	No	Health	TP36

bp724	GA5 TP36 Not all relevant local health services were included in the initial consultation. Inadequate provision has been made for health services in the Langley build. Local GPs and other health services are stretched already. Good Hope Hospital has suffered from cut backs and is struggling to meet the demand from the exisiting local population. It is unlikely that health services will be built alongside housing - developers will want to see a return before they invest in other services.	GP services to be developed alongside housing. Use of brownfield sites for housing development before even thinking about consulting on any green field site.	No	Health	TP36
bp738	There is already great pressure on Good Hope Hospital - the proposed Walmley development will only increase demand.	Scrap the plans for Walmley - it is not appropriate - there are areas where this would be more appropriate - on brown fields sites in other areas of the West Midlands.	No	Health	TP36
bp740	The health services in the Sutton Coldfield area are already severely stretched both at GP and hospital level. I know from personal experience the enormous waiting times in A&E at Good Hope Hospital. The health facilities will not cope with the occupants of another 6,000 homes without extension and improvement.	Provision for a significant increase in GP surgeries and hospital facilities.	No	Health	TP36
bp754	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp768	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp786	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp827	GA5 TP36 The plan does not include details of any additional local health services which were not included in the initial consultations. Full details of the Local GPs, health care centres, dentists, elderly facilities as well as proposals for how Good Hope Hospital will cope with an increased population of around 10000+. If development is allowed to start without contracts for health services to service the community being in place they will not be completed by developers if they dont see the expected return on their invest.	The plan does not provide sufficent information on the additional health facilities that will be provided or the timescales within which these will be started.	No	Health	TP36
bp898	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp906	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp909	It isd not clear what new health facilities will be provided under the plan. There should have been consultation with all the various health providers including the local hospital trust. I see no evidence that this has been carried out. The impact on local services will be considerable and yet no time scale for extra provision is evident.	A timetable is required showing what is to be provided, and when, together with which bodies will fund the facilities required. This must take into account the existing services for the existing population to ensure there will be no adverse effect on current service provision.	No	Health	TP36
bp913	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36

bp960	Good Hope Hospital has suffered from cut backs and is struggling to meet the demand from the exisiting local population it is built on land surrounded by roads and housing, how could the hospital be expanded?	do not build 6,000 more homes in Walmley that would require this already over stretched hospital to be their local health provider.	No	Health	TP36
bp975	Access to Health providers is already stretched in Sutton Coldfield/Four Oaks. Schools are over subscribed. Congestion is getting worse. I don't believe this area can absorb the occupants of another 5000 homes or that any building should be allowed on green belt land.	Use brown field site and do not build on green belt. Consider other areas of Birmingham that need regeneration and you must put in new GP surgeries and schools at the same time as providing extra housing not at some vague time in the future	No	Health	TP36
bp981	Policy numbers : TP36 Health TP37 A Sustainable Transport Network GA4 Growth Area - Sutton Coldfield Town Centre GA5 Growth Area - Langley Sustainable Urban Extension GA6 Growth Area - Peddimore Green Belt Site Submissions - Hillwood Road, Dutton's Lane, Weeford Road, Fox Hill Farm, and Wheatmore and Withy Hill Farms The plan, with respect to Policy TP36, does not define or meet objectively assessed development and health requirements and it is not consistent with achieving sustainable development. No specific health strategy and deliverables have been developed to accommodate the increase in population and pollution caused by the developments under Policies GA4, GA5, and GA6 and the proposed developments in the Hillwood Road, Dutton's Lane, Weeford Road, Fox Hill Farm, and Wheatmore and Withy Hill Farms areas of Sutton Coldfield. In the absence of such specific strategy, it is neither deliverable nor consistent with national policy. Existing services in the area are already overburdened and no funding appears to be available for upgrading or additional services. Policy TP36, in its introduction, states:"Planning can play a key role in providing access to a healthier	1. The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6, and the other Greenfield areas, should be abandoned. 2. A comprehensive health development plan created for Sutton Coldfield and its environs. 3. Policy TP37 developed to include the necessary infrastructure to serve the enhanced health proposals.	Yes	Health	TP36
bp987	health centres should be accesable to their users. Major hospitals should be on good public transport routes for the whole of the city - few currently are) Surgeries etc should be spread throughout neighbourhoods so as to minimise the distances people have to walk to them. Take aways / fast food outlets should be restricted near to schools		No	Health	TP36

bp1014			The plan does not fully set out the health requirements and how they will be fullfilled. Full consultation with the local Hospitals and GP surgeries has not been undertaken and i ama aware that Good Hope Hospital has not provided any response. This hopspital is also strugling to meet the existing demand placed upon it. The support provided is also for an older community not one that woul support additional youger peaople and children	Ensure that proper consultation is undertaken and that approriate resources are set out including how they will be funded. Approprite public transport will need to be identified to show how these facilities can be accessed.		Health	TP36
bp1040			TP36, GA5, GA6 (Langley and Peddimore) Sutton Coldfield has just one, immensely over-subscribed hospital, Good Hope. Not to mention the other existing over-stretched health facilities. Placing an extra 12,000+ people into Sutton Coldfield will only serve to compromise the already diminishing quality of healthcare. Not only that, there is no mention anywhere that the council will be providing funding for extra healthcare provisions? As it is, many services currently provided at Good Hope hospital are being transferred to Heartlands Hospital, which in turn increases traffic across the region.	The plan needs to outline, very specifically, how both Good Hope hospital and any existing healthcare facilities will cope under the strain of an extra 12,000+ residents. Where will the funding come from? Will there be an extra hospital? What will the timeframes be for building such services?	No	Health	TP36
bp1056			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp1070			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp1094			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp1123			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp1136	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to enhancing physical and emotional well-being by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect, energy use and flood risk) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Health	TP36

bp1142			Building on the Green Belt will not increase accessibility to green open spaces, nor will it improve air quality and reduce noise. More traffic on the roads from a large housing development at Langley and heavy goods vehicles using the Peddimore industrial site will have an adverse effect on the health of Birmingham citizens. Climate Change issues cannot be addressed by destroying more trees and concreting over more of our countryside. Health care facilities in Sutton Coldfield, especially Good Hope Hospital, are unable to cope with demand now. The large increase in population caused by building on the Green Belt will mean that local people will suffer from poor health services.	There should be no development of Green Belt land.	No	Health	TP36
bp1158	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The Canal & River Trust welcomes the reference in the policy to the use of the canals for walking and cycling. The canal infrastructure can contribute to new waterside developments to cater for healthier and active living by encouraging walking and cycling via use of the canal towpaths. Also existing and new developments can benefit from the recreation and leisure facilities provided by the canal network on and next to the water. The canal network can be used as a resource for healthy and active lifestyles. The Department of Health publication Be Active, Be Healthy: A plan for getting the nation moving refers to the waterways and towing paths.		No	Health	TP36
bp1172			There is no timescale or funding in place to provide the additional healthcare needed for 12000+ people who will be living in these 6000 homes. Good Hope Hospital is already over stretched to meet the needs of the people and many hospital visits are already being moved out of the area as Good Hope struggles to meet demands.. No consultation with the Healthcare providers is outlined within this plan. Currently there seems to be no understanding of the healthcare requirements to meet the needs of 13000-18000 people.	Council funding must be in place prior to any building taking place. The timescale for healthcare development must also be in place. This must be the responsibility of the council and not of the developers.	No	Health	TP36

bp1208		I am very concerned about the increased pressure that a 6,000 housing development would place on Good Hope Hospital and the local surgeries. It is difficult to get an appointment at the doctor's at the best of times. The hospital is struggling and has been featured in the local press as having been given notice to improve. The plans refers to health facilities being provided but what guarantee is there? is this left to the developers? they certainly won' t invest in facilities until housing stock has been sold so what happens to new residents in the meantime?	I would like to see more details of provision and a guarantee that facilities will be financed and provided as the development grows.	No	Health	TP36
bp1285		Ref TP36/GA5/GA6 there are no plans available that explain teh development of health facilities. i cannot get a doctor's appointment now in Sutton, let alone with thousands more houses built. Is there an expansion of good Hope hospital or a timetable for new doctor's practices or a new A&E? No. Everything is based on Developer's providing funding. Health options and facilities are already insufficient in the local area - no detailed plans are available to answer these concerns.	Guaranteed funding and specific detail on development of new A &E and infrastructure is needed now, not after the go ahead is given.	No	Health	TP36
bp1323		Excellent objectives not met by the proposed developments at Peddimore and Langley. Where are the environmental assessments and evidence of alternative proposals?	Do not develop the Green Belt	Yes	Health	TP36

bp1345		TP36, GA5, GA6 There is no clear plan of what health facilities actually cover and what provisions are being made. The health service in the sense of doctors, dentists and hospitals is already over-subscribed and additional housing developments in Green Belt, rural areas will exacerbate this situation. The provision of sufficient and clean water needs to be addressed without increased costs to householders for such provision by water company suppliers. Provision of additional sewage treatment needs to be in place to deal with the additional homes and businesses suggested. Building on the Green Belt will reduce the amount of green space available for healthy activities to reduce resiratory diseases, obsesity through walking, cycling and other leisure activities. Such activities in such areas can also provide employment opportunities.	More professionally staffed and equipped medical treatment units and walk-in surgeries for minor medical problems attached to workplaces, large shopping centres, and other easily accessible populated areas to reduce the burden on hospital accident and emergency units, and the appointment system at surgeries. Detailed studies in conjunction with water provision and sewage provision companies to ensure the systems are fit for purpose, and ensure that these companies have funds to provide such systems and do not transfer charges to customers. Build on brownfield sites before any consideration is given to building on the Green Belt of which only 15% now remains around Birmingham.	No	Health	TP36
bp1366		Local health services are already oversubscribed and the plan does not give a clear outline of the services which will be provided and how any increase in the population will be facilitated.	Specific detail outlining funding and the plans for what is to be provided.	No	Health	TP36

bp1404	The provision in its current state is not sustainable. The proposed new development should be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided. However, Good Hope Hospital currently serves Tamworth, Lichfield and Sutton. It covers a catchment population of around 450,000, and sees more than 76,000 accident and emergency attendances per year including people from Tamworth and Lichfield. Good Hope is believed to be running close to capacity. Sutton Coldfield will increase by 13,000 people, Lichfield 10,000 and Tamworth a similar figure. Good Hope Hospital alone cannot really cope with a population increase of 30,000 more people over the next 20 years. There are also concerns over connectivity to enable people to access the current health care provision if no alternatives are provided. Many health facilities for Sutton are provided by Heartlands hospital. The plan is very clear that for the plan to be "sustainable" the new housing development should be accessible to jobs, shops and services by modes of transport other than the car. The current healthcare arrangement will not enable this as the connectivity to Heartlands can only	The proposal to be consistent with planning policy and BDP policy. The proposed new development should be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided. Funding should be secured in advance and not dependent on an developers return on investment. A clear delivery plan should be in place and be in place during early development. To ensure the provision meets the requirements of a sustainable development BCC need to demonstrate how and when they consulted with current health care services in Birmingham to ensure the provision meets both the needs of the current community and the to be. A new hospital is required to meet the needs of the current and to be community of Birmingham as the BCC are forecasting a population increase of 150,000 by 2031. The "local planning authority should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see" (source NPPF Paragraph 69) and not one that is the preserve of specialists.	Yes	Health	TP36

bp1470	The substantial building on the green belt is contrary to the provision of easy access to green space. Investment in derelict and empty housing located in inner city communities is a priority and will have a far better impact on improving the general living environment for both existing and new residents in Birmingham. It is wrong to think that building out rather than investing in will improve the health and wellbeing of our communities. This simply provides a donut effect with inner city areas becoming more and more unattractive to live and work. I do not feel that this current plan has fully exhausted development within existing suburbs and this needs to be addressed before any further urban sprawl. I therefore oppose the current plan for 5000 houses, to be built on block, on Green Belt due to commence as early as 2017. I feel that rather than improve public health this will instead present significant pressures on local infrastructure in health care and aspects of leisure, employment etc. The phasing of new supporting infrastructure must be made clearer and ahead of starting any other building. My over riding concern is that increasing population is unsustainable based on the current health care	The investment in existing suburban areas including regeneration of empty residential and commercial sites will contribute to a far better social and economic environment for everyone. Avoidance of Green Belt development is a priority if you are to meet the objective around access to open green space. There also needs to be more detail around “Health facilities”, what exactly is to be provided and when. The plan needs to address the needs of an already over scribed health service and the impact of the increased population the development will bring. To make the plan “sustainable” new hospitals, GPs, local drop in clinics, Dentists etc must be provided and funding guaranteed before any development takes place.	No	Health	TP36
bp1492	Existing facilites overstretched and over subscribed - too much generality and no specifics in the plan!	Specific detail needs to be provided about what will be provided and when to meet the influx of people with specific and general health needs.	No	Health	TP36
bp1550	The proposed Green Belt developments in the North East corner of the boundaries will be reliant on the services of Good Hope, a hospital already suffering from cuts, struggling with its current workload and with a chequered history with regard to the quality of care it has been able to provide to its community. It seems almost unbelievable that this plan has been formulated without any reference to the healthcare professionals employed within the vicinity. The "health" of a community which has destroyed a valuable and beautiful environment with its trees, open air and watercourses is also questionable.	Before 6,000 more households are authorised in the community and the green belt irrevocably compromised some concrete proposals for the health and wellbeing of the new and existing residents must be formulated.	No	Health	TP36

bp1556	We are being asked to comment on a plan which is not complete. The plan should be a strategy of how to deal with a population increase of 150,000 and a housing need for 80,000. The plan only has the detail for 51,000 houses. I am unable to make an informed decision when this information is missing. However based on an increase in population of 150,000 will mean that a new hospital will be required to service Birmingham and not the loosely worded " health facilities".	A plan should be presented to the public which is complete we can then comment on whether the infrastructure requirements are sufficient and sustainable. A new hospital will be a mandatory requirement for Birmingham based on the forecasted growth figures.		Health	TP36
bp1592	This proposal will increase the population of Sutton Coldfield by some 10%. This will put extra strain on the current Good Hope hospital.	Reduction in the size of the development or commitment to extra health facilities within Sutton Coldfield.		Health	TP36
bp1620	Policy TP36 – I think the plan has not made clear the extent of the health challenges that exist in Birmingham and does not go far enough in its attempts to address them. The Birmingham Health Profile 2013 identified the following issues: The health of people in Birmingham is generally worse than the England average. Deprivation is higher than average and about 79,500 children live in poverty. Life expectancy for both men and women is lower than the England average. It is 10.8 years lower for men and 5.9 years lower for women in the most deprived areas of Birmingham than in the least deprived areas. Over the last 10 years, all cause mortality rates have fallen. Early death rates from cancer and from heart disease and stroke have fallen but remain worse than the England average. In Year 6, 24.4% of children are classified as obese, worse than the average for England. Levels of teenage pregnancy and breast feeding are worse than the England average. Estimated levels of adult 'healthy eating', physical activity and obesity are worse than average. Rates of sexually transmitted infections, smoking related deaths and hospital stays for alcohol related harm are worse than the England average. It	Commit to identifying and implementing changes that can have a significant impact on improving the health of all Birmingham citizens.	No	Health	TP36

bp1666	There is no detailed information on new hospital/health provision. Are the thousands of new residents simply expected to use already strained local health centres? How can the plan be considered to be "sustainable" if there is no specific outline for improving health services to meet the needs of the added population?	Specific information is needed on what new health facilities will be provided, when, and how they will be funded.	No	Health	TP36
bp1668	Air quality and noise are serious issues within the inner city. I have noticed a marked deterioration in both over the past 8 years.			Health	TP36
bp1690	5.5, GA5, Langley Sutton Coldfield's Good Hope hospital is all ready overcrowded with it's services stretched to capacity. Coupled with decreasing funding from the NHS means that the local health care facility will not be able to meet the needs of the additional 6,000 additional homes proposed. As such, the plan for healthcare is not sustainable.	In order to cater for the additional 6,000 homes (and increased population) I would like to see BCC fund a new hospital in Sutton Coldfield within the first 2 years of building and funding be in place before the commencement of building the new homes in the Langley area.	No	Health	TP36
bp1741	Good Hope serves and aging population and not a younger one. Many paediatric services have been deferred to Heartlands which increase cross city travel. Good Hope has never been properly consulted and is server stretched and over subscribed. IT WILL NOT COPE WIITH THE ADDITIONAL NUMBER OF POTENTIAL RESIDENTS PROPOSED. GP surgeries are also under immense pressure to reign in budgets. There is not the money to impose more.	A brand new conurbation elsewhere is what is need to be properly funded and built.	No	Health	TP36
bp1750	Local surgeries and hospital are greatly overwhelmed with current demand (particularly as local hospital services are being withdrawn.	Cease planned development of current sites and look	No	Health	TP36

bp1752	Sutton Coldfield does not have enough health facilities to support the existing population, never mind an additional 6,000 homes. It is near impossible to get same day doctors appointments, unless you declare it a medical emergency. Good Hope hospital does not have the funding to maintain some of the essential services. There is zero additional funding available to fund new health facilities for a larger population - it is imagined that the developers will provide this but there is no requirement in the plan for them to guarantee this funding. There are no timescales or concrete information about what additional health facilities will be provided.	The exact additional health facilities and a guaranteed sum of funding (and its source) need to be detailed before the go ahead can be given to any development. The plan needs to take into account the fact that health facilities are already unable to cope adequately with the local population, never mind with an additional 6,000 homes. A brand new hospital, along with additional medical centres must be guaranteed prior to any development being approved.	No	Health	TP36
bp1800	A lot of good ideas in this section but no detail. To tackle obesity and improve fitness consider:- 1. limiting the number of fast food outlets - these simply encourage laziness, are cumulatively expensive and consequently deter people from putting any thought to food purchases and preparation. 2.regulate portions of chips and price out large portions - a small portion is surely adequate for the average person. The provision of empty spaces is of great importance to the City Centre and housing developments but the effects on the mental and physical well being can not be compared to the uplifting experience of looking at, walking and cycling in the open countryside. Save the Green Belt you are contradicting so much of what the BDP is championing. Why are shopping malls still being built. It's so much healthier to shop as on the traditional high street- leaving one shop breathing in fresh air, experiencing daylight before entering another shop. Bring back, invest in and support the decaying high streets that exist in all communities thereby eliminating the need to travel to larger retail outlets and cutting the carbon footprint. No detail on 'Promoting health care facilities especially within centres'	Add more detail re Health facilities in the new developments mentioned in Section 5 Add timescales and costs to help consultees make their judgements. Provide evidence of cooperation between the necessary health organisations and other authorities.	No	Health	TP36

bp1835	TP36, GA5, GA6 It is puzzling how development of Green Belt land will address the issue of health inequality, improve life expectancy or quality of life, when air quality will not improve, noise will not reduce, accessibility to open spaces will not increase and road safety will not improve. The policy descriptions provided are too vague and do not address the issue of an already oversubscribed health care facility, Good Hope Hospital. There is no mention of how healthcare services in the area will be funded.	A more specific and detailed policy on health needs to be clear before any development is undertaken. The impact of an increased population on already struggling healthcare services needs to be fully addressed, with a complete consultation with providers in the area.	No	Health	TP36
bp1851	Excatly what additional health provisions will be put in place? Good Hope is already extremely stretched. This policy does not address the extent of what additional provisions will be put in place, when and how much they will cost.	Do not build any additional houses in an already extremely stretched community.		Health	TP36
bp1858	Not enough information on how health requirements will be sustained and or improved/fullfilled. Full consultation with the local Hospitals and GP surgeries has not been undertaken, Good Hope Hospital has not provided any response. Already struggling services will be taken to breaking point to meet the demand.	Ensure that proper consultation is undertaken and that appropriate resources are funded. Public transport will need to be identified to show how these facilities can be accessed.	No	Health	TP36
bp1901	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp1942	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp1951	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp1974	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp1999	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2008	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2015	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2019	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2026	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2048	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2059	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2068	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2072	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2082	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2087	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2090	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2119	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2127	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2134	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2143	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2154	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2169	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2190	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2198	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2279	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36

bp2288	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2308	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2312	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2324	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2339	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2348	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2375	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2386	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2393	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2423	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2433	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2450	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2456	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2464	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2484	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2488	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2497	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2515	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2547	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2562	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2568	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2574	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2603	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2609	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2614	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2619	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2635	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2652				Health	TP36
bp2668	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2674	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2680	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2689	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2698	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2709	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2741	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2748	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2809	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2845	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2864	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2865	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2895	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2932	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp2961	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp2981	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3001	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3037	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3046	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3054	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3088	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3130	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3142	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3158	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36

bp3222			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3237			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3247			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3256			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Health	TP36
bp3267			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3279			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3283			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3294			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3328			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3351			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3360	Mr Ray Harris	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Health	TP36
bp3366	Mrs G A Pestridge	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3372	Mr Paul O'Connor	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3378	Mr Robert Smith	Roughley Neighbourhood Forum	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3384			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3390			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3396	Mr David Pestridge	Weeford Road Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3410			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3431			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3442			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3464			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3472			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3525			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3539			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3564			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3569			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3580			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3585			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3630			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3642			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3651			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3661			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3672			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3689			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3705			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3753			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3783			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3798			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Health	TP36

bp3830	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3847	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3860	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3921	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp3937	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp3982	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4014	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4022	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4030	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4049	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4056	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4071	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4083	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4100	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4107	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4110	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4121	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4133	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4140	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4147	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4150	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4268	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4271	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4279	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4306	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4318	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4347	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4349	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4369	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4376	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4379	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4385	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4399	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4417	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4433	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4463	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4493	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4513	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4535	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4546	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4564	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp4572	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4589	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4598	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4626	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4642	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4651	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4658	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4672	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4683	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4706	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4707	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36

bp4724			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4726			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4737			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4744			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4759			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4775			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4798			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4824			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4862			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4895			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4913			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4924			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4937			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4949			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4953			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4959			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp4977			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5006			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5018			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5036			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5052			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5074			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5137			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5188			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5221			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5229			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5250			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5275			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5309			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5348	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5384			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5453			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5470			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5523			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5546			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5629			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5647			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5666			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5695			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5706			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5721			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5734			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5861			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5874			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Health	TP36
bp5895			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5933			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp5934			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36
bp6019			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Health	TP36

bp159			There is absolutely no detail on how or if this can be achieved, if it will meet with the needs of the people and what the cost will be	Show what assessment has been done. Prove that these targets are realistic, wanted by the residents and not some high ideal from the 'city' Provide a fully costed high level plan showing how this will be achieved supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp319			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp325			The need to travel will not be minimised it will increase causing congestion and pollution.	We need detail and clarification on transport infrastructure and on the funding.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp329			The plan has not shown that the "high quality integrated trasport system" it aspires to is feasible in the area I am familiar with, ie Sutton Coldifeld and its environs. My experience of existing local road and rail routes make me doubt that "sustainable modes" will be achievalbe to offer "convenient means of travel".	No funding is specified for necessary changes to the roads which would be affected by developments proposed in our specific area, namely the A38 and its associated networks. Proposed developments in the eastern green belt area will increase congestion at all points of access to and from Birmingham in that area.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp335			TP37 GA5 GA6 Where are these new road networks going to be built???? There is no rail line in this area that could accommodate extra commuters. The roads are already busy and will just get busier - which in turn will lead to more accidents on the road.	Congestion and pollution should be decreased, not increased. Definite plans should be in place with money available to fund, should be in place prior to any development.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp346	Mr Francis Mason	Walmley Residents Association	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp399			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp408			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp416			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp420	B1. Connectivity. TP37. GA5. GA6 B2. Planning says: 'Development of a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, where most sustainable mode choices also offer the most convenient means of transport', but fails to say how? Currently, roads from Sutton through Walmley to Birmingham are severely congested, as is the A38 at peak times. An extra 12,000 cars will bring the roads to permanent gridlock. An entry/exit Rd onto the A38 will allow more traffic to crawl onto it, but just increase the volume when on it! The Planner's suggestion of a "sprint bus" from Sutton to B'ham is laughable, unless it has wings! Developing the railway line through Walmley would be an asset, but Councillor's inform us that this would not happen for at least 30 years due to lack of funding!	B3. A more sustainable approach is needed. The Sutton rail line through Walmley should be developed before building a new town next to Walmley, Build a development closer to the city centre; less commuting for people going to work and less of a carbon footprint. Let's reduce the congestion and pollution, rather than increase it!	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp434	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp442	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp446	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp463	Comments relating to TP37 , GA5, GA6. Please use these comments for all these sections. There seems to be no evidence in the plan for "development of a high quality sustainable integrated transport system.....choices off the most convenient means of travel" in the plan. No funding for A38 exit. It will increase congestion and pollution around Walmley. It is not sustainable to support the development proposed. If no new hospital then there will be an increased carbon footprint of private traffic to Heartlands hospital.	Need to reduce congestion and pollution and do studies to assess the impact of an additional 10000 cars. Need to guarantee transport infrastructure and re-open Sutton Rail line through the park.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp468	The additional development will lead to congestion from increased travel and unnecessary pollution. How will need to travel be reduced with 6000 new properties?	We require clear definitive information regarding funding for transport infrastructure.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp484	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp487	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp496	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp514	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp521	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp536	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp564	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp606	Re TP37, GA5, GA6: The plan appears to be vague in terms of the development of a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system. There is no funding for the exit/entry onto the A38, congestion will increase, along with pollution. Transport provision is not sustainable or sufficient to support a housing development of this size. Why are there no cycle routes planned into Birmingham City Centre? Planners should try heading towards the A38 island at Minworth at 8.00am from either the A38 or Wesbster Way, Walmley as everyone heads into Birmingham. It is at a standstill now, how much worse if this housing at Langley and industrial development at Peddimore goes ahead?	Funding for transport infrastructure should be guaranteed before development goes ahead, particularly rail links and a cycle route into the city to reduce congestion and pollution. Has anyone carried out a pollution study to see what the impact of thousands more cars will have on the area?	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp607	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp612	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp633	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp640	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp732	The traffic congestion is bad enough already, without introducing a further 5,000 households into the equation. The daily journey into Birmingham has turned into a crawl, and there are very few options for alternative routes from Walmley to Birmingham, so we have little choice but to put up with the chaos. I also use public transport when I cannot get a lift into Birmingham and there is already standing room only on rush-hour routes. As for the proposed "sprinter" bus, have BCC forgotten that the bus lane along Tyburn Road had to be abandoned last time? How and when exactly is the transport system going to be developed, and where is the funding coming from? BCC apparently cannot afford to repair pot-holes, let alone make any real improvements to the transport system. What commitments have the developers made in terms of improvements to infrastructure?	Concentrate on the brownfield sites until they have been developed to their full potential. Make the developers commit to funding and putting in place the necessary improvements to infrastructure first, before any more houses are built. Otherwise, Walmley and the surrounding areas will come to a complete standstill.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp737	Traffic through Walmley is already a complete bottle neck - why add to this headache? This will only increase traffic congestion and not reduce it, thereby increasing CO2 emissions also.			A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp745	Re:- TP37, GA5, GA6 The traffic into Birmingham from Walmley is already bad enough without the plans to build this development. There has been no demonstration that there will development of a sustainable, integrated system of transport. Approximately an extra 10000 cars will increase Co2 emissions and pollution. The transport provision is not sufficient to support these 600 extra homes and the 80 hectare employment zone.	Congestion and pollution sould be reducing and not increasing. Transport funding should be guaranteed before any development takes place. Pollution studies should be carried out and what the impact of the extra volumes of traffic will have on the emission levels.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp753	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp766	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp776					On the question of transport I object to the plan because the provision stated would not be sustainable. It would bring more traffic on to the roads. There is not enough detail and funding has not been secured. The re opening of the Sutton Park line is only mentioned as 'desirable' – surely this should be a must if such a high number of new residents are coming into the area. The majority will no doubt be working in and around Birmingham. The plan talks about an access road to the A38 but no mention of increasing capacity to an already congested route. The majority of people will use private cars – so that means yet more traffic on the already congested roads around Walmley and Minworth. That is not sustainable planning. The lack of new hospital and the reduction of services at Good Hope means yet more people travelling to Heartlands for certain procedures meaning yet more cars and there is no reasonable public transport links.	The council should look at all the major roads in the surrounding area to reduce congestion on local roads. It should secure funding for the Sutton Park rail line and have a clear plan for its re introduction in line with any housing development. More detail is needed about how these plans will fulfill the NPPF requirements of reducing greenhouse emissions, congestion, minimising travel and journey lengths.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp787					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp829					Unless the transport network is improved as part of the plan the increase in housing development will result in more workers arriving late with the resultant impact on industry of loss of output. Children will not arrive at school on time effecting their education. The area will become less attractive to new industry and the aims of the plan to achieve growth for Birmingham will be impacted as empty industrial units become the norm and recently built housing remains unoccupied as the area becomes grid locked.	Look at improvements to the whole transport network and start improvements to make the areas attractive to new industry and residents.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp863	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP37. Birmingham City University has made a separate detailed response to the "Birmingham Mobility Action Plan" which relates to this policy and section 9 in the BDP.			A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp879					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp899					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp907					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp914	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp965	Policy numbers : TP37 A Sustainable Transport Network GA4 Growth Area - Sutton Coldfield Town Centre GA5 Growth Area - Langley Sustainable Urban Extension GA6 Growth Area - Peddimore Green Belt Site Submissions - Options A, B, & C The plan, with respect to Policy TP37, does not define or meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements and it is not consistent with achieving sustainable infrastructure development. No specific strategy and alternatives have been developed for the areas under consideration. In the absence of such specific strategy it is neither deliverable nor consistent with national policy. Policy TP37 includes, in its introduction, the statement:"An efficient, comprehensive and sustainable transport system is an essential element in supporting the City's economic competitiveness, meeting the targets for reducing CO2 emissions and enabling the delivery of sustainable development. Promoting sustainable transport modes will help re-balance the focus to those modes that have lower emissions and contribute to creating a higher quality environment across the City."Policy TP37 states requirements for a	1. The proposed developments on the Greenfield Sites under Policies GA5 and GA6 and in Options A,B, and C referred to above, should be abandoned. 2. A comprehensive infrastructure plan developed for Sutton Coldfield and its environs, and Policy GA4 developed to include redevelopment for the whole of the town centre including the railway station and its adjacent car parks, such development to include provision for a public bus, or other appropriate le light transport terminus. 3. Emphasis should be on defining and developing a sustainable transport network that reduces traffic pollution in all its forms.	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1015	The plan does not set out how this will be achieved the existing infrastructure can not support the existing demand and the proposals in the plan do not provide ways of dealing with it.	The plan needs to identify the new and improved road links that would reduce congestion.		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1035	I reviewed and completed a questionnaire for the Birmingham Mobility Action Plan (BMAP) and was suprised to see that it did not provide any specific proposals to imporove transport and mobility within the Walmley area despite the current Birmingham Plan 2031 proposing significant new housing in this area. Surely such a proposed increase in the number of houses must also be supported by proposals for how to deal with the resulting increasing transport and mobility requirements?	Provide details regarding how transport and mobility requirements are to be met, and ensure these are also included in the Birmingham Mobility Action Plan (BMAP).	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1039			TP37, GA5, GA6 (Langley and Peddimore) This is a key weakness of the plan for me. Anyone who lives in, or knows the Sutton Coldfield area well, will tell you that the roads are already more congested than is acceptable. Key roads such as Walmley road, Whitehouse Common road, Chester road, Birmingham road, Tyburn road and Kingsbury road are often gridlocked during busy periods of the day/week (rush hour and Saturdays) The A38 bypass into Birmingham is already struggling to cope with the commuting traffic, so an extra several thousand cars, and hundreds of extra HGV's from the proposed Langley development, will extend journey times by a considerable amount, impacting on the local economy and increasing pollution.	There are very few options to enable an 'improvement' to the existing transport network in Sutton Coldfield, since many roads are already full of traffic, and at the busiest times of the day, the buses and trains rarely have a spare seat. If the disused Sutton Park Line was to be re-opened however, that would certainly help to alleviate at least some of the extra burden. Asthma is on the increase across the country due an increase in pollution, so it would be useful to have a thorough study carried out to determine what sort of impact the extra traffic would have. The A38 would have to be widened to accommodate the extra volume of traffic. An extra entry/exit point is not enough, it only encourages further congestion on to the Aston Expressway.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1057			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1067			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1095			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1125			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1134			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1137	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to a sustainable transport network by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (air quality improvement, noise reduction, wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1144	Traffic congestion around Walmley, Minworth and Kingsbury Road, Chester Road, Castle Vale is huge. It is naive to think that traffic using an industrial site at Peddimore will use sustainable transport and not create pollution. Residents of a new estate will use cars as there is not a transport infrastructure in place. Commuting traffic into Birmingham City Centre from these areas is already heavy.	The Green Belt development should not go ahead. The area cannot support this amount of increased traffic.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1175	Traffic congestion around Walmley, Minworth, Chester Road, Chester Road Railway station and Castle Vale is already very heavy. It is stupidity itself to think that commuters using an industrial site at Peddimore will use sustainable transport and not create any extra traffic. Residents of a new estate will use their cars to commute into Birmingham City Centre as there is no extra provision for road/ or rail infrastructure. There is no provision in the plans for reintroducing passenger rail services at Walmley- it is currently a seldom used freight line only. Why not use the existing steel rails already in the ground?	Consult with London Midland, Centro and Network Rail about a new passenger rail service from Walmley into Birmingham New Street station. Fund part of this development and build a car park for this station to allow cars and cyclists to park there. Plan for the long term rail demand, especially when petrol prices will rise faster than inflation.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1211	The NPPF states that any plan should promote sustainable transport. Policy GA5 indicates that a strategic modelling has been undertaken but has not been discussed with the highways Agency. Again another element of the plan that is incomplete. The new development will increase traffic volume significantly and the present infrastructure, already struggling, will be unable to cope with the increased capacity and demand. The opening of the Walmley railway station is not possible. BCC doesn't have the funds for this development.	More detail on how the existing roads will be managed to cope with the extra demand made by residents in a new development.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1281		In chapter 5 the report "Transport Modelling Assessment, Initial Output Report" January 2014 the council and their consultant set out extensive information on the performance of junctions in their modelled road network, and conclude in the report by stating that the proposed developments will have only marginal effects on the road network. However, chapter 6 of the document "Transport Evidence Base: Scoping and Methodology Report" September 2012 states "However, the model outputs are not suitable for detailed analysis of individual junctions. We therefore propose using the PRISM model outputs to understand the change in trip patterns and impacts at individual roads and junctions. Further modelling using standalone modelling packages will be undertaken as part of latter stages to inform Birmingham City Council and other stakeholders about when parts of the network will cease to be operational in future."The analysis undertaken in the first mentioned report is therefore based on an incorrect aproach which had been specifically dismissed. The council therefore cannot conclude that there will be no adverse impacts. This also calls into question the rigour which has been applied	The forecasts using the PRISM model showing the operation of junctions in the report "Transport Modelling Assessment, Initial Output Report" January 2014 should not be used to assess the eproposed plans. The original procedure set out in the document "Transport Evidence Base: Scoping and Methodology Report" September 2012 should be followed. * * *

bp1289	In Table 1.1 of the document "Transport Modelling Assessment, Initial Output Report", January 2014 it is shown that there would be five numbered (or actually 6 total) stages to the study. The available published information only covers up to Stage 3a (Strategic Modelling). There is therefore significant work still to be done (or at the very least made available for the public). The plan is therefor not in a state where it cannot have been properly considered and for it to assessed as being "sustainable" or not.	Proper assessment of the proposed plan needs to be undertaken and considered against the objectives of a sustainable road network, before it can be finalied. * * *

bp1290		In the doucment "Birmingham Development Plan, Green Belt Development Movement Infrastructure Plan" January 2014 it states:"District Highway Corridor: Fox Hollies Road and Wylde Green Road 4.5.15 There is a risk that these roads would attract additional traffic due to traffic restraint on the route via Reddicap Hill, and also as an alternative route to Penns Lane for connection to the A452 Chester Road. This is not desirable as it connects with the A5127 Birmingham Road at a junction where a capacity enhancement would be difficult to provide, and could lead to an increased flow of traffic on local roads in Boldmere to the west of the Birmingham Road. Traffic management interventions would be implemented to discourage through traffic on this route."It can be seen from this that modifications will be made to Fox Hollies Road and Wylde Green Road to discourage new traffic, but clearly this will impose delays to existing traffic on these roads (the implication being that the management will be on these roads rather than restricting access onto these roads). Hence existing residents will suffer because of the new development.	Firstly Green Belt protection should not removed from any land, secondly any new development should be supported with additional infrastructure rather than imposing new physical limitations on the network. * * *

bp1299	To assess the plan, the council has used its PRISM model to provide forecasts of future traffic use. In the report "Transport Modelling Assessment Initial Output Report" January 2014 it states that for the model to be acceptable, more than 85% of its links need to meet the "Acceptability Guideline". It then goes on to demonstrate that for the Calibration links the maximum achieved is only 84% and for Validation Links it is only 81%. Clearly these values are below the target and hence by the reports own admission, the model is not of the required standard and therefore should not be used for the study.	The model needs to be improved so that it meets the criteria that have been set out. In the meantime, no use can be made of the PRISM model nor its outputs and any part of the plan based on PRISM should be excluded. * * *

bp1344	TP37, GA5, GA6 - It is questionable whether 'development of a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, where the most sustainble mode choices also offer the most convenient means of travel' has been demonstrated. The A38 entry/exit has no funding. Increased residential development around Walmley will only increase congestion and pollution. Additionally school/hospital/business development will create the same problem. The present and planned road infrastructure will not sustain such development. Lack of public transport will increase the use of private cars and subsequent parking problems if a new hospital in addition to Heartlands is not provided. It is suggested that the Sutton Park line be re-opened. This has cost, environmental and parking implications. The suggested 10,000 additional cars increases the safety hazards for pedestrians both young and old.	Funding and plans should be in place to open the Sutton Park line BEFORE an employment zone is created. Similarly funding should be in place for any planned amendments to the existing road infrastructure, together with funding for on-going and regular maintenance. Studies should take place to advise on the impact on health and congestion of an additional 10,000 cars with additional CO2 emissions. Consideration should be given to all safety implications for both pedestrians and other road users of additional vehicles within any proposed large-scale residential/commerical developments.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1395	The provision in its current state does not provide a viable solution to deliver a sustainable development as it is not consistent with National Policy. This is due to the proposals within the connectivity section not satisfying the criteria within the NPPF, Chapter 4, Promoting Sustainable Transport. The transport provision will in fact increase greenhouse emissions and congestion and capacity on an already overstretched area as the plan does not address the current infrastructure issues. There is no indication of how it will minimise travel and journey lengths. The current proposal is not consistent with BDP policy TP27 which states any new residential development "Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided". Reference :GA5 and GA6 are not positively prepared - there has been no assessment of current transport infrastructure issues versus the impact of an additional 6,000 homes and 80ha. employment zone. There are uncertainties in the provision. The BDP Infrastructure Delivery Plan Schedule has only notional reference to implementation timeframes of between 0-10+ years with no	Proposal to build on the Green Belt removed as the BCC have not proved the provision will enable sustainable development for the Langley SUE and Peddimore employment area. A viable transport infrastructure to be in place for the Birmingham Plan 2031 as per the BDP's policy TP27 which states any new development to "Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided "The most appropriate strategy for Birmingham to be considered against all reasonable alternatives before any decision is made on what will constitute a sustainable transport network. To ensure the provision meets the requirements of a sustainable development BCC need to demonstrate how and when they consulted with the local community in Birmingham to ensure the provision meets both the needs of the current community and the to be. The “local planning authority should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see” (source NPPF Paragraph 69) and not one that is the preserve of	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1457	The only possible outcome of the proposals to build on green belt is increased traffic congestion on the existing road infrastructure. Whilst I applaud initiatives to encourage people to travel by means other that the car, in practice they only work for a small percentage of the population who live and work close to those alternatives. If a new housing development goes ahead on green belt how are the people who choose to live there going to commute? They will inevitably choose to use a car. The increased traffic will then be entering the existing inadequate and poorly maintained road infrastructure. All of the major arterial roads around the north, north east and east of the city are already grid locked - particularly the M42 and the A446. If these plans go ahead this will only get worse.	Stop development of green belt land.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1477	The plan states that a sustainable high quality integrated transport system will be developed, where the most sustainable mode choices also offer the most convenient means of travel but this is not demonstrated in any way. The A38 entry/exit is not funded ie. unlikely to actually happen. The A38 is very congested in the lead in, during and immediately after the morning and evening rush hour peaks. This plan will simply add to congestion and make our communities suffer increasing commuting times which are a major barrier to real sustainable growth - you need to be able to move around efficiently to get to work. I observe gridlock around Walmley, Walmley Ash, Eachelhurst Road, Sutton Coldfield bypass, and the local roads feeding into these main routes on a daily basis. The plan will introduce 10000 additional cars at least onto local roads and the network cannot cope with that level of increase. Air pollution will be increased in the area by the impact of all the additional traffic. The plan does not adequately provide for improved public transport. The local railway station reopening to passengers is absolutely essential to provide a genuine alternative and additional capacity for people to travel into the city centre	The focus must be on securing and guaranteeing the funding to improve the transport infrastructure up front - the plan does not work without the transportation (you only have to look at how other cities develop transport ahead of actual population and employment growth ie. DLR, Crossrail in London - come on Birmingham it's not rocket science). Guaranteed funding for transport infrastructure before development starts on houses or employment zone. Railway station to reopen essential. Regular passenger commuter rail services to Birmingham with the reopening of stations on route to give people options not to go by road. Sutton Park line to reopen essential. Full environmental study on pollution impact of 10000 cars added to local traffic levels.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1493	This section raises major concerns, yet the proposal is vague and non-specific on many important points. There is already clear overloading of the transport system serving the area, yet there are only vague proposals relating to needs mentioned in this section.	A major consideration needs to be given to connectivity before any proposal should be allowed to proceed. People will not buy or choose to live in an area where they cannot access good transport and travel links.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1501	I can not see any where in the plan how the transport network is being improved. All around the A38 area, through to the Asda at Minworth, up through to Walmley Village, down Webster Way, along Walmley Road, Over the years I have seen the congestion progressively deteriorate. Having regularly used the public transport network, as it stands now it is not fit for purpose. Buses are always overcrowded during school run times. There is no nearby rail connection having to travel to Wylde Green to sue the train and movement around the area is awful at rush hour times. The infrastructure could not cope with an increase in people and vehicle movements. The risk of increases in accidents and injuries massively increase if this ill though plan is adopted. TP37, GA5, GA6	Decrease congestion not look to increase. As it stands, Walmley can not cope today. Consider a more sustainable approach. Re-introduce the Sutton Rail Line and establish a sound infrastructure before moving forward with any further proposals. Review the existing bus network and look to a more viable sustainable bus network taking cars off of the road and put people on public transport which as it stands is inadequate. . One other thing to consider is how much pollution will the additional 6000 homes with the associated cars create?	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1526	TP37 GA5 GA6 Sutton Coldfield and especially Walmley have congestion of traffic at the best of times. More housing will increase the amount of cars on the road and therefore the already overcrowded roads will be impossible to negotiate. Public transport is already used to capacity. Standing room only on squashed, tightly packed trains from Sutton Coldfield need to be addressed.	This plan will be difficult to resolve. The roads around Sutton Coldfield/Walmley have little scope for widening to cope with the extra traffic. Public transport needs to be improved both buses and trains are overcrowded at the moment. Funding should be provided to improve transport infrastructure. All this should take place before any housing development.		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1552	The greatest single weakness of this Plan is the lack of a coherent transport policy. The roads in Sutton Coldfield are already completely overloaded especially at peak times. Road capacity on the A38 and A5127 is not sufficient to cope with development on this scale. An immense mistake was made in the 1960s bu closing down passenger services on the Sutton park rail line. No passenger facilities remain and reopneing them would require vast investment in infrastructure. Capacity at Moor Street / Birmingham New Street. even with an extra platform at Snow Hill is not sufficient to cope with a regular service from Sutton Park / Walmley similar to the Cross-City Line. The effect of 1000s more commuters using principally road will create gridlock in the Walmley area.	There should be a clear commitment to the reopening to passengers and electrification of the Sutton Park line (with funding secured) before any further housing in the Sutton Coldfield /Walmley area is considered.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1555	We are being asked to comment on a plan which is not complete. The plan should be a strategy of how to deal with a population increase of 150,000 and a housing need for 80,000. The plan only has the detail for 51,000 houses. I am unable to make an informed decision on whether this the right policy when information is missing from the plan. There are too many uncertainties within the transport infrastructure plan to make it consistent with planning policy.	A plan should be presented to the public which is complete we can then comment on whether the infrastructure requirements are sufficient and sustainable. A viable transport infrastructure plan presented for consultation.		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1651	This comment relates to TP37,GA5 and GA6 I feel that the plan does not provide enough information to prove that the development will be sustainable and have an integrated transport system. The proposed plan can only increase the congestion around Walmley, thereby making everyone's journeys longer, putting extra strain on the already overly busy road system. If the old Sutton park line was guaranteed to be reopened, this may help contribute to extra transport provision to support the housing development.	Infrastructure funding should be guaranteed before the general public are bombarded with planning. Studies regarding the extra pollution that will be created should be carried out and made public for all to see. The old Sutton railway line should definitely be reopened if this plan goes ahead.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1656	Provision outlined in the plan for "sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system" is highly unlikely to be sufficient to support the number of houses planned in the long term. No. of cars will undoubtedly increase several fold with extra capacity, bringing added pollution and congestion. Where is the funding for transport infrastructure upgrades?	More time needs to be spent examining added infrastructure needed (e.g. hospital, to prevent added road travel to existing hospitals). Study conducted on environmental impact of added pollution from additional large number of private motor cars as new houses are added. Guaranteed funding for transport improvements before going ahead with plan.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1671	Car clubs are a great idea but their range is limited and does not usually permit access to amenities outwith the city boundaries.			A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1742	The rail network is already under pressure, cramped and unreliable. Alternative routes will not alleviate this, only increase the problem and frustrations of many commuters. Sutton and surrounding areas will not cope with alternative routes or an increase in traffic through the areas. Alternative transport is unsustainable. If it's pouring with rain what would be your chaise? wait for a bus that is running late or hop in the car? I know which I would choose. I have mentioned infrastructure in previous sections of my comments and concur with most comments outlined elsewhere by fellow objectors		No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1753	The plan does not demonstrate the development of a "sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, where the most sustainable mode choices also offer the most convenient means of travel". There is no funding set aside for the additional proposed A38 junction. The proposals will greatly increase the traffic around the already congested Walmley area. This in turn will also increase pollution levels in the area. Re-opening the bus lane on the A38 will create further congestion rather than making it easier for the additional population to commute into the city centre. The Sutton railway line has been mentioned but it is merely desirable and there is no funding available for it.	There needs to be a focus on really reducing congestion and pollution rather than increasing it. Walmley is already highly congested at peak times. The Sutton railway line must be brought back into public service prior to any development being given the go ahead. A study on the impact of an additional 10000 cars in the Walmley area on congestion and pollution must be conducted.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1762	The reality of building 6000 new homes in the green belt area near Sutton Coldfield will result in at least 6000 more cars trying to leave the area each morning to go to work and to take the children to school. Your transport provision detailed is not sustainable. The desire to reopen the Sutton Park rail line and railway station is indeed desirable but not realistic. Funding will never be found for such an expensive solution.	At least one additional entry / exit to the A38 should be funded. I undertsand that there is no funding inculded for such an improvement. All additional new traiffic is supposed to join the existing commuter rush through Walmley.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1805	Attempts to change the public's attitude to travel have failed at terrific costings for associated signage e.g. shared cars on the spine road, bus lanes which result in increased congestion while the bus lane remains for the main part empty. Introduce an Oyster type card for buses and trains at a price that makes it financially viable, that is significantly cheaper than driving and parking every day. Make travel free during the rush hour times - use digital communications to switch to fare paying at given times.	Introduce a travel system that makes it financially nonsensical not to use the system.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1844	TP37, GA5, GA6 Roads within Sutton Coldfield already experience an unacceptable level of congestion and such proposed plans will add nothing but further congestion to the roads, which will not reduce CO2 emissions.	Proposals should focus on reducing, not increasing congestion on roads if a more sustainable transport system is to be achieved.	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1854	Having been a resident in Walmley for over 10 years, I can vouch for the congestion around Walmley, Minworth and Kingsbury Road and Castle Vale as being saturated. How can adding huge numbers of additional vehicles create sustainable transport and less pollution? A new estate will have a huge impact on what is already a congested route. It is simple common sense - we don't have the schools/roads/health care to cope with the additional demand, this will also lead to a knock on effect on the value of houses in and around the area.	The project should not go ahead without sufficient healthcare, education and infrastructure provision - where are the new schools/gp's/road networks to accomodate?	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1885	Test Message timed at 15.34 03/03/2014			A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1902	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1906	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1924	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp1943	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1953	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1966	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1973	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1984	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1987	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp1997	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2007	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2016	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2020	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2027	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2046	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2060	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2070	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2084	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2089	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2093	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2097	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2125	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2132	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2146	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2166	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2188	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2218	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2277	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2287	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp2309			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2316			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2325			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2340			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2349			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2361	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2376			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2385			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2392			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2404	Sarah Moult	VPS Administrator @ BMW Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2424			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2432			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2437			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2449			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2455			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2463			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2482			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2489			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2498			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2516			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2527			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2549			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2561			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp2567			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2575			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2604			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2615			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2637			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2643			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2651			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2658			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2667			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2673			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2679			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2687			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2688			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2697			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2708			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2740			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2747			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2772	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2838	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2843			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2879			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2886			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2896			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2909			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp2930	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2936	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2958	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2982	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp2999	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3038	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3045	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3066	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3087	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3092	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3129	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3143	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3152	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3156	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3161	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3177	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3201	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3212	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3214	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3252	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3257	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3274	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3280	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3286	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3303	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3329	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp3352	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3411	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3420	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3432	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3443	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3466	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3473	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3485	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3519	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3550	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3556	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3563	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3565	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3579	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3598	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3600	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3608	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3649	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3656	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3657	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3673	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3687	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3695	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3706	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3714	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3737	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp3741	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3748	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3754	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3784	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3826	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3839	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3843	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3846	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3858	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3861	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3893	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3910	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3918	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3919	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3934	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3942	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3945	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3952	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3957	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3963	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3970	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3980	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3989	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp3998	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4012	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4020	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp4028	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4046	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4074	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4082	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4098	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4099	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4123	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4139	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4148	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4149	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4239	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4261	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4273	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4275	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4280	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4288	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4296	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4303	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4307	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4310	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4320	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4343	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4344	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4353	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4359	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4368	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp4377	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4380	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4405	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4412	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4431	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4452	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4468	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4488	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4495	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4498	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4514	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4528	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4565	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4571	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4606	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4628	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4644	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4652	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4663	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4665	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4676	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4684	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4687	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4708	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4721	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4727	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp4741			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4750			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4764			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4799			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4813			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4821			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4825			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4865			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4872			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4887	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4894			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4914			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4925			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4938			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4950			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4955			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4978			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp4996			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5020			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5029			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5037			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5053			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5075			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5138			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5164			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5189			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp5217			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5251			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5349	Ms Paulette Ross	Hints and Canwell Parish Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5387			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5454			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5471			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5483			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5526			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5548			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5566	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5631			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5639			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5650			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5662			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5674			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5690			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5697			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5707			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5710			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5722			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5735			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5751			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5758	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37

bp5828		c/o Brooke Smith Planning (Connaught Square Ltd)	Andrea Caplan	Principal Planner Brooke Smith Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5840		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5862					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5875					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5881					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5912	Mr Nick Dawson	Connectivity Manager Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp5932					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp6005								A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp6026					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	A sustainable transport network	TP37
bp160					The Transport Strategy for Birmingham places pedestrians at the top of the road user hierarchy with the commitment to encouraging walking as a safe, attractive and convenient means of getting around the city. There is no indication that this is desired by the general public. It appears to be a 1984 type diktat from the 'city' There needs to be a mix of road user hierarchy dependent of location and circumstances This statement in isolation is ludicrous	Stop the rhetoric and provide firm costed plans or leave out		Walking	TP38
bp864	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP38. Birmingham City University supports this policy but believes the design principles embodied in a travel hierarchy should be applied to existing as well as new developments.			Walking	TP38
bp988					Shared spaces approaches should be supported where appropriate rigid engineering responses should be minimised.	Policy should specificaly emphsises the importance of the attractivness of places to encourage walking and that were appropriate sharred space schemes would be specificaly supported	Yes	Walking	TP38

bp1139	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to making walking safer and more pleasant by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (cleaner air, noise reduction, wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity.			Walking	TP38
bp1327			Excellent policy		No	Walking	TP38
bp1673			Great. However, would also like to see something done about flooding on the roads which results in pedestrians being soaked to the skin by passing traffic (particularly BAD ON Bristol Road).			Walking	TP38
bp2839	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp5118			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp5413	Jennifer Smith	Marketing Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp5568	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp5760	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp5774	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp6002			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Walking	TP38
bp30			i live near a cycle route and generally the cyclists that use them are rude and have little respect, perhaps a jolly good session on cycling laws and etiquette			Cycling	TP39

bp161					Tow paths are not a safe environment for cyclists unless the intention is to rail the length of the canals. Cycling in Birmingham is currently not a priority, if it were the roads would be repaired adequately, as a cyclist I can assure you they are not. The phase one of the 'Birmingham Cycle Revolution' focuses on area within 20 minutes cycling time from the city centre. So that excludes the area planned for the major green belt residential build Reference is made of access to bike - what does this mean? A London style 'Boris Bike', the sponsorship funding for which is about to be withdrawn	Provide a fully costed high level plan showing the what, the how and a funding plan supported by at least high level assumptions	Yes	Cycling	TP39
bp866	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP39. Birmingham City University considers that making cycling safer on main roads and at traffic junctions should be the policy priority as these roads have high capacity.			Cycling	TP39
bp1140	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission			Support the policy and welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to making cycling safer and more pleasant by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (cleaner air, noise reduction, wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Cycling	TP39

bp1159	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The policy refers to the further development and enhancement of the network of canal towpaths. Canal & River Trust consider the towing path network provides a motor-vehicle-free environment in which to travel to work, school or home and is particularly suitable for cycling. Many of the canal towpaths within the City are to be enhanced as part of the Cycle Ambition Bid funding to enable them to fulfil their potential as green transport corridors suitable for all-weather cycling. The enhancements include providing a 'sealed' bituminous surface, with improved accesses at certain locations, and signing and wayfinding measures which will cover about 37.5km of the canal network. Where works are not forming part of the Cycle Ambition developments could contribute to enhancing canal towpaths. The Canal & River Trust consider where appropriate and in accordance with the tests, planning obligations secured from the development or regeneration of sites on the waterside or otherwise benefiting from it should be reinvested and framed positively to benefit the waterways infrastructure. For example for on-going maintenance costs for maintaining the towing path as a form of open space, and the		No	Cycling	TP39
bp1188			the current cycling lanes are an insult as in some cases they are less than than 10 meters long. they are parked over and driven over without any form of policing. they may tick a political box but in reality they are disjointed and ill thought out. look at the island by walmley b418/ thimble end lane what is the purpose, where does it go.	go to Holland and see how it needs to be done. better to have fewer proper lanes that the miss mash of lanes that cannot be used now.	No	Cycling	TP39
bp1328			Canal towpaths could be kept clean to avoid punctures. Throwing cyclists from proper (new) paths onto major roads is dangerous. Use of bus lanes is madness.		No	Cycling	TP39
bp1676			Impractical. No mention of facilities for showering and changing. Or do we just lower our standards for presentation and hygiene?			Cycling	TP39
bp1801			The cycle lanes in residential areas are often rendered dangerous because of motorists parking half on the kerb and half on the road. It would make sense to paint yellow lines with cycle lane markings to keep the cyclists safe.		No	Cycling	TP39

bp2840	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Cycling	TP39
bp5572	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Cycling	TP39
bp5761	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Cycling	TP39
bp6000			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Cycling	TP39
bp31			its cheaper to drive it is generally safer cleaner too buses need to be sorted out really 3.90 a day saver 2.00 pound a single trip to the city ! what happened to encouraging bus use ? oh i also think why have we not got an oyster card system ? London does and it saves faffing around for change !!			Public transport	TP40
bp162			The bus remains by far the most important mode of public transport in Birmingham. There continues to be a challenge in making bus travel attractive as a sustainable alternative to the private car. - Has this been tested with the general public, is this what the public wants, is this a ' city' diktat	Demonstrate how the public has been involved in making this assumption	Yes	Public transport	TP40
bp326			Its proposed that the development of 6000 properties and a retail park should take place on Green belt land in Walmley, Sutton Coldfield which will inevitably lead to more transort, congestion and pollution taking place. The area as it stands already suffers major transort problems in Walmley Village, Webster Way, Kingsbury Road and other major roads leading into the Sutton Coldfield Town Centre. At a recent public meeting the planners of Birmingham City Council told the attending residents that transort links would be provided and that public transport would be improved by providing speed buses, bus lanes, cycle lanes and opening up the Walmley railway station. All this with no available budget to do so.	Abandon any thought of Building on any Green belt until all Brownfields sites have been fully developed first. Once all Brownfield sites have been developed then re assess the additional homes and retail units required. Produce an updated fully costed plan based on accurate data, information and needs required once all Brownfield Sites have been developed. Once the above suggestions have been carried out Its possisble that the 80000+ properties and business units anticipated as required by Birmingham City Council may not be required and if this should be the case, then some of the Green belt planned for development could be saved and protected for future generations.	No	Public transport	TP40

bp598	Housing development should be focussed along corridors well served by existing passenger rail links. It should be an objective that housing developments are only built where there is a passenger train station within 15 minutes walk. This would encourage use of rail and reduce car dependency, in line with the plan's environmental and sustainability objectives. If green belt development is to be included in the plan, it should be clear that such development cannot commence until passenger services along the Sutton Park Line and the Water Orton Corridor have commenced and have been found to be working effectively.	Amend the plan as detailed.	Yes	Public transport	TP40
bp661	As usual you have assessed the shortcomings of the region's transport infrastructure accurately. I remain concerned that if central government continues to underfund our region, many of the projects to which you refer will continue to be long-term or unachievable aspirations. The process of accessing local funding and utilising local knowledge and expertise must be accelerated if we are to achieve the 21st century transport system the city deserves and aspires to. It is gratifying to see that the extension of the Midland Metro by "bite-sized chunks" appears to have have got this unfinished project moving again. I can understand that financial restraints might have persuaded you that bus rapid transit is a more affordable alternative in the short term for some transport corridors, but once the citizens of Birmingham see what a good light rail network can offer, I predict that they will demand more routes. Generally, rail and light rail attract passengers who otherwise only tolerate buses because there is no alternative. There must be greater cooperation with neighbouring authorities on transport matters and demands must now be made of government that our relatively low-density	Commit to rail rapid transit to Birmingham Airport if "world class" aspirations are to be realised Take steps to encourage airlines to commit to long haul destinations from the airport Push through the Camp Hill cords project as a matter of urgency and free up some train paths at New Street Ensure high quality interchanges from one mode of transport to another - particularly rail to Metro at Snow Hill and New Street Lobby National Government to recognise the need for rail enhancements now in preparation for HS2 Visit Manchester and learn more about how a city half the size of Birmingham can make such rapid (relatively) progress with their Metrolink	No	Public transport	TP40
bp715	Why can it take 2 hours via bus (including changing buses) to get from Hawkesley to Rubery? It only takes 30 minutes by car. What plans are there for getting across the city easily and efficiently by public transport?	A overview of the current and future public transport system - not just for the city centre. This will enable residents to see more easily how public transport links interconnect.	No	Public transport	TP40

bp840					There are no concrete plans for public transport, only a wish list which will probably never happen. Bus transport will only add to the traffic congestion and the provision of bis lanes on narrow roads will be a non-starter. The hope that train lines can be reopened depend on the rail authorities and there is no capacity at present within the existing infrastructure. Money for any improvement would need to come from areas outside local authority control and there is no possibility of a commitment from the relevant authorities to make this happen.	The funding and plan for improvements to the transport infrastructure should be in place and committed to before the commencement of any development.	No	Public transport	TP40
bp867	Mr Brian Rance	Assistant Director of Estates (Planning) Birmingham City University	Mrs Katherine Tomlinson	Department Secretary Birmingham City University	Policy TP40. Commitment is required to extend the Metro to the new HS2 station and to service the Eastside learning zone.			Public transport	TP40
bp1255					Surely that Sutton Park line including Walmley and Sutton park would still then follow the same route into Birmingham City Centre as the current Sutton to Birmingham New Street. I drive every day to either the Sutton or Chester Road stations and catch the train into Birmingham. Without the addition of any more people it takes me anywhere between 15-45 minutes to reach the station (I live 5 minutes from both) due to traffic - the 15 minutes is only possible during school holidays even though I travel much earlier than these times, and the train journey itself is often a health and safety issue. It only needs 1 scheduled train to be late to have to encounter people standing the full length of the aisles, wedged up against the doors when they open at stations and having to endure the exasperated looks of those who are waiting on the platforms but cannot get on the train when it stops. Public rail transport cannot cope with the current working residents of Walmley let alone more people.	Build in areas where there are different routes that are likely to be used available to popular working destinations such as Birmingham.	No	Public transport	TP40

bp1282	The report "Birmingham Development Plan, Green Belt Development Movement Infrastructure Plan" January 2014 states"4.5.11 It is considered that a modal shift from car to cycling and public transport is critical both to the sustainability of the current economy in Sutton Coldfield Town Centre, and for it to be able to accommodate new shoppers and jobs taken up by Langley residents. This can only achieved by implementing a comprehensive multi-modal transport plan for the town. This may be the subject of separate studies, but in any case is likely to involve a mix of physical and technology-driven urban traffic management control measures. The purpose will be to rebalance the network to ensure that alternative means of travel (walking, cycling and public transport) are an equitable and credible alternative to the private car. 4.5.12 The specific measures being considered at this time include: Improvements at the Reddicap Heath Road junction with Hollyfield Road to assist bus travel, address conflicting turning movements and control traffic flow using signal timings; The introduction of traffic signal control at the junctions of Walmley Road with Hollyfield Road and Reddicap Heath Road;	The council needs to undertake a proper study to come up with more reliable proposals before seeking to finalise this report. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible	Yes	Public transport	TP40
bp1329	Reiteration. The focus and Bus and Coach is woefully myopic. What is needed is more effective rapid transit systems (trams and Trains) to take the stress and pollution away from roads. One line to Wolverhampton is but a token. Just visit most German cities to see how that is done. Dresden makes most UK cities look pathetic, let alone Frankfurt. Transport must be integrated and on at least a regional scale - covering the whole Midlands. Inept central government policy - all parties - does not help	Go and see best practice	Yes	Public transport	TP40

bp1442	In agreement that bus services are the most important public transport in need of development. Living near the proposed industrial development site of Peddimore, our public transport links are currently terrible. The 116 bus is the only direct bus route into Birmingham and runs at most hourly during the day. The last bus into the centre of Birmingham is at 18:07, the last return bus is 18:47 making this transport link impossible to use for a night out. The service doesn't operate at all on Sundays. The nearest train station is Water Orton from which trains only run into Birmingham centre every 2 hours and the latest train back at 19:52. The cost of using buses can be prohibitive. For us to travel into the centre of Birmingham when the 116 isn't running means the cost of two busses for two people and a long journey which costs not much less than a taxi. I don't understand how Birmingham Council can put in place improvements to public transport when the services are run by profit focussed private companies. If improved services were put in place to support the proposed Peddimore development, they would presumably be focussed on transporting the workforce and not improve the overall situation	Outline how the proposed transport improvements can be put in place.	No	Public transport	TP40

bp1622			Policy TP40 – I support the re-opening of Sutton Park railway line to passenger services and the provision of new stations at Walmley and Sutton Park. These would need to be supported by car parking. However, the proposals for the line they would be on that is set out in the West Midlands Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 would seem to take passengers from Aldridge around the East of Birmingham to Hazelwell without any station interchanges that would allow for a greater variety of journeys. It is not clear to me how successful the new route / stations would be, if they do not enable people to travel into the centre of Birmingham. Policies GA5 and GA6 both relate to developments on Green Belt land. Whilst I do not support these proposals, if the land is to be removed from the Green Belt and developed, it would be essential that the public transport infrastructure and access improvements would need to be operational at the same time as the developments began to be used. If there are delays in the introduction of new bus / train services in Langley (GA5), people will have to use their cars and so not get into the habit of using the public transport services. This will create a risk that they will then not use them	Include references to supporting infrastructure at new stations such as car parking. Ensure that proposals to enhance the city's rail network will create routes that people will want to use. An objective should be to make them so desirable that they will significantly ease congestion on the roads. Commit to ensuring that public transport developments are timetabled to coincide with other developments to their mutual benefit.	No	Public transport	TP40
bp1678			Would be great if any of these plans came to fruition.			Public transport	TP40
bp2773	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp2825	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp3799			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Public transport	TP40
bp4719			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Public transport	TP40
bp4889	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp4966			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp5438	Mr Matthew Bowers	Head of Planning and Regeneration Tamworth Borough Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40

bp5575	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp5605	Ms Rebecca Mayman	Wyre Forest District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp5628		Development Director Calthorpe Estates	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp5634					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp5762	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp5795	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Public transport	TP40
bp6001					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Public transport	TP40
bp32					you could always re open the canals...nothing wrong with cargo chugging up them takes it off the road			Freight	TP41
bp163					How does this fit with putting pedestrians at the top of the hierarchy for road users. A lack of joined up thinking? What work has been carried out to establish the feasibility or market need for freight transport by canals	Provide details not just vague aspiration and subject headings	Yes	Freight	TP41
bp989					Support should be given tothe development of a road freight hub where large lorries can transfer to smaller vehicles for more local deliveries (less harmful to roads and environemnt) Deliveries from multiple companies to one or a number of closelty located sites can be loaded onto one lorry for delivery. This minimises congestion energy costs and CO2. Some large companies are already requiring this.	The plan should indicate that it would welcome proposals for such a scheme		Freight	TP41

bp1162	Miss Katherine Burnett	Area Planner West Midlands Canal & River Trust	The canals of Birmingham are not waterways which are principally available for the commercial carriage of freight. The navigable waterways of Birmingham are cruising waterways which are principally available for cruising, fishing and other recreational purposes. We do however welcome freight users on cruising waterways, on the assumption that they operate within the current policies and arrangements for the operation and maintenance of the cruising network. To this end we are supportive, in principle, of the policy proposal in TP41 to support new wharves which could assist such activity. The proposed policy TP41 Freight proposes to normally protect sites used for waterborne freight facilities or sites suitable for waterborne freight facilities. We note the content of the West Midlands Metropolitan Freight Strategy Executive summary in the evidence base. This includes the comment that waterborne freight activity “by its nature will always be niche in nature” and that there will be “focus on supporting businesses and operators who wish to use water freight as practical”. The Council, however, do not appear to have identified which locations are considered to be	No	Freight	TP41

bp1295					How would increased support for rail freight in Birmingham impact on the viability of reopening the Sutton Park Line. The current use of this line is a limit on its potential use as a passenger service (speed and train pathways). If more freight is expected on the railway this would be expected to have an adverse effect on the Sutton Park Line for passenger services.	The impact of greater rail freight in Birmingham needs to be properly substantiated and its impact on proposed public transport improvements assessed. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible	Yes	Freight	TP41
bp1330					Hams Hall and the emerging Minworth Prologis park are putting large numbers of lorries on the local roads. Now you suggest another one on top of that on Peddimore. That is going to cause yet more congestion and pollution. The use of rail seems minimal.	Do not develop Peddimore	Yes	Freight	TP41
bp2774	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Freight	TP41
bp2841	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Freight	TP41
bp4906	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Freight	TP41
bp5393		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Freight	TP41
bp5576	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Freight	TP41

bp5764	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Freight	TP41
bp164			Again general platitudes. no substance and no costs	Provide details of planned future charging points and information on the level of usage of the current ones. Provide costs for any planned initiatives	Yes	Low emission vehicles	TP42
bp1331			Try trams and trains.Hundreds of them! In Frankfurt there are 9 fast S Bahn train lines, 15 regional train lines, 10 tram lines interwoven and integrated with 75 local bus services. Although the S bahn network has taken traffic away from trams there were nearly 50 million passengers running on the 42 miles of track with high frequency service in 2012 in a city smaller than Birmingham	Plan more tracks. Reverse the vandalism of the past.	Yes	Low emission vehicles	TP42
bp1343			Has the council costed out the cost of charging points and whether or not there will be enough electric vehicles being used in the short to medium time to justify the outlay. I dont accept there will be massive rush to purchase electric vehicles because they are not yet designed for distance travel and also the need for regular charging up of these vehicled will be deemed a nuisance factor by users	Carry out an accurate assessment and cost for suppling charging points and also an accurtate assessment on the amount of electric vehicles that will be in use over say the next 20 years.	No	Low emission vehicles	TP42
bp3071			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Low emission vehicles	TP42
bp3674			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Low emission vehicles	TP42
bp5577	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Low emission vehicles	TP42
bp16			This document is anti car - the car is responsible for a significant amount of economic growth in this country. What about the growth in hybrid and electric lightweight carbon fibre cars? The fact that most have cars is indicative of how vital and useful they are to us. If you pick a fight with the car you will lose and Birmingham will fail. Businesses will look to invest elsewhere where employees can get to work.	Drop the 20mph. It takes about two hundred yards to overtake a cyclist at 20mph if they are at average speed. This causes problems with oncoming traffic. Does 20mph mean a traffic calming measure every few yards? This is unclear. If so have you calculated car wear and tear in your analysis? Embrace personal sustainable transport. Electric cars etc. Parking charges do not discriminate between electric and conventional cars.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp33	why have cars in bham at all if its a 20 mile limit that is a stupid idea 30 is fine 40 is better the trick is to keep traffic flowing and thats not helped by barmy ideas such as 20 mile limits !! keep children under control stop crossing in stupid places wear bright clothing start taking responsibility for yourself stop clogging up islands with zebra crossings and green man crossings! but drivers should be reminded that they should obey the law and not speed its education not daft 20 mile limits			Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp35	The Plan appears to view the car solely as a problem to be managed, rather than as a mode of transport that has a right to be considered alongside walking, cycling and public transport. To an extent this is understandable following the city's past experience, but not recognising the need to provide for car users would be fatal to any aspirations for Birmingham to be a global city. Thanks to developments in technology, cars in the future will be much less polluting. There are and will continue to be people who for various reasons need the flexibility to drive into the city, and the city cannot afford to be inhospitable to them. The Plan therefore needs to do more to facilitate car use, in a sustainable way.	The Plan needs to ensure that there is an improved road network and parking, although not at the cost of allowing cars to ruin the city centre core or creating gridlock. That balance is perfectly achievable. The Middleway (A4540) should be the main circular route around the city centre; through traffic within the area bounded by it should be kept to a minimum, except for the vital A38 route. The Middleway is in urgent need of upgrading. It needs ideally to be grade-separated throughout its route and traffic on it should be able to stay on it without having to go around roundabouts. This would enable traffic to move freely around the centre of the city without clogging up the roads within it. The downgrading of Moor Street Queensway has also had a detrimental effect on traffic flows. The removal of grade separation here, so that pedestrians can cross at surface level to access the Eastside, is sensible enough, but the road layout and traffic light phasing causes hold-ups, as does (more importantly) the blockage caused by the fact that St Martins Queensway is single-	Yes	Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp38	I agree entirely with the comments already posted about speed limits and being anti car., 20mph speed limit is ridiculous, you are going back to the old days when a man walked in front of a car with a red flag! College Rd in Perry Barr/Sutton used to be 40mph, you reduced it (why I dont know) to 30mph, no one takes any notice at all unless going past a speed camera. Cars going at slower speeds cause more pollution, not less. You should be working with motorists/car owners, not attacking them.		No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp65	20MPH SPEED LIMIT Is it the Council or another minority lobby group that is trying to push this 20mph limit through? It is not clear here. We should be told whose agenda this really is. The current speed limits are fine and should only be altered on particular roads where there is a problem. I thought Birmingham wanted to be a vibrant city, not a retirement village. If you want to improve our quality of life then reduce the noisey and polluting aircraft that plague us here in Erdington/Wylde Green. Seems the government wants to increase unhealthy air travel but restrict cars.	Drop the 20mph plans.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp165	There are no costs and no timetable. There is no road improvement plan to enable people to get to and from Pedimore development or adjacent residential development in Sutton, unless this is item 11. Sutton Relief road, if so provide details	Show the all the assessment carried out including, current capacity and usage together with future needs assessment together with the assumptions made and the basis for the assumptions. Then provide details of the alternative options considered together with the cost benefit analysis to support these plans. finally provide a timetable	Yes	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp190	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp387	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp828			There is insufficient information in the plan on what improvements will be made to the existing road system and what new roads will be provided where development will take place and the timescales that these would be completed within. When ever there is a major incident on the M6 the road network around Birmingham grinds to a halt. The plan should include this fact and how improvements will be made to alleviate this problem and improve things for all the residents of Birmingham.	Detail the road improvements that will be included and what benefits this will provide to the residents of Birmingham as above.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp990			Should include use of sharred space approaches where appropriate			Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1104			My concern is that by building on the Sutton Coldfield greenbelt that traffic congestion will increase dramatically. I commute to Dudley, and 10-15 minutes is added to my journey due to congestion around Walmley. I feel that there has been no consideration, in the planning, with regard to the transport infrastructure. The could be up to an additional 10,000 additional cars passing through Walmley, an area not equipt to deal with this volume of traffic. The greenbelt plans need to involve realistic consideration to expanding the transport network in this area.	Less houses built in the Walmly/ New Hall greenbelt area Increased links to the A38	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1141	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to reducing some of the negative impacts of traffic congestion by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (cleaner air, noise reduction wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity			Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp1192	Walmley village is already a bottle neck. we were refused a phased pedestrian crossing light at the Junction of wylde green road and village because of the knock on effect to traffic into the city. so producing more traffic will have the same effect. either there is already too much traffic or there is not. it seems the planners chose their observations to suit their argument.	use brown land already in th city limits rater than land on the outskirts.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1253	Ref TP37/GA5/GA6 the plan has not shown any development of high qulaity investment into the infrastructure. Plans of thousands of houses will increase congestion not reduce it. Capacity around Walmley is already insufficient and an additional 10,000 cars will only serve to cause more misery and chaos. The reopening of the Sutton Coldfield Park railway line to the public is essential and not simply desirable.	Ref TP37/GA5/GA6 Committed and guaranteed expenditure to the project on transport, rather than an add on.Railways lines to be opened and new stations built BEFORE any housing building. Infrastructure needs to be built before developments. Pollution studies need to be undertaken when there is a reduction in both green space and an increase in roads and cars - a double whammy	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1287	Traffic and congestion management, 7th & 8th bullet points"Ensuring that the planning and location of new development supports the delivery of a sustainable transport network and development agenda. The prevention or refusal of development on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."Whilst ostensibly a postive policy, this approach is undermined by the methodology used in the assessment of the plan, by the use of a variable demand model (PRISM) in which traffic demands will be modified in response to increased congestion. This establishes an approach within the council that accepts a (forced) change in existing traffic movements to accommodate new development. This will allow developers to follow this precedent and simply argue that whilst they might create congestion in the short term, the long term effect will be minimal as others are forced to accommodate them.	The methodology used to assess the plan needs to be modified to avoid the travel demands being modified (i.e. either the origin or destination of travel, rather than just the route or mode of travel) in response to imposed congestion from new developments. * * *

bp1333	You will not control road congestion without rail or tram. The developments at Langley and Peddimore will make matters much worse in that area . Where are the environmental pollution estimates?	Plan tracks and do not develop the green belt.	Yes	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1392	I have no idea whether a reduction in speed to 20 MPH would work or not, although I would like to see more traffic calming measures in the area, and would be delighted if something was done to stop cars racing through my beautiful village. I would expect that if 6,000 houses are built and a possible extra 12,000 cars hit the area, traffic will be at a standstill, so speed will not be an issue, getting to work might be though.	The traffic issue needs to be properly thought out, and considerations made regarding what will happen if another 12,000 cars try to get in and out of Walmley	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1398	The plan is not consistent with planning policy chapter 4. For example the NPPF states any transport infrastructure is about encouraging solutions “which support reductions in greenhouse emissions, congestion, provide a viable infrastructure, need to minimise travel and journey lengths, Schools to be within walking distance” The NPPF is also very clear that any local plan should “promote sustainable transport “. The proposed infrastructure plan however has too many uncertainties and does not promote sustainable transport. The connectivity plan fails to demonstrate how it will reduce congestion,capacity,greenhouse emissions or in fact there is insufficient detail that a viable infrastructure has been provided. The proposal is not consistent with BDP policy TP27 which states any new residential development "Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided". The proposal has not addressed the current issues with the existing infrastructure and there is also no real commitment to ensure the infrastructure will be in place before the new housing is provided.	A viable transport infrastructure plan to be put in place where real focus is on reducing greenhouse emissions, congestions and capacity on our roads. A plan in place which has certainty. The current proposal to be consistent with BDP policy TP27 which states any new residential development "Be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new housing is provided".One which addresses the current infrastructure issues on capacity and congestion and emissions in the local area and then consideration given to the impact the Langley SUE and Peddimore employment area will have on top of this. A plan which has secured funding to ensure the infrastructure is developed alongside the proposed Langley SUE and employment zone and not a notional time frame of 0-10 plus years (but in first two years of development).	Yes	Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp1418	The solution is not positively prepared. In fact the BCC should acknowledge that a sustainable transport network is not possible. The major roads and routes are already congested and at capacity. Any new development will but increase even more congestion and capacity, C02 emissions and carbon footprint. The plan does not strike a balance between what it is trying to achieve and what it can realistically achieve. The proposed new development should be adequately serviced by existing or new infrastructure which should be in place before the new but the plan does not states this. There are too many uncertainties to make the Langley SUE and Peddimore development sustainable.	Create a connectivity plan which strikes a balance by working with local residents and communities to understand the current issues they as road users have and realistically what can be done to improve it. Use this as a baseline to work to when considering what changes to be made.	Yes	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1500	The transport plan completely fails to address the consequences of placing 6,000 houses at Walmley. Whilst the consequences of building in the A & B areas proposed earlier and rejected would be impossibly worse still, traffic congestion and access/parking to railway stations will still put a huge strain on roads with existing under capacity.	Build on existing derelict and empty land within the existing city infrastructure where this capacity available.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1599	As I have previously pointed out, the current road system in the proposed development area is too sparse to support such a large increase in traffic. Major roads are very spread out and already extremely busy in peak times. This development is in the wrong place - too far from the centre of the city, so commuting times, expense and pollution will increase for all.	Reduce the size of the development, use existing sites closer to the city centre	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1644	With reference to GA5 and GA6, the plan does not include an integrated transport system with sustainable mode choices. The plan will increase congestion around Walmley, since there are only 2 routes through Walmley (Thimble End Road/Webster Way) and the Walmey Road through the village, the latter with speed restrictions and several traffic lights to accommodate pedestrians. Congestion is especially severe in the mornings from 7.30am to 9am. The plan would add to this - at least 6,000 extra cars from the planned 6,000 new homes and employment zone.	Pollution and traffic should be reduced not increased. One option is to open the rail line through Walmley for passenger traffic. I for one would gladly use this.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp1810					For the following reasons I believe the plan is unsound. The BDP (Para 5.55) states that there will be '...significant improvements to the local highway infrastructure and public transport services. Policy GA5 Connectivity section gives no detail as to how this will be achieved. It states that opening the Walmley railway station could improve accessibility but the financial position of the City Council eliminates any possibility of its realisation. Hence the use of the word 'could' in the documentation. If it was financially viable parking would need to be considered. existing car parks on the Cross City line do not have enough capacity for existing commuters. The planned car park extension at Four Oaks at a cost of £2 million will provide additional parking for a mere 63 vehicles! How far does this go to cater for a potential increase of 6,000+ cars. Consider the cost if this is applied, as suggested in the plan to other station car parks. The suggestion of a new junction with the A38 is again unrealistic for the same reason. The BDP needs to include the detail of their Connectivity plan and demonstrate that the transport system will be integrated, high quality, convenient and sustainable. Reference is made to 'upgrades	Provide detail, timescales and costings in the plan.	No	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp1916					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp2775	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp2794		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp3801					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp4907	Mr Gerald Kells	CPRE			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp5179					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43

bp5298	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp5423		City and Provincial Properties Plc	Mr David Smith	Turley Associates	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp5578	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp5766	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Traffic and congestions management	TP43
bp34					how about also looking at self defence and confidence building to enable the whole reclaim the streets idea walking should be safe at any time of the day or night, you could also look at cycle share provision such as northfield echo center Oh and repair the streets pot holes and improve drainage, make it a better walking environment !			Accessibility standards for new development	TP44
bp166					The 2011 census therefore shows that 64.2% of the population do have access to a car. This must be recognised and taken into account. Just assuming that everyone has the time to use public transport is wrong. Further there are no costs attached to the overall aims - is these cost viable targets. A 10/15 minute walk to a surgery takes no account of a growing elderly population that would find a 5 minute walk difficult and 15 minute walk impossible. Demonstrate how these numbers have been established,	Provide details and costs for this public transport reliant view of the future. As virtually 2/3 of the population have cars, demonstrate whether the view of the city planner s fits with the desires of the city residents. Demonstrate what work and impact assessments have been carried out as to the impact on the road networks. For example will the roads be filled with half empty buses for the majority of the day to achieve the given targets. Provide definitive information on where adults will need to get to to work, to shop for medical treatment and how that will be achieved within the aims set. Provide details of where children will be provided with school places to hit the targets. In short provide some detail	Yes	Accessibility standards for new development	TP44
bp1334					There used to be much higher levels of public transport but our short sighted forefathers reduced bus and train services and eliminated trams to allow for the future use of cars! I do not see accessibility criteria being met for green belt proposals.	Do not develp the green belt	Yes	Accessibility standards for new development	TP44

bp1417			9.59/9.60 - these targets are not realistic when you consider that the current proposed developments in the to be SUE and Peddimore employment zone have no real commitment of funding for the schools and health care facilities and only aspirational time frames of 0-10 plus years. The transport provision as it stands is not viable or sustainable with too many uncertainties. These policies are aspirational and not realistic and have not been reflected in the plans infrastructure plan for sustainable development.	A sustainable approach to the transport provision to be provided.	Yes	Accessibility standards for new development	TP44
bp2842	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Accessibility standards for new development	TP44
bp5579	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Accessibility standards for new development	TP44
bp6003	Mr Christopher Lowe	Committee member Push Bikes	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Accessibility standards for new development	TP44
bp167			A list of bland statements such as 'Unified Street Services Network that provides a seamless connection for a range of digital technologies, linking together all the street activities such as street lighting and car parking' What does this mean, why is it required and how much will it cost?	Provide details of what it is, for example how many people reading this document will know what 'Unified Street Services Network that provides a seamless connection for a range of digital technologies, linking together all the street activities such as street lighting and car parking.' means? Provide details of what it is, what it will cost, who it benefits, how it benefits and a cost benefit analysis that this is a worthy consideration for spending tax payers' money on	Yes	Digital communications	TP45

bp1302			Item 9.65 "With the emerging digital connectivity technologies, Birmingham has the opportunity to transform its street services, particularly in the areas of street lighting and off street public car parking. A Unified Street Services Network will provide the City Council with the ability to manage all its street devices in a centralized networked approach." This is all very vague. OK, so there Birmingham has an "opportunity to transform its street services" but will it actually do anything? How long has the council had to prepare the plan and all it can suggest is an unsubstantiated change in "the areas of street lighting and off street public car parking". What does this actually mean? Are street lights going to be turned off if the IT system knows there are no cars or pedestrians about, are they going to flash on and off to entertain drivers stuck in traffic jams? This demonstrates a lack of thought and rigour in coming up with a plan to be presented to the public.	Re Item 9.65 More thought should be put into what actually could be achieved. Whislt significant changes in technology might be expected up to 2031, it should be possible for the council to come up with something more concrete if it deems this worthy of inclusion in is plan. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on.	Yes	Digital communications	TP45
bp1335			Telecommunications are critical. Unfortunately current provision only responds to demand and does not create it.		No	Digital communications	TP45
bp1391			I am not sure what most of this means. I have no idea what a Unified Street Service Network is. My dread is that it might be a proliferation of unsightly mobile phone masts blasting microwave radiation at us, and dazzling over bright white lighting. I am encouraged by the mention of installing alongside utility ducting. I take this to mean underground fibre optic option, and endorse this wholeheartedly.	I would like the plan to emphasise that installations go underground, by way of fibre optic.	No	Digital communications	TP45
bp5580	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Digital communications	TP45
bp5637			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Digital communications	TP45

bp168	lots of bodies, lots of funding opportunity but no detail of what the costs, might be, what the city might be eligible in terms of funding and what it can now afford and what it might be able to afford in the future	Provide some details of costs, which funds might be applicable, how and why. What the city can afford in terms of both managing this process and repayment of any loans. The city is currently close to being insolvent and will need to sell off significant assets to meet its current obligations. Will developers and investors want to invest in the city and how much. Demonstrate that the aims of the city as outlined in this ultra high level concept document, are financially feasible and will not frighten investors and developers away by being financially unrealistic. Also provide the basis on which the inability to fund projects will be identified prior to starting and will result in plans being withdrawn and resubmitted. For example if the transport, schooling, medical, infrastructure targets, as specified in this document, cannot be demonstrated to be clearly in place prior to commencing the extremely large housing development proposed in Sutton it will be withdrawn until such provisions can be demonstrated to be available	Yes	Implementation
bp320	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp362	10.16 did you mean actors? surely partners would be a better word	explain further what you mean!	No	Implementation

bp600			Prior to making my response to this consultation, I made a number of Freedom of Information requests to neighbouring authorities asking them for copies "of any formal correspondence you have received from Birmingham City Council in pursuit of discharging the duty to co-operate required by the National Planning Policy Framework". The replies I received indicated that, whilst there have been some high level discussions, there have been no formal proposals and no agreements reached to discharge the duty. I also submitted a Freedom of Information request to Birmingham City Council asking them for "a copy of any agreement reached through the West Midlands Joint Committee, the Local Enterprise Partnership or the West Midlands Planning Officers Group in pursuit of discharging the duty to co-operate required by the national planning policy framework". After an initial response suggesting that the council was "unable to locate the information requested", I received a subsequent and more detailed response stating that, since the information was still draft, the council was relying on exemptions within the FoI legislation to withhold the information. These responses	The plan should not be submitted until proper agreements have been reached with neighbouring authorities to ensure a joint approach is taken to meeting Birmingham's housing needs and avoiding the need to develop on the green belt. Until such agreements are in place the plan cannot be considered sound.	Yes	Implementation
bp991			The emphais on inward investment and the lack of mention for suporting localy funded development and maximising the return to the local economy and its resilaince through retension of local ownership is unbalanced	equal emphasis on suporting locla investment and ownership	Yes	Implementation
bp1143	Mr Simon West	Forestry Commission	Welcome the contribution that trees and woods (the Birmingham Forest) can make to making Birmingham an enterprising, innovative and green city, by delivering economically active and investment attractive landscapes that contribute low carbon products and services, (wood for fuel and construction, carbon sequestration, reducing heat island effect) enhancing quality of life (social cohesion, physical and emotional well-being) whilst supporting biodiversity. Adequate provision for protection, creation and maintenance of green infrastructure including trees and woods is required.			Implementation

bp1206	I need to express my concerns about the BDP. It has been a very difficult document to manage and comment on . it seems almost as if it has been designed to result in people giving up on the consultation process. I know this is not the correct section to drop this comment in but I had to register my thoughts somewhere.		No	Implementation
bp1217	This document has not been easy to respond to. Working residents would not have the same amount of time that I have. It has been time consuming and the site has been difficult to work with. I feel sure the plan could have been presented in a more direct and simple way making it more accessible for all.		No	Implementation
bp1284	The council has failed to provide information on the costs involved in implementing the various proposals. It is therefore not possible to determine whether the plan is actually achievable or whether ambition outweighs reality. Instead it is a case of vague hopes of affordability matched with vague hopes of money from outside sources. The credibilty of the plan is therefore undermined.	A proper costing of the plan should be undertaken to examine whether it is actually possible to implement. * * *

bp1596	The localism act was intended to “Reform to make the planning system clearer, more democratic and more effective “. The plan “Birmingham Development plan 2031” does not demonstrate these principles. The plan disadvantages a community in being able to interpret the information presented based on the volume of 70 evidence documents, 13 supporting documents and a plan which is 213 pages long. It is also noted that documents are being uploaded to the evidence base “after” consultation start. It is unclear how the BCC have given members of the public enough influence over the decisions of the plan. It is unclear how the BCC have adhered to this act and opened up the planning system to the local community with Birmingham. It is unclear how effective they have been in making the process more democratic and more effective.	A plan created that adheres to not just the planning policy but also the localism act. A plan that includes the local community and that is the result of a collective enterprise	Yes	Implementation
bp1607	Before any plan is signed or implementation guidelines set, BCC should consider first that the National Planning Policy Framework states that it is replacing “over a thousand pages of national policy with around fifty, written simply and clearly, we are allowing people and communities back into planning” “In part, people have been put off from getting involved because planning policy itself has become so elaborate and forbidding – the preserve of specialists, rather than people in communities”. The planning policy is very clear. What is also clear however is that the Birmingham city council is not following best practice and translating this at local level. The residents of Birmingham are faced a consultation which includes 70 evidence documents, 13 supporting documents and a plan which is 213 pages long. It is also noted that documents are being uploaded to the evidence base “after” consultation start. The city council are not allowing people and communities back into planning. Planning remains the preserve of specialists here in Birmingham. The plan created by the Birmingham city council has disenfranchised a community in being able to comment and be consulted. The plan in its	A plan created which adheres to the principals of the planning framework. A plan created which is not the preserve of specialists but one where the people and communities are included in the planning process. A plan and consultation presented to the local community which is not elaborate and forbidding and one that has been developed as a " collective enterprise".	Yes	Implementation

bp1655			I have concerns that regardless of the councils apparent aspirations they will have difficulty delivering on these as owing to succesive budget cuts over the years, the council does not have the resources to oversee things properly. A clear example of this is the implementation of a Toucan Crossing on Walmley Road: this had input from a (limited) public consultation and even having addressed specific questions on the safety of the site, shortly after it was put into action the adjacent Bus Stop had to be closed for safety reasons. After raising questions about what was to happen in mid November 2013 I was assured that action would be taken to relocate the the bus stop in a matter of weeks. Two and a half months later the bus stop remains where it is and is still out of action. A bus will occaisionally drop passengers at the stop despite the signs saying it is closed for safety reasons, and so remains a specific risk to people's safety (and the potential risk of a corporate mansalughter charge if someone was killed). This clearly demonstrates that the council already has difficulties actually undertaking relatively simple infrastructure changes. Its ability to undertake more widespread and demanding	The council needs to take a more roubst approach to the implementation (and planning) of its new policies and plans.More explicit policies need to be put into place to ensure adequate funding and adequate staffing is in place when planning and implementing changes to the city's infrastructure, and hence the council must make maximum opportuity of obtaining financial input from private sources (whilst maintaining maximum independence from developers and such like). The council also needs to take account of the views of the public and not just assume that the council knows best simply because it is the council. * * *

bp5299	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Implementation
bp5406	Chris Crean	Friends of the Earth			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp5581	Julien Pritchard	Campaigns Support Worker Friends of the Earth Birmingham			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp5699					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp5776	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp5811	Christine Cushing	Chair Birmingham Civic Society			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp5841		c/o Tyler Parkes (Police & Crime Commissioner for WM)	Winkler	Tyler Parkes Partnership	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Implementation
bp15					There are too many quantity measures and not enough quality. As they stand these measures create a significant moral hazard. For example a houses completed measure just means more poor houses.	Measures to indicate area attractiveness 1. Home/land value 2. Residence happiness Quality of life 1. Educational attainment 2. Crime Employment 1. Productivity 2. Earnings 3. Occupation types		Monitoring
bp24					i agree with bp15 cooments. measure should be more stretching most of these arent at all strectching. They merely reflect whats happened..that cannot be a good thing surely. if you are purely monitoring them then on the same page list the targets then all citizens can see how the council is performing.these figures should then be published annually. also have concerns on tp9, tp 10 ,tp 14 tp 24 TP10 the green belt around the city is key to a green and pleasent city.who wants to live in an urban sprawl that reaches from telford to stafford to coventry to redditch. Green belt is key and must be protected and if some of it cannot besaved then building must be sensitive to green corridors, city seperation and parks.	tp9 increase in the number of "friends groups" in the city yr on yr. number of new parks/allotments etc created must be at least 2x the acreage of those parks etc lost to development. monitor and report numbers of residents using parks etc annually. link data to city child obesity targets. TP10 the green belt around the city is key to a green and pleasent city TP11 Capital spend on sports facilties to be increased yr on yr. Everything from olympic pool to cycling velodrome etc. links in well with obesity and happy fit citizens tp13 A very weak measure...how about % recycle from resident waste to increase yr on yr target ..75% by 2025 overall waste levels/citizen colected to decrease 30% tp24 shouldnt the number of tourists coming to the city be a measure too....it should increase of course yr on yr.		Monitoring

bp169	In terms of monitoring anything it would be normal business practice to specify how measurement will be made, a clear definition of each KPI, current performance, future state performance expected/required. Do these exist in any of the documents referenced?	Against each policy number specify, the exact definition of the measure and how data is collected and assessed, the current performance and the future state performance. so for example in TP43. how will current journey time be assessed - for different transport types and destinations, what constitutes a road injury - hospital visit, ambulance required, life threatening, limb breakage, etc. In TP 44 I understood form the specification of requirements all i.e. 100% of new major developments would meet specified accessibility standards before they could process. Define the financial penalties for non achievement of requirements	Yes	Monitoring
bp664	MONITOR, MONITOR MONITOR..... Need I say more. I am afraid I don't buy any of this, what about existing infrastructure... especially Sutton Coldfiled's infrastructure which is currently at breaking point. There isn't enough money available for the council to afford to monitor all of the above properly and effectively. BCC are finding jobs for themselves in this list.	Monitor the amount of low emission vehicles actually using the new electric hook ups in Sutton Coldfield. at what cost were these two points put in? are they generating any financial revenue for the council, have they paid for themselves? Monitor the lack of pedestrian crossings around Sutton Coldfield and the fact you haven't enough money to provide a decent crossing at the busiest set of traffic lights. Victoria Road, Coleshill street, Upper Holland Road and Coleshill Road.	No	Monitoring

bp992			Most of thes monitoring crieteria are about showing wether or nor exisitng policeis are being pursued not wether these policeis achieve any worthwhile outcomes. the whole section needs a drastic rethink	PG 2 drop unless there are balancing indicators that emphsise benefits to local people, what people who actualy live and work in the city think of it. PG 1 add in jobs lost in relation to developments. PG3 says it all no indicators as to wether an atractive palce is being made - Need surveys of peoples views of cahnges and aspirations as to where they wish to live in and outside of Birmingham TP 3 BES is just one scheme for improving energy effecincy far too narrow a base. Almost all the indicatoirs need to include some indicator of quality getting quality that people who live / work or who might live/work in Birmingham is crucial and almost totaly lacking building lots of poor quality damaging developemnts that underminde the furture of Birmingham would show as succes on these indicators	Yes	Monitoring
bp1338			It is important to measure progress but that is not an objective, just a tool.		No	Monitoring
bp1401			More detail is required on how the policies will be measured,by whom and when.	As above.	Yes	Monitoring
bp5408	Chris Crean	Friends of the Earth	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Monitoring
bp5778	Rohan Torkildsen	English Heritage	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Monitoring

bp9	Mrs Michele Nickolds	Sutton Coldfield Rural	No the City Council has not complied with the duty to co-operate in preparing the Plan.	The "duty to cooperate" legal test (S33A) is about the process which requires neighbouring local authorities to align their plans when development strategies, e.g. transport or housing, spill across their legal boundaries. This “duty to cooperate” has two components; firstly to talk to neighbouring authorities, a.k.a. “engage constructively and actively on ongoing basis”; and secondly to deliver the goods where a cross-boundary development need have been identified. The second test is more problematic. Birmingham has determined that around half of its housing need has to be met by relying on land beyond its boundaries i.e. in neighbouring authorities. For Birmingham’s Plan to be “sound” it must be “positively prepared” i.e. it must show how it is going to meet its housing needs, including cross-boundary allocations if necessary. A joint study to look into this is currently being done under the auspices of the Greater Birmingham & Sollihul Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP). Residents of Birmingham should have access to this study when commenting on the draft plan. It appears unreasonable	No	Duty to co-operate
bp75			Absolutely not.	The outcome of work with other authorities has not been completed therefore BCC have developed this plan with partial information; this is not acceptable when they are proposing to build on the greenbelt.		Duty to co-operate
bp81	Mr Keith Pringle	Management Consultant Jakema Programme Management Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate

bp99			no, it has denied people the abilty to make comments regarding building on the green belt, by only allowing one comment per computer , by setting as the IP address on lt, therefore people could only make one comment on a PC either in their home or if at a library only the first person could use it, this 'fault' made the consultation period invalid, and when the planning accepted they had made the mistake, they refused to allow more time or reset the consultation, therefore the full and proper time was not allowed	The "duty to cooperate" legal test (S33A) is about the process which requires neighbouring local authorities to align their plans when development strategies, e.g. transport or housing, spill across their legal boundaries. This “duty to cooperate” has two components; firstly to talk to neighbouring authorities, a.k.a. “engage constructively and actively on ongoing basis”; and secondly to deliver the goods where a cross-boundary development need have been identified. The second test is more problematic. Birmingham has determined that around half of its housing need has to be met by relying on land beyond its boundaries i.e. in neighbouring authorities. For Birmingham’s Plan to be “sound” it must be “positively prepared” i.e. it must show how it is going to meet its housing needs, including cross-boundary allocations if necessary. A joint study to look into this is currently being done under the auspices of the Greater Birmingham & Sollihul Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP). Residents of Birmingham should have access to this study when commenting on the draft plan. It appears unreasonable		Duty to co-operate
bp170			As there is no information on how the City Council has developed its plans and considered the cost, benefit to existing residents of the options it has considered, it is difficult to say definitively whether or not the council has complied with the requirements. The absence of such critical detail in this document has to lead me to assume that such consultation has taken place	There is absolutely no detail on what options have been considered, for example on the ring fencing of current unused offices and industrial sites. What assessment has been made on future needs, how have these been calculated and on what assumptions and how these might be made using the existing and significant unused brownfield sites in Sandwell and that area referred to as 'The Black Country'. If there is in fact an unproven level of ring fenced industrial land. How will the council review this prior to building on green belt land	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp176	Mrs Marie Pringle	Sales Controller McCurrach UK Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp179			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp184			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp194			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp196			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp218			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate

bp254			Absolutely not. It has gone ahead with this plan without consulting with Residents groups and the community as a whole.	The "duty to cooperate" legal test (S33A) is about neighbouring local authorities joining plans and strategies to create a seamless approach to important issues such as transport or housing. Their “duty to cooperate” involves talking to each other, and working towards a common aim, which is beneficial to both authorities and their communities. Birmingham has embarked on a joint study with Solihull. Residents have not been given access to material and discussions which took place between the two authorities.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp312	Cllr Phillip Parkin	Birmingham City Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp316			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp318			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp323			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp352			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp356			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp359			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp375			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp382			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp425			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp429			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp498			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate

bp588	No.	This plan has taken a specific ideological approach towards sustainability requirements within the city which in the main incorporates a growth agenda. As far as I am aware no alternatives to this approach have been consulted upon nor does the Sustainability Appraisal indicate that alternative approaches were considered. For example there are alternatives such as an 'utility agenda', a 'de-growth agenda' or a 'steady-state agenda'. Similarly BCC has taken upon itself to write into this plan the promotion and expansion of human development over and above the interests of non-humans without any authority to do so other than being in office. Obviously simply being in office does not satisfy the requirements of the duty to do-operate as stated in the Localism Act and as such this plan is an illegal document. Again, on a more democratic and socially sustainable note, the plan contains assumptions that Birmingham residents have chosen population growth. There is no evidence that BCC has consulted with Birmingham residents regarding whether expansion is something the people of	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp601	No - the City Council has not complied with the duty to co-operate in preparing the plan.	Prior to making my response to this consultation, I made a number of Freedom of Information requests to neighbouring authorities asking them for copies "of any formal correspondence you have received from Birmingham City Council in pursuit of discharging the duty to co-operate required by the National Planning Policy Framework". The replies I received indicated that, whilst there have been some high level discussions, there have been no formal proposals and no agreements reached to discharge the duty. I also submitted a Freedom of Information request to Birmingham City Council asking them for "a copy of any agreement reached through the West Midlands Joint Committee, the Local Enterprise Partnership or the West Midlands Planning Officers Group in pursuit of discharging the duty to co-operate required by the national planning policy framework". After an initial response suggesting that the council was "unable to locate the information requested", I received a subsequent and more detailed response stating that, since the information was still draft, the council	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp614	Re GA5,GA6: The plan goes against Core Planning Principles within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states, "Promote the development & diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses". The plan is not sustainable as it goes against the ability of future generations to meet their own needs in terms of food production (an increasingly big issue) if productive farmland is replaces by housing or industrial development. This will directly affect the amount of food the UK can produce. BCC has repeatedly used the excuse for changing the land use that the farmland is Grade 3 but tGrade 3 is 'average' not 'poor'.	Birmingham has only 15% Green Belt land and most of it in Walmley is farmland. In order to maintain sustainability in terms of food production and food miles, farmland should be removed from the development plan. BCC's plan to develop Green Belt land cannot be justified when the Sustainability Appraisal states that there is uncertainty over where a large proportion of Birmingham's housing need is to be located.	No	Duty to co-operate

bp617	No - they have failed to correctly assess the impact on Sutton Coldfield by building on Green Belt land.	I think they had a pre-conceived idea and were determined to build on the Green Belt irrespective of views of the people or the better options available. Have ready most of the comments by people far better placed than me to judge it would seem that my presumption was correct. The City Council has a long way to go to convince the people that this is the best plan.	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp621	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp627	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp645	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp648	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp652	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp663	No, I don't, the Council and their Legal departments are very very slippery and try to jump through all the loops and hoops they can find to get what they want. Sorry Birmingham City Council, I don't trust you at all. This is not the first time they have tried pushing planning through in Sutton Coldfield without taking the right routes. Take a look at the money wasted on trying to increase the intake at a local school on Whitehouse Common, very ill thought through and the community stuck together to find that there were an awful lot of tricks pulled. What a waste of time and money.	I don't trust the Council, they will find every trick in the book, baffle and twist and screw anyone to get what they want.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp691	no	There was an opposition from the people for any development , however we are being given anothe options for modifying the grpwth which we did not ask for . So please refrain form using the green belt in sutton coldfield	No	Duty to co-operate
bp696	No	I am not convinced that BCC has consulted with local educators, health care providers or local people when preparing the plan to build on Sutton Coldfield green belt land. The plan has been pushed forward despite overestimated and outdated figures and statistics, when the Government has clearly stated that green belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances	No	Duty to co-operate
bp730	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp762	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate

bp780			No I do not. I have not heard or seen of any evidence that the council has consulted with the local communities or agencies in any way shape or form.	Where is the evidence? Where have public meetings been held? Where is response or contribution from Good Hope Hospital, local residents associations, local schools?	No	Duty to co-operate
bp781	Mr Philip G Sharpe	Planning Officer The Inland Waterways Association (Lichfield Branch)	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp818	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	It is hard to answer this question as regards co-operating with neighbouring local authorities. As regards public bodies, there seems to have been a lack of consultation on present infrastructure capacity and on future capacity to meet the presumed population growth.	The council has provided amongst its supporting evidence a list of contacts with other local authorities but this does not tell the general public much beyond dates and venues of meetings. It is not clear what was discussed or how far any positive outcomes have resulted (although it is interesting to note that Coventry has disagreed with Birmingham's projected population figures). At the outset of consultation on the BDP, when challenged on the fact that there had been no consultation with our District General Hospital regarding capacity, the reply was that such matters would be discussed later in the process. Now we are at the Pre-Submission stage there is still a concern that the Plan will go ahead without a clear knowledge of infrastructure present capacity and future needs. We hope that the very genuine concerns expressed by some many respondents to this consultation will be heeded.	No	Duty to co-operate

bp819	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	It is difficult to comment on the duty to co-operate with other local authorities, for the reasons given below. There does seem to have been a lack of consultation with other public bodies.	The city has produced a list of meetings with other LAs but as this consists largely of dates and places and very little about what was discussed, or what has developed as a result, the public cannot be sure about the level of "co-operation" (although it is interesting to note that Coventry has disputed Birmingham's figures on the level of housing need). At the start of the public consultation process, when Planning officers challenged to explain why no one had consulted the authorities at our District General Hospital about its existing and future capacity, we were told that such consultation would take place further into the process. We are now at the Pre-submission stage and still frankly none the wiser. Have the Education Authority and the local health service providers been consulted, for instance? In addition to their local commitments, Good Hope Hospital provides some services to residents of Derby, Tamworth and Burton on Trent. Birmingham Education Authority has links with Solihull concerning pupil placements. As regards Community Involvement we consider that the public consultation	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp837			Re:-GA5/GA6 No!!!!!	I would like to know how BCC has worked with the local communities in the creation of this plan. I would also like more information/evidence of the feedback from the community, what they wished for on the residential environment and facilities and where these are included in the plan.	No	Duty to co-operate

bp961			The National Planning Policy Framework states that Birmingham should engage with surrounding partners to provide a holistic sustainable growth plan. There is no evidence that this has happened, for example where is the history of the recorded dialogue between Litchfield and Birmingham. Not only is it contra to the NPPF it is not in the spirit of encouraging diverse areas of social, economic and environmental growth. Birmingham has effectively taken the opportunity for other areas to attract inward investment. The NPPL clearly states that this is national coordinated effort with all parties and partners adjacent to Birmingham City Council working together to provide networked and integrated strategic growth plan.	The problem with the Birmingham Plan 2031 is that it does not take any account or coordination of surrounding areas that need growth and inward investment. It must re-set the overall objectives and plan a strategy to encourage and support for all of the midlands, In other words it cannot act in selfish isolation and starve other needs areas of investment and growth.		Duty to co-operate
bp972	Miss Patricia Harrision	Executive Officer Wythall Parish Council	Yes but consider that it is essential that Wythall Parish Council be consulted at an early stage if any new homes are to be built in the Green Belt.	As already stated in our comments to Q05, Birmingham City Council should identify and develop sites within its boundaries before expanding into the Green Belt of Wythall. We would not accept homes for Birmingham in Wythall whilst vacant sites exist and empty flats, such as those above the Aldi supermarket at the Maypole, remain unoccupied many years after their construction. Wythall Parish Council must be consulted at an early stage if any new homes are to be built in the Green Belt.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1019			No	No agreement has been reached regarding securing provision with adjacent LPAs for accommodating objectively assessed needs	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp1076			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp1170			No. Clearly not, if they had they would have tried to bring the 72,000 empty homes in the Midlands back into use first and formost. http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg	They have not spoken to neighbouring LA's about bringing Empty Homes into use.	No	Duty to co-operate

bp1221	No. There is very little detail on the amount and quality of discussions with regional Local Authorities, other than a list of dates and initial comments. There are no details of any pursuance of dialogue to come to agreement with the other Authorities. The Black Country Authorities have indicated, according to the supporting documents, to consider accommodating 3,100 houses. There is no information on whether this offer has been accepted and if so has that number been subtracted from the total number of houses being proposed. The GBSLEP has commissioned a Strategic Housing Needs Strategy, due to be completed in February 2014. There is no reference to the weight the City Council will give to the results of the Strategy. There is no evidence that the Council has carried out its Duty To Co-operate as outline in national planning policy.	Lack of detail	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1274	No.	The plan is badly presented and difficult to follow, therby limiting the ability of the public to properly understand and scrutinise the propoals. Statements are made in the text of the plan that would supposedly support the council's assertions but there is no way of confirming if these statements are actually true. Although the council has a page on its website for "documents which form the 'evidence base' for the BDP and links to other associated documents referred to in the plan." there is no cross referencing within the plan to the information in these documents. Therefore it is not possible to directly check if a statement made in the plan is based upon information dealt with in the supporting information. Instead reader would have to wade through a large quantity of reporting to track down individual items, in order to consider if there is supporting information and whether this is relevant and correct. There are a number of methods of providing references, and with current word processing software it is easy to add footnotes and cross references. Instead this is entirely missing. This is therefore a	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp1339	I see no evidence of working with adjacent authorities in the plan submitted	Lack of data and no mention in Warwickshire of nearby developments	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp1394	No. Even though the BCC might have done some work with other authorities, the BCC have not engaged "constructively, actively and on an on-going basis" to a sufficiently advanced degree to make the plan mature enough for examination.	The BCC local authority has not ignored the requirement to cooperate.A duty to cooperate statement has been prepared. However, as this process is acknowledged in the SA to be incomplete and inconclusive, in such circumstances, the plan is unsound and in a form unsuitable for examination as it does not consider all viable alternatives, and an advanced Green Belt allocation is pre-emptive, presumptive and premature.	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp1476	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes engagement with adjacent/surrounding Authorities and partners in order to explore alternatives before the use of Green Belt development is considered. The draft plan is deficient in explaining/providing sufficent evidence to show that this has been carried out a) At all or b) to an adequate level.	Birmingham City Council Planning Department should engage and consult with adjacent/surrounding Authorities and partners in order to explore alternatives before the use of Green Belt development is considered.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1547	I think that the circumstances in Birmingham are not 'exceptional' so do not warrant building on Green Belt land.	See above	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1569	No. I have found out about what is going to happen through local community/campaign groups. I think the Council should have sent information to all residents in Sutton Coldfield about what is happening with the use of green belt and this should have been done before anything was agreed with property developers. The process of submitting comments is also extemely involved and has put many people off - particularly those who are not confident with computers. Accessing paper copies of proposals/plans and comment forms has not been transparent.		No	Duty to co-operate
bp1581	No. How was this consultation done, with whom and when? Local residents and services do not seem to have been consulted. If any were how has the feedback been incorporated into the plan? Have Local Education Authority, NHS commissioners, Hospital Trusts,Community Services, Local General Medical Practitioners, ambulance services, Police and Fire services, Water and Sewerage services? How are all the increases in service provision to be funded - developers wont pay staff wages>	Large housing developments like the Langley site will need an infra structure which will have considerable financial impact on local service provision, and should not be considered until these services have agreed to the necessay increase in provision.	No	Duty to co-operate

bp1604	A duty to cooperate statement has been prepared. However, the SA states it is incomplete and inconclusive and detail missing. The plan is therefore unsound. It does not consider all viable alternatives. An advanced Green Belt allocation is pre-emptive, presumptive and premature.	Green belt land removed from the plan.	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp1606	No it has not	Walmley Residents Association confirmed that it had not been contacted by the council in regard to this development, despite the council claiming it had.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1627	No I do not.	I am not convinced that BCC has consulted with local schools, health care services or the community when preparing the plan to build on Sutton Coldfield green belt land. The Government has clearly stated that green belt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances - this is not an exceptional circumstance - there are many brown field plots available. It appears that the plan has been pushed forward despite overestimated and outdated figures and statistics with little consideration to the environment or the communities involved.		Duty to co-operate
bp1658	No I do not.	Where is the evidence of how community feedback (on desired facilities, infrastructure upgrades, etc.) has been taken into account/included in the Plan? I would like to see more detail on how community feedback has been used.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1667	I do not believe the Duty to Cooperate has been pursued vigorously and energetically enough, particularly to search for green land development opportunities that would create a preferable alternative to the Green Belt developments proposed in the Birmingham Plan, especially those in Sutton Coldfield Garden cities and new town developments beyond the administrative boundary of Birmingham would be more sustainable and ecologically preferable to the breaching of the Green Belt. The NPPF highlights the requirement for these avenues to be exhausted before Green Belt development is proposed and more needs to be done to develop these alternative options.	Not enough evidence of a positive result from applying the Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities to secure the above.	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp1693	5.5, GA5 No	Neighbouring Local Authorities have not been consulted, despite this being a significant feature of BCC's plan in regard to the building of additional homes. The local community of Sutton Coldfield has not been fully and inclusively consulted, including local residents, religious groups and resident associations for instance. The results of any consultation with Sutton Coldfield's health care provision have not been made public, so I cannot answer as to whether local health care services such as Good Hope hospital have been consulted in regard to the building of 6,000 new homes and additional residents, which would impact upon their service delivery. This needs to form part of the plan.	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp1743	The whole plan is so cumbersome to read through and not very user friendly on which to make comments. I do not think the council have been open or transparent through much of this consultation and little has been undertaken city wide to promote the plan and request comments. I live to the North and as you can imagine am well aware of the issues being faced. My colleagues - many of which are to the south of the city - have little or no awareness of the plan. How can all of this be open and transparent? Much more could have been promoted through social media, TV and radio broadcasting, local newspapers, mail shots publicising the consultation - but on this has not happened given that it is such a huge thing for Birmingham to have to go through.	unfortunately, I have no faith in the powers that be. Despite spending 4 hours of my time commenting on this I do wonder id it will make any difference at all.	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1754	No.	There has been zero evidence of Birmingham City Council consulting with the local communities. In addition, despite meeting dates and venues, there is zero evidence of Birmingham City Council meeting with other Local Authorities to discuss the plans. There has been no evidence of meetings with Good Hope Hospital or other Health facilities, the education authorities or any other relevant parties. We have seen no evidence that this legally required action has taken place.	No	Duty to co-operate

bp1811	Mr Maurice Barlow	Solihull MBC			The Council is content that the City Council has met the Duty to Cooperate as far as Solihull is concerned	The City Council has already informed the Council of the likely shortfall in housing land supply through joint working for the GBSLEP and Metropolitan Authorities areas in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. Discussions have also been held bilaterally with City Council officers. As a result, the Solihull Local Plan, which the Council adopted in December 2013, makes clear that the outcome of the Strategic Housing Needs work and the growth strategy for the GBSLEP area will provide a high level context for reassessing the Solihull Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment. In the event that further housing provision is needed in Solihull, the Local Plan indicates that a review of the green belt in relevant locations may be required, and that a review of the Local Plan will be brought forward to address the housing need	No	Duty to co-operate
bp1819		Consortium of West Midlands Developers and Land Owners	Mr John Pearce	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	No	Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 amended the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to introduce a “Duty to Co-operate” for local planning authorities in terms of the preparation of a development plan document as far as it relates to a strategic matter, which came into force in November 2011. Subsequently, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework, which reinforces the Duty to Co-operate and requires local planning authorities to work collaboratively to ensure strategic priorities across administrative boundaries are properly co-ordinated and reflected in development plan documents. Due to the significant shortfall in the supply of housing sites within Birmingham City to meet the level of housing that the Council are planning for, there is a clear and pressing need for the City Council to work collaboratively with its adjoining neighbours and other authorities in the HMA. To this effect, the Council have published a “Duty to Co-operate Statement” (October 2013), which sets out how they have approached this matter in relation to the production of	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp1920					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate

bp1975			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2069			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2100			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2149			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2155			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2173			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2207			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2210			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2213			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2273			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2300			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2320			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2362	MR MIKE DUNPHY	STRATEGIC PLANNING MANAGER BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2411	Stacey Green	Development Plans Officer Redditch Borough Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2428	Mr Nick Corbett	Director Transforming Cities Ltd.	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2438			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2478			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2503			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp2584			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2596			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2627			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2646			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2660			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2702	Clare Eggington	Principal Development Plans Officer Lichfield District Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2713			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2716			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2723			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2730			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2733			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2776	Mr Steve Maxey	Assistant Chief Executive North Warwickshire Borough Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp2778		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2858					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2874					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2889					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2913					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2916					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2956					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2964					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp2968					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp2989					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp2994					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3009					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3010					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3016					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3029					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3033	Mr Paul Sheehan	Cheif Executive Walsall MBC ABCA Association of Black Country Authorities			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3072					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3082					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3093					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3105					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3111	Mr Peter Thornley	Church Warden St John the Evangelist C of E Walmley			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp3148					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3165					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3191					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3205					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3218					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3231					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3238					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3261					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp3289					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3299					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3301					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3333					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3344					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3356					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3362	Mr Ray Harris	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp3418					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3452					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate

bp3465					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3474					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3478	Susan Green	Planning Manager - Local Plans Home Builders Federation			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3490					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp3509					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3515					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3534					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3594					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3610					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3619					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3675					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3722					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3765					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3770					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3803					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp3818		Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3820		Birmingham Properties Group	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3832					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp3885	Tracy Darke	Chair Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Association of Planning Officers			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4115					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4127					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4156					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4159					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4163					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4171					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4176					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4181					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4186					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4191					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4196					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4201					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4206					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4211					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4216					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4221					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4227					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4232					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4242					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4247					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate

bp4333	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4383	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4396	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4406	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4418	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4445	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4457	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4464	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4479	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4489	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4496	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4497	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4503	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4507	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4515	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4520	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4541	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4552	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4558	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4563	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4629	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4647	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4677	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4690	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4697	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4703	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4713	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4725	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4767	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4770	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4776	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4779	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4829	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4833	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4851	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4905	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4917	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4964	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp4972	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp4980	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5022	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5057	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5068	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5096	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5110	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5139	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5144	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5151	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5165	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5173	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5180	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5192	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate

bp5218					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5222	Mr Paul Bayliss	Project Manager South Worcestershire Councils			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5238					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5256					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5263					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5281					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5300	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5316	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5326		Rubery Holdings Ltd	Mr Nigel Gough	Director - Town Planning and Development Department CP Bigwood	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5329		BDW Trading Limited	Mr Stephen Stoney	Technical Director Wardell Armstrong LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5359					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5395		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5398					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5420	Mr Mark Andrews	Acting Planning Policy Manager COVENTRY CITY COUNCIL			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5431	Rev Steven Doel	Reverend St John's Church			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5459					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5464					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5472					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5485					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5494					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5500		North Worcestershire Golf Club & Bloor Homes	Mr Simon Hawley	Senior Planner Harris Lamb Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5567					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5573	Paul Campbell	Director Richborough Estates Ltd	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5586		Dickens Heath Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp5592		Cheswick Green Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5606		Gallagher Estates & Miller Homes	Chris May	Director Pegasus Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5641					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5661		West Midlands Harp Planning Consortium	Mr Christopher Burton	Tetlow King Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5665					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5680					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5689		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5702		Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin	Partner Deloitte LLP	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5711					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5713	Mr Malcolm Ratcliff	Senior Planning Advisor Mineral Products Association			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5725					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5739					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5744					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5752					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5847		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5853					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5863					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5877					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5882					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5883	Mr Mark Parkinson	Economic Development and Planning Policy Manager Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5891	Mr Nick Dawson	Connectivity Manager Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5901	Councillor Caroline Wood	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp5929	Councillor David Smith	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5937					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5944					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Duty to co-operate
bp5948	Councillor Janet Eagland	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5956	C Jeff Sheriff	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5958	Mr Matthew Griffin	Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy) Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5966	Councillor Martyn Tittley	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5972	Councillor Susan Woodward	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5978	Councillor Terry Finn	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate
bp5983					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5986					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp5988					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Duty to co-operate
bp6014	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Duty to co-operate

bp10	Mrs Michele Nickolds	Sutton Coldfield Rural			No the plan is not legally compliant.	Birmingham City Council must show that the plan is “justified” i.e. the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives. This is normally done by preparing a Sustainability Appraisal to assess the Council’s preferred strategy against reasonable alternatives. The public must be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions. To this end the Sustainability Appraisal contains a brief non-technical summary which is all the public should need to look at. The Sustainability Appraisal prepared by Birmingham City Council is nowhere near ready because the Plan is incomplete – as it is silent on how cross-boundary housing needs will be met - the public have been left in the dark as to what the reasonable alternatives are and why the preferred strategy has been chosen. UK law says that Birmingham City Council cannot adopt the development plan unless it has an adequate environmental report i.e. Sustainability Appraisal. The logical order of work should be (a) complete the GBSLEP housing study and propose various development	No	Legal Compliance
bp60					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp76					I am not sure .	I would have thought that the fact that the proposal does not address the 'objectively assessed requirement' in that it only accounts for 61% of the defined housing need would mean that it is not legally compliant. I would also think that the lack of any meaningful communication with the residents, businesses or organisations of Sutton Coldfield to advise them of the proposals would render it non-compliant.		Legal Compliance
bp82	Mr Keith Pringle	Management Consultant Jakema Programme Management Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp111		KFC (GB) Limited	Mr Steve Simms	Director SSA Planning Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance

bp171			No. The use of Green belt land should only be considered after all other options have been eliminated. this has not been achieved.	The decision by the council as to what land will be reserved for industrial and office use and the future needs for these uses is not defined or proved. The ability of the council to achieve its aims in a cost effective manner is not proved, for apart from any other consideration there are no costings in this document. The consideration of the needs and aspirations of current residents has not been directly established. The future 'needs' of residents appear to have been decided without consultation by the council. This, I would suggest, is unconstitutional and therefore not legal. The level of response to this over lengthy document will result in a very small percentage of the population responding and is therefore not a mandate for the council to act	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp177	Mrs Marie Pringle	Sales Controller McCurrach UK Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp191			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp201			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp219			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp322			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp353			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp357			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp390	Cllr Phillip Parkin	Birmingham City Council	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp394			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp619			I would like to know how BCC has engaged with or created a shared vision with the local community in drawing up this plan. I read the local newspaper, visit the local library each week and I cannot recall seeing anything that asked me for my views on this plan. I found this consultation process difficult to engage with. It is too big, perhaps it should have been broken down into separate plans for each area of Birmingham. I have spoken to many people who said they had no idea how to comment or object, many were not happy using computers or email and did not know where to get forms from. It has taken me 3 hours to complete this. It requires a lot of commitment, many people would have given up.	I have not seen in the plan any evidence of the feedback given by communities on the residential environment and facilities they asked to be provided or what their feelings were about largescale housing developments or large scale industrial developments. The plan is very vague, it talks loftily about vision, etc but there appears to be little in the way of hard facts regarding how all of this is to be funded except by developers who will probably be the only ones to benefit.	No	Legal Compliance

bp622			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp628			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp646			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp649			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp653			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp690			no	In view of current floods i oppose use of green field sites for developemnt	No	Legal Compliance
bp782			No	It is incomplete, it has not fulfilled a number of points on the National Planning Policy Framework. There is not enough detail, it has not consulted. The bottom line is that this is an easy option for Birmingham City Council - and I say that as a proud Brummie. The council needs to raise funds for it's mistakes and selling the Green Belt off is the way to do it. I live in Sutton Coldfield but do not believe it's a vendetta against the town. The council has not protected any of the Green Belt over the years and this is what it has got left - it has no where else to go to sell land and raise money. Shame on you all!		Legal Compliance
bp796	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	No - it does not conform to Government policy on the Green Belt and is not sufficiently "based on effective joint working".	The government has recently re-stated that "unmet need" would not constitute the "very special circumstances" justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt (Ministerial Statement quoted on the Planning Portal, 23rd January 2014). There has been no "effective joint working" with the residents most affected by the Langley/Peddimore proposals, who are vehemently opposed to the plans. Also there is insufficient evidence of consultations with local providers to determine the existing and likely future capacity of local services.	Yes	Legal Compliance

bp817	The plan is flawed an incomplete. The housing requirement is for 80000 dwellings, but the plan only details where some 50000 are to be built. Out of date immigration figures have been used to calculate potential inward immigration. Latest figures indicate a fall in the levels of immigration, thereby reducing the number of dwellings required. Several points regarding the proposed infrastructure do not appear to have been thought through and are extremely vague with a lack of hard detail. There is no information on how the infrastructure is to be funded e.g. the suggested reopening of the Sutton Park rail link. This particular proposal is an 'expression of hope' as it is extremely unlikely that this will happen in reality, and should not even be included as part of the plan. There is no mention of cross border building in neighbouring areas. Has the Council liaised with its neighbours? If so, what possibilities exist, or if not, why not?. These facts should be incorporated in the plan. For such a major project, this plan, as submitted, lacks credibility. There is an obvious lack of attention to detail, the easy options have been promoted, and there are too many instances of a 'wishful thinking' attitude.	The plan, as it stands is unsound and therefore not legal. The Council appears to have ignored the guidelines of the NPPF regarding the use of Green Belt land. The Council are meant to consult with various groups in the Sutton Coldfield area, but this has been on a very limited scale. Several residents associations, schools, doctors' surgeries, for example, have not been consulted. Any recommendations from the Council, resulting from their consultations have to be viewed with scepticism - the Council has simply not spoken with enough people on this issue. The plan should be revisited and updated, with the appropriate amount of detail to back up all proposals. In particular the Council should a) indicate where 80000 houses are going to be built, if that is the requirement. b) create budgets for all infrastructure spends, detailing costs and potential funding and deal in probabilities not vague 'wishlists'. c) revise housing requirements based on the latest immigration figures. d) expand the Consultation process to more people/groups in the Sutton Coldfield area e) give details of negotiations with	No	Legal Compliance

bp822	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society	We believe it is not legally compliant because it is contrary to stated, and recently re-affirmed, government policy on the Green Belt. The justification claimed for building in the Green Belt is that there is a shortage of suitable land in the urban area but we do not consider that to be "exceptional circumstances". However, if the Inspector should be minded to approve the Plan, we would ask that certain stipulations are made: That a phased approach is essential, with green/field green belt land should not be developed until most of the brownfield land development in the area has been delivered. That phasing is vital for related infrastructure - transport improvements including railway connections, health service provision, schools etc as any development takes place. That Peddimore should only be developed for major commercial projects which would be very difficult to provide for elsewhere' That Langley SUE should only be developed when there is a real lack of housing land within the urban area. That proper consideration of landscape and archaeological factors should be phased into the proposals so that green field areas are not seen as deasy and cheap to develop, and to make sure that impacts are properly mitigated.	Opting for the use of the green belt is the easy option requiring no constructive thought. The fact that there is a shortage of development land in the urban area is not an exceptional circumstance, it is inevitable that urban development land will grow short and now that it has that fact will pertain into the future and cannot be defined as exceptional. Either now or later a different solution to providing for housing need must be found. Solutions to accommodate housing beyond the city boundary are still under discussion with other authorities, as is the LEP development strategy for commercial development. Birmingham's plan is therefore premature. The green belt land in question is of high landscape and amenity value and has tremendous value in its own right for the community, now and for future generations, as comments made on each consultation on the Plan have shown. The extent of growth now forecast demands a change of approach. Expanding the city area further is not sustainable because it compromises the ability to cater in other respects for future generations, results in	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1021			No	A duty exists to cooperate with other adjoining authorities. Whilst this has been initiated it falls short of consummation of the duty to co-ooperate		Legal Compliance
bp1078			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance

bp1286	No.	I do not consider the plan to be legally compliant. The testing of the "connectivity" of the plan is based upon the flawed use of the PRISM transport model. This model assumes that travel demands will be modified according to travel costs (following the approach used to test new transport infrastructure such as the M25 when additional travel demands can be generated). The use of such a model in the case of a land use planning study is incorrect in that it presumes that people will not only be happy to change their home/workplace to take place of new travel opportunities but that they will be equally happy to be forced to change their home/workplace in response to increased congestion from new development. This establishes a de facto policy that new developments need not be supported by new infrastructure, instead existing residents/workers must relocate to accomodate them once congestion occurs (not simply change from car to bus, or choose a different route). This is clearly contrary to established planning practice and can hardly be considered "sustainable".	Yes	Legal Compliance

bp1307	No	I have a concern that this plan is not legally compliant in that for every online submission, it is asking the individual "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?" I do not think that this is an appropriate question to ask at this point. Why should anyone at this point in time have to decide whether or not they wish to speak at a public inquiry? As we are still in the public consultation stage it must still be presumed that the document is open to change (if not, then obviously the Plan would not be legally compliant). Therefore the document a Planning Inspector would view would not be exactly the same as the one presented at the public consultation. It is therefore possible that something might be added in or changed under a specific item for which any individual might wish to speak on even though they originally had not foreseen this during the public consultation. Such an individual may therefore have stated in their response that they did not wish to speak on this issue, only to find later that is exactly what they want to do. Posing this question now might therefore exclude	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1340	Possibly not, but then I am a lay person not familiar with planning law.	Other comments	No	Legal Compliance

bp1419	No.	I beleive that the plan is not legally complaint in that insufficient attention has been paid to the need for consultation with the public. After the completion of the Options Consultation Stage 2012/13 and shortly before the response to the consultation was published by the council, I submitted a Freedom Of Information request, seeking the council's summary of input from the consultation. I was told that no such summary existed. If such information did not exist, then how could any practical use have been made of the information recieved from the public? The only way this could have been done would have been for everyone working on the project (which covers a wide range of departments) to have read each and every comment submitted, which is obviously impractical. The only practical approach would have been to provide a summary of consultation respnses (preferably by an independent body) and for this summary to be circulated throughout the council, and for this to have been done before any update to the plan was made. Whilst the council has subsequently produced a report	Yes	Legal Compliance

bp1420	I believe not.	The BCC have failed to cooperate "constructively, actively and on an on-going basis" to a sufficiently advanced degree to make the plan mature enough for examination. The SA declares in its non-technical summary that there is uncertainty over where a very large proportion (30,000 units/houses, roughly 37%) of Birmingham's identified housing need is to be located. This significant shortfall clearly does not satisfy a requirement that the plan be positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements (51,000 identified against a requirement of 80,000). • This is not sufficiently justified against alternative strategies as they are unknown. • It is not effective as it acknowledges uncertainty and incoherence with the strategies of the adjoining local authorities. • In addition, is contrary to national planning policies for housing as identified in NPPF, this is relating to a full assessment of need which should pay regard to household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change and cater for the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1426	The creation of the Birmingham Plan 2031 is not consistent with planning policy. There is no evidence or reference within this section or any section within the plan that the BCC engaged with local people and communities to ensure the plan reflected the needs and priorities of the community. The heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is about " a collective enterprise "; a planning process which is supposed to include people and communities. Paragraph 1 of the NPPF states that " it provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities."There is no evidence this occurred .	A plan created which is consistent with planning policy. A plan which is not the preserve of specialists but a collective enterprise which included communities which reflects the needs and priorities of the communities.	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1548	No	The circumstances in Birmingham are not exceptional, so do not necessitate building on Green Belt land.	No	Legal Compliance

bp1594					The plan is not mature enough for examination. The SA is very clear there is uncertainty over where a very large proportion (30,000 units/houses) of Birmingham's identified housing need is to be located. The plan has not been positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements (51,000 identified against a requirement of 80,000). The BDP is not justified against alternative strategies as they are unknown. There is uncertainty and incoherence with the strategies of the adjoining local authorities and so is not effective.	A plan presented which is legally compliant.	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1812	Mr Maurice Barlow	Solihull MBC			The Council is content that the Birmingham Development Plan is legally compliant and sound.		No	Legal Compliance
bp1817		Consortium of West Midlands Developers and Land Owners	Mr John Pearce	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	No	Please see comments in relation to the Duty to Cooperate	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1881					No.	I am concerned about how some (in fact many) comments made on the plan during the consultation period have been published before the end of the consultation period. I thought that comments would normally be only available to the public once the period has ended. If comments are to be published then this could be open to abuse. Are all comments being published? The on line system indicates that comments have to be processed and also some may be rejected as inadmissable. How can the public be sure that this is being carried out in an unbiassed manner - some comments may be released earlier than others allowing specific parties to be able to produce comments deliberately tailored to counter points that have been made that are unfavourable to the council. While I have no reason to believe that Birmingham City council has done anything such as this, I am questioning the general principle of whether any public body should be publishing comments in the manner carried out by BCC as the prcoess might be open to abuse, and hence how legally compliant the	Yes	Legal Compliance

bp1883			No.	I am concerned that the consultation period may have been extended beyond the stated period. It has been comonly advertised that the consultation period will close at 12 noon on 3rd March 2014. However I find that at the present time (13:14 on 03/03/14) the consultation portal is still open for new comments and it is stated "Status: [graphic of a green tick mark] Open (From 06/01/14 00:01 to 03/03/14 17:00)"Possibly this webpage has said this before and I have not noticed the end time. Or has this changed? Certainly the end date/time is not consistent with that publicly advertised. This additional time is during work hours and hence will tend to favour development companies in being able to submit last minute information.	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1976			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp2101			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp2104			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2150			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp2156			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp2174			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2211			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2214			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2301			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp2479			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2504			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp2585			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2597			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2628			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2647			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2661			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2700			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2711			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2731			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2734			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2735	Sally Maguire	Lead Advisor Natural England	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2736			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2811			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2859			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2877			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2890			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2914			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2917			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2941			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance

bp2965			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp2969			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp2991			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp2995			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3011			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3017			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3030			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3073			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3083			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3089			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3094			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3106			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3133			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3149			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3166			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3192			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3206			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3219			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3234			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3239			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3249			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3262			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp3290			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3295			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3300			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3302			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3310			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3335			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3345			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3357			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3363	Mr Ray Harris	Weeford Road/Duttons Lane Development Group	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp3401			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3419			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3453			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3467			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3491			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp3511			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3517			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3535			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3551			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3596			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3611			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3620			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3676			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3773			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3804			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp3833			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp3923			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance

bp4104	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4124	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4128	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4144	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4157	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4158	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4164	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4172	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4177	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4182	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4187	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4192	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4197	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4202	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4207	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4212	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4217	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4222	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4228	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4233	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4243	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4248	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4254	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4366	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4387	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4407	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4419	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4446	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4458	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4465	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4480	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4490	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4494	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4504	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4508	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4521	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4542	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4553	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4559	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4566	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4607	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4630	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4633	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4649	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4678	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4698	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4704	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4768	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4769	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4777	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4778	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4830	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance

bp4847					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4852					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4904					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4918					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4963					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp4973					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp4981					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp5023					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp5062					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5069					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5088					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5097					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5140					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5145					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5152					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5166					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5174					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5193					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5240					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5257					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5264					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5301	Mr Paul J Gilmour	Project Manager Harvest Fields Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5317	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp5360					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5396		Ashford Developments	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5399					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5460					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5465					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5486					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Legal Compliance
bp5496					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5570					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5574	Paul Campbell	Director Richborough Estates Ltd	Ms Laura Smith	Senior Planner Turley	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5587		Dickens Heath Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp5593		Cheswick Green Parish Council	Miss Sian Holland	Administrative Assistant Stansgate Planning	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp5683					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5691		Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Michael Davies	Director - Planning Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance
bp5726					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Legal Compliance

bp5740					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5745					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5753					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5848		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5854					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5884	Mr Mark Parkinson	Economic Development and Planning Policy Manager Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5887					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5904	Councillor Caroline Wood	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5919					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5930	Councillor David Smith	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5938					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5941					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5946					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5949	Councillor Janet Eagland	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5957	C Jeff Sheriff	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5961	Mr Matthew Griffin	Team Leader (Minerals Planning Policy) Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5967	Councillor Martyn Tittley	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5973	Councillor Susan Woodward	Staffordshire County Council and Lichfield District Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5979	Councillor Terry Finn	Staffordshire County Council			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5984					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5987					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5989					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance
bp5990					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Legal Compliance

bp6015	The Gilmour Family	Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Legal Compliance
bp1				This comment is for the document overall - it seems like a set of platitudes, with almost no substance to it. All the sections promise much in the section heading, but in many of the sections there are just a couple of lines of content - which merely wastes the potental commenters time in going ot it - a major disappointment.	This comment is for the document overall - it seems like a set of platitudes, with almost no substance to it. All the sections promise much in the section heading, but in many of the sections there are just a couple of lines of content - which merely wastes the potental commenters time in going ot it - a major disappointment.	No	Policies Map
bp7				I believe that brownfield sites and other sites with closed factories and shops on them could be exploited to meet ALL the new housing needs for the next 25 years. Please explore this more fully before chipping away at our green belt lungs. Also increase permissions for flats and approve less houses to maximise land use. Sutton Coldfield is already creaking from an infrastructure perspective and thus cannot take any more homes even with the proposed investment in schools and highways. If consultation is meaningful then listen to the public and respond - most believe you are going for the easy green belt option rather than brownfield re-use	No green belt development and explore use of brownfield sites Compulsory purchase of empty shops and factories		Policies Map
bp36				we are 100% against this devolopment on green belt land.we have lived in walmley for the last 18 years and in that time traffic congestion has become a major problem and this will only get considerably worse with any new devolopment, all brownfield sites which there are numerous should be considered first and foremost and secondly all vacant property(which runs into thousands) in birmingham should be made habitable and occupied. green belt land should be the last resort not the first on the basis it's the easiest and cheapest option.	once all brownfield site have been used and only then should greenbelt be considered but NOT on this proposed land as it is totally unsuitable for devolopment due to the infrastructure	No	Policies Map

bp40	I am very much against any development on the Green Belt land surrounding Sutton Coldfield. The Green Belt was introduced for a specific purpose to provide leafy, green buffer zones and prevent ugly conurbations dominating the landscape. The green belt has many other benefits. The trees create healthier air and a psychologically nourishing environment providing a healthy and relaxing place to live for all. The green belt is also vital in providing wildlife corridors, connecting smaller habitats, which in isolation would be far less viable. Birmingham City Council must try harder to find a way of overcoming the shortage of affordable housing while protecting the concept of the green belt. I wonder if the plans for more radical expansion on green sites is fuelled by the need for homes for first-time buyers or by opportunists hoping to replace green spaces with buildings that benefits their own economic growth. The green belt is an inspiration to anyone living round or near it and should not be discarded cheaply. For city dwellers it provides a valuable connection with nature as it is there, right on the doorstep, and it's benefits to the local population, and beyond, are many.	All brown field sites should be utilised to the full. There is a suggestion that some English councils with green belt land are preparing to allocate some of it for development ahead of brown field sites. I find this notion incomprehensible and if it were to be the case would be a betrayal of that City's residents.	No	Policies Map
bp195	green field sites should stay green field. The existing infrastructure is overloaded and more development will break it	More use should be made of brownfield sites	No	Policies Map
bp476	I firmly believe brown field sites should be redeveloped for housing before attacking the Green belt. The local infrastructure cannot support this development. The roads in Sutton Coldfield are already at full capacity.	Look for alternative brown field sites	No	Policies Map
bp605	It will be interesting to see the extent to which the opposition of human development on the green belt will be taken into consideration and then ignored and then they will say why have people lost faith in the political process and fail to engage. Why, because none really exists, it is all for show. Currently there is no one supporting a change of use of the green belt and the further deterioration of what precious green infrastructure still exists in Birmingham other than people in the BCC who do not even live in Birmingham.	To make transparent that the growth agenda was not democratically decided upon. To make transparent that the choice to increase the human population in Birmingham was not democratically decided upon. To make transparent that increased human development will reduce the scope and range of green infrastructure within Birmingham. To include hyperlinks to the evidence base that is either directly or indirectly referred to.	Yes	Policies Map

bp660	For a start off the Council have made this map very hard to read. Making decisions very difficult, not a complete surprise by an underhanded council. A clear and concise plan would be of great benefit to us all. Secondly, yes there are plenty of brown field sites available, such as the old Cincinnati Milacron building near Castle Vale, how much land could be developed there, helping to increase house prices on Castle Vale. look at the house prices at Pype Hayes and see how well that development has taken off. It is all too easy to take back handers to use nice fresh land than to really look at how we can re-utilise these wastelands throughout Birmingham. How about trying to keep everyone happy, and regenerating these poor sites, yes they will cost more but surely the long term benefit to people who live in the run down parts of Birmingham would ultimately benefit from the regeneration in their area. Giving them a sense of belonging to a larger society instead of being ousted in ghettos. We are constantly being bombarded about saving energy, recycle, reuse.... the Council should take a leaf out of their own book and recycle and reuse wasteland, waste buildings, even in some cases... long shot	A clear and concise and easy to plan, and summary, without the guff then I can address my concerns. I think the plain English Society would have something to say about complicated presentation of the whole document. I don't think, (personal opinion) that this document embraces all aspects of society. You have to have a degree in town planning to understand any of it.	No	Policies Map
bp689	I would like to oppose the development of the houses on the green belt.	Use of brown field sites . please do not use green field sites in Sutton coldfield	No	Policies Map

bp734	I wish to raise my objection to the building on the Sutton Coldfield greenbelt (including the Peddimore site).	There are a large number of empty houses in Birmingham and the government has already provided the opportunity for councils to convert commercial properties into residential flats. Using these buildings – there are a large number of empty buildings that I walk past daily in the city centre – would reduce the need to build on green belt land, which the national planning policy states should only be used in exceptional circumstances. Additionally, utilising buildings in the city centre would take the pressure off an already stretched public transport and road network by reducing the need for people to commute. The council should be regenerating existing urban areas as well as developing brownfield sites and empty houses/office blocks. I understand that as well as the 12,000 empty houses in birmingham there are already more than 14,000 sites that have already been granted planning permission to build on therefore there is no need to build on the green belt land. The plan is also not sound because of out of date immigration figures and the lack of consultation with organisations, residents	No	Policies Map
bp955	Having spent a whole evening on this, then I accidentally closed the site down, and only the first of my comments seemed to have been submitted, even though I pressed submit each time. So I have now given up on this, except to say I support the development of brown field and industrial or run down areas, but I oppose the development on our green belt land.	The plan should have been put into an easy format and posted to householders for comment. All this detail just deters people from commenting.	No	Policies Map
bp974	The development of Green Belt land in Sutton Coldfield is uneccessary and the whole idea should be dismissed.	Other area should be used where there are plenty of brown field sites. The roads and services in Sutton Coldfield cannot cope now with the amount of residents. If this was to increase without the correct infrastructure it would create chaos. We have limited Green Belt as it is, nobody wants to live in a concrete jungle.	No	Policies Map

bp1006	I strongly oppose the plan to build additional homes on the green belt sites in Sutton Coldfield. The plan is based on the premise that we need 80,000 more homes between now and 2031. However, with immigration dropping, we will need fewer homes. Moreover, there is huge space capacity on brownfield sites in and around the city centre, many of which can clearly be seen close to the cross city line. If the homes were built on these it would enable dwellers to make better use of the existing public transport links, reducing the need for improving road transport links and capacity and regenerating these run down areas by providing jobs and communities. Moreover, there are already 12,000 empty houses in Birmingham and more than 14,000 sites with planning permission already granted. Thus the need to use green field sites is unfounded and should, according to National Policy, only be used in exceptional circumstances which, clearly, do not exist in this case. The plan outlines a "big picture," however, the map is too difficult to read, so a clear understanding of the current plan is not possible and therefore the consultation is flawed. Also the narrative which paints this "big picture" does not actually	Firstly, the plan should address how it will use the existing spare capacity which is already available - empty houses, disused factories and commercial sites, derelict land and areas already granted planning permission - so that the emphasis is on regeneration of areas and re-creation of communities and jobs within the locality, reducing the need for unnecessary travel. Secondly, it should aim to provide new build on these existing sites so that the new population can utilise the existing public road and rail transport links - clearly a greener option. Thirdly, the plan and accompanying map should clearly show exactly where any build would be, the numbers of people expected to be accommodated and where additional facilities such as surgeries and schools will be located to accommodate their needs, along with the costs involved in providing these and how they will be funded. Finally, the plan should outline what consolation has taken place with all stakeholders and who they are within Birmingham, and what agreement (if any?) has been reached with other local authorities in terms of provision	No	Policies Map
bp1171	There are 72,000 Empty Homes accross the West Midlands. Birmingham CC has not worked with other Local Authorities to bring these into use. http://www.emptyhomes.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/regionaltotals-stats2012.jpg They have not utilised the governments Empty Homes programme.	Concerntrate on Brownfield sites and bring Empty Homes into use. Protect the existing Green Belt.	No	Policies Map

bp1187	I am outraged to say the least! about this proposal So much of our countryside has already been decimated by housing development. I live right by my old primary school, Little Sutton Primary, and when I went there, there was nothing but fields all around. I used to love sitting on the playground, looking out over the open countryside. Now, there is nothing but rows of houses blocking the view. And now the council want us to sacrifice more of our land for even more houses? NO! This development will bring in too many people, resulting in longer waiting times at Good Hope Hospital (which frankly is already in poor service, so together with this it will make it beyond a joke), increased traffic (aren't we supposed to be trying to convince people to drive less due to carbon dioxide poisoning?), and over-crowded schools. There is too many people as it is. We should be concentrating more on our problems we currently have, without making more of them. Plus, my family moved to Sutton because we love the countryside, open fields, trees and such. We definitely did not move here just to watch it being swallowed up by the city. I love walking my dog out in the country, looking at the	There are plenty of other areas I've seen around Birmingham that haven't been used (brown field sites). Use them.	No	Policies Map

bp1247	I beleive that this map is not based upon the most up to date information. For example it includes land designated as "Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation" on land that was formerly part of Woodgate Valley Country Park but was sold by the council to ASDA to build a supermarket and petrol station on Barnes Hill. The council should not be presenting incorrent information to the public in a consultation document. What else might be incorrect with this map.	The map needs to be thoroughly reviewed before being resubmitted. * With regard to the question "Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public?", it is unclear how information submitted by the public as part of this stage of the public consultation would subsequently be used at a public inquiry, or other assessment by an independent inspector. Presumably a public consultation exercise should be expected to result in some changes to the proposals, and hence any document considered at a public inquiry would differ from the document I have reviewed. In addition it is evident that there is still outstanding work to be done on the plan and hence the council may present further information in the future which I may wish to comment on. Furthermore, given the quantity of information presented on the city's website and the limited time available, it is possible that further points will become apparent between now and any examination in	Yes	Policies Map
bp1325	It is difficult to make meaningful comments on a plan that is difficult to read and understand, even by zooming in on the image affords little improvement in the image. The rest of the document makes it clear that the City Council intends to destroy the little green belt that surrounds the conurbation by allowing development of virgin land. Having witnessed piecemeal development I have seen the effect on the infrastructure with crowded roads, schools and railways. There is little evidence that the necessary infrastructure would be provided for a "new town" of 5000 houses on the green belt.	Meaningful proposals to use brownfield sites rather than an easy option to develop on the green lung of Birmingham	No	Policies Map
bp1342	The policy should encompass the whole region and feedback from adjacent authorities.	Data from adjacent authorities	Yes	Policies Map

bp1367	I am completely opposed to this development in an area that simply that does not have the capacity to take the extra housing. This matter is made worse as due diligence has not been carried out in this development plan process.	TP10 GA5 - the council needs to identify why it is looking to build on green belt (which is there to prevent urban sprawl) when there are viable options which have not been looked at first. There is brown belt empty homes to the total of 12000 and 17000 homes with planning permission already that should be given first consideration. TP35 GA5 school planning is ambiguous and insufficient. Primary and secondary schools are already oversubscribed in this area. Additional housing without a guaranteed date for school development within a year of housing development should be compulsory for the development approval TP37 GA5 and GA6 - the transport plan is not sustainable. There is not funding for the a38 exit/entry and the roads within Walmley are already gridlocked.	No	Policies Map
bp1445	I am 70 years old and have lived in Sutton Coldfield all my life. I have seen it change from a small historic country Warwickshire town of around 25,000 people, where I knew virtually all my peers and the town centre comprised small, independent shops. Now, under Birmingham control, where we as residents pay over 30% of the council tax and have only around 11% spent in Sutton, the population has grown to over 100,000 and the town has become a sprawling, characterless mess of estate housing , high street shopping chains, and congested roads. I am horrified at the plan to now swallow up perfectly good farm land and green belt to accommodate yet more housing - Sutton Coldfield needs a chance to recover its identity!	We do not need any more housing here.If the population of Birmingham is expanding then the council should explore other options for housing them elsewhere, using up all the brown field sites from the inner city outwards. This would regenerate the city and reduce the need to increase passenger links and spend money on roads that are not really required, and allow the resulting money saved to be used to improve the current roads and transport links.	No	Policies Map
bp1451	I fundamentally oppose the development of green belt land. What can possibly be sustainable about it? Green belt was created to protect against uncontrolled urban sprawl yet this is just what you are proposing.	Do not develop existing green belt. Look at other alternatives first.	No	Policies Map

bp1519	I strongly oppose the development of Green Belt land to the north and east of Sutton Coldfield. Adding more homes on the outskirts of Mere Green would overwhelm the existing infrastructure, especially roads, transport links, schools and hospitals. Access to shops, transport links and other amenities in Sutton Coldfield and the City Centre would involve travelling through Mere Green which is already very congested at peak times. Despite the availablility of the Cross City Line, car parking is only available at Blake Street, Four Oaks, and Sutton Coldfield stations and all are full well before 8:00am with places already taken by many people travelling by car from well outside the immediate area taking advantage of cheaper rail fares within the city limits. As a result, residential areas around these stations are already swamped with the overspill from the inadequate car parks. Schools in the area are already heavily oversubscribed as are local GP surgeries. Outpatient treatment at Good Hope hospital already involves crowded waiting areas and a lengthy wait, and the car parking facilities are already grossly inadequate. Admittedly there are good public transport links to the hospital but this is an impractical	Several smaller scale developments should be considered instead of massive developments on Green Belt land which would simply swamp existing infrastructure and facilities. All brownfield sites within the city limits should be developed initially thereby taking advantage of existing road and transport links. Redevelopment of existing empty housing stock and other run-down areas within the city limits would make use of existing road and transport links and would also serve to revitalise existing local amenities. Both of these options would fit in with the overall objectives of the city's development plan and would involve the improvement of existing facilities rather than the destruction of them. Development of Green Belt land should only be viewed as an option of absolutely last resort and not simply because it is the easiest, cheapest or most profitable. Once the Green Belt land is gone it is gone forever.	No	Policies Map

bp1568					The infrastructure in Sutton Coldfield and the immediate surrounding areas is already at breaking point. The schools, GP surgeries and hospitals are already over subscribed. An extra 5,000 homes averaging 3 people per home would bring over 15,000 people into the area all relying on local amenities. This would mean approx, 5,000 children would require school placements in an area already over subscribed. These extra homes would also average a least one car per household , further stretching the capacity of our over used roads. Green belt land should only be used for building in exceptional circumstances. There are numerous areas of land throughout the West Midlands that have been purchased in the past for development by large building companies. Theses areas of land are not being developed at the present time as they were bought during the housing boom when land prices were high. Building on these sites would mean less profit for the building companies and they would rather wait until prices rise again to minimise their losses. The green belt should not be eaten into just to increase profit for building companies . This should be a last resort only after the thousands of sites with planning	1. Build on sites that have already been granted planning permission prior to using green belt land. 2. Regenerate the thousands of empty houses within the West Midlands. 3. Regenerate brownfield sites which would bring much needed housing into our inner city areas.	No	Policies Map
bp1744					I concur with my fellow objectors on this. Map too busy and not easy to read.			Policies Map
bp2632					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	No	Policies Map
bp2795		St Modwen Developments	Mr Robert Barnes	Planning Prospects Limited	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Policies Map
bp2800	Mr Michael Scanlon	West Midlands Planning Manager HS2 Ltd			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Policies Map
bp2826	Mr Geoff Inskip	Chief Executive Centro			See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Policies Map
bp5318	Mr M Nechell		Mrs Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Policies Map
bp5620		AXA Real Estate Investment Management	Mr Paul Rouse	Savills	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Policies Map
bp5646					See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Policies Map

bp5849		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online		Policies Map
bp6016	The Gilmour Family		Greg Mitchell	Framptons Planning Consultants	See Comment Reference Online	See Comment Reference Online	Yes	Policies Map