Statement on behalf of Project Fields to Birmingham City Council (BCC) response to Project Fields Matter E hearing statement

The comments are in the order of the BCC response to the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.

1.1 It remains the view of Project Fields that whilst the Council has met regulatory requirements there was no real intent to engage effectively with the local community. A plan of the scale and size of the BDP a more detailed and interactive consultation was warranted. This view is reiterated in many of the written Matter E statements for examination.

There is a real need to ensure that the consultation process and techniques used by local councils are proportionate to the scope and scale of a plan. There is also a need to ensure that a plan for twenty years of growth is based on reasonable discussion with the community to form those assumptions. The scale, significance and impact of a combined 400 hectare Sustainable Urban Extension and employment zone is not that of a large housing development but a development that is equal in size to that of Walmley or in fact any ward in Sutton Coldfield. The consultation on such a matter clearly justified more than the minimum requirements.

1.2 Appendices 1, 2 and 3 confirm that pages of complicated evidence have been added to the evidence database after consultation close.

Please note that the purpose of the “Exam” is clear and I have not been referring to these documents.

Documents within the “History” section of the evidence database were also not available; however some of the documents are familiar due to being part of previous consultations.

Appendix 1 – This is a screen shot of the evidence database during consultation.
Appendix 2 – This is a screen shot taken in August.
Appendix 3 – This contains the list of the names of the documents which were not present during consultation.

Please note in the Suzanne Webb consultation representation (March 2014) comment’s in answer to Q-64 that during the actual consultation that documents were still being uploaded despite consultation having started.

This is also commented in the Project Fields representation and that the link to the BDP evidence database was not always apparent as one of the links took you straight to the plan itself and one link to the evidence. (Q-2)

Please also refer to my comments in 1.3.

1.3 In response to the Council comments that some of the documents I reference “are updates to existing evidence and further detailed assessments which were made as soon as practicable.” Using TA23 to TA29 as an example these are not updates or detailed assessments but key inputs into the evidence for the BDP for transport and connectivity. This is verified by the Councils own process as follows:
Using document TA8 Transport and Infrastructure Evidence Base and Strategy 2014 the process on page 6, Figure 1.2 “Evidence Collection Process” describes the intended stages evidence is required for input into the draft BDP and then public examination.

In Table 3.1 “Modelling Approach” - this confirms what process formed part of Stage 3 and when this occurred. The table below is an extract from 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3a</th>
<th>Transport Modelling Assessment</th>
<th>May 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3b</td>
<td>Junction Modelling</td>
<td>Between January and April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Green Belt Development Movement Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TA23-29 are documents which if they had been available during consultation would have given the local community and businesses more insight into how the SUE and Peddimore development would be served in terms of transport and connectivity. It is also unclear why the Council started at Stage 4 and worked backwards.

The documents are highly technical so it would be even more important to publish these during the consultation process when (at least in theory) it would be possible to engage with the Council to find out more information and make representations.

1.3.1 It is also noted that the IMP1 – Infrastructure Delivery Plan June 2014 presented for examination supersedes the October 2013 document used for consultation. This is starting to render the consultation a pointless exercise if documents are to be superseded and new information presented during examination.

1.3.2 During consultation residents could only comment on the documents TA2-TA7 alongside the previous version of IMP1. Had we been privy to the additional documentation this would have created the opportunity to have made more detailed representation on the overall viability of Peddimore in relation to the SUE.

1.3.3 In September 2014 I asked a question on the matter of the consultation via the public gallery at a Birmingham Council Meeting. I was assured that all background evidence and supporting information were publicly available from 21 October 2013 (see Appendix 4).

1.3.4 Using the Councils own words used on the Birmingham Development Plan Evidence Base they state very clearly:

“In order to pull together the policies contained in the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP), a number of studies were undertaken to establish currently levels and provision of various uses across the city.
Below are the documents which form the ‘evidence base’ for the BDP and links to other associated documents referred to in the plan”
1.4 My comment is referring more to the substantial difference in the evidence data base (since consultation close as per 1.2) and that the audit trail of documents is not as it was presented during consultation. Therefore it has proved challenging to keep track of documents and their content and location when preparing for public examination.

With regards to the change from 3,500 to 5,000 in policy GA5 this was brought to the attention of the Council immediately following consultation during a meeting I had with council officials. Market Capacity was stated as 3,500 in the plan.

1.5 As per my comment six in the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.

1.6 The Councils state that the omission of the CCG was an admin error only and that the Trust was consulted. However it does not explain why if this is the case relevant policies within the BDP do not explain how they will mitigate the impact of the Heart of England Foundation Trust reconfiguring the services between three centres of excellences (COE). Two of the COE’s are in fact outside of the boundaries of Sutton Coldfield which will therefore impact any sustainable urban extension. This would have been a key output of any meeting and key input into the plans policies.

1.7 As per my comment six in the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.
1.8 As per my comment six in the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.
1.9 As per my comment two in the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.
1.10 As per my comment two in the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.
1.11 As per my comment four in the Project Fields Matter E Hearing Statement.

1.12 At no point following consultation close and a review of my comments made during the consultation did the Council seek to clarify or arrange a meeting with me.
Appendix 1 and 2 – As per attached documents

Appendix 3 - These are a list of the documents not present during consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Reference</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub -03</td>
<td>Submission Sustainability Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub -06</td>
<td>Pre submission habitat regulation’s assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub- 08</td>
<td>Evolution of Sustainability Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG2</td>
<td>Green Belt Assessment Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG3</td>
<td>Version during consultation was 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG4</td>
<td>Sutton Coldfield Green Belt Site Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC2</td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Statement (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Appendices 1-6 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Appendices 7-12 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Appendices 13-17 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Appendices 18-20 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Appendices 21-27 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duty to Cooperate Appendices 28-31 (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>Draft Greater Icknield Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES6</td>
<td>Update to Waste Capacity Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES9</td>
<td>Strategic Flood Level Assessment Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES20</td>
<td>Technical Paper 2 (Unsure if this is the same document as was there in March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP2</td>
<td>Employment Land Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP3</td>
<td>Employment Land Study for Economic Zones and Key Sectors 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP4</td>
<td>Employment Land and Office Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP5</td>
<td>Retail Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP6</td>
<td>Retail Needs Assessment Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP7</td>
<td>City Centre Retail Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP8</td>
<td>Local Centres Strategy 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP9</td>
<td>Shopping and Local Centres SPD 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP10</td>
<td>Birmingham City Centre Enterprise Zone Investment Plan 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people Accommodation 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Education Development Plan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Private Sector Empty Property Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>5 Year Land Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>SCHLAA 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA1</td>
<td>Birmingham Mobility Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA8</td>
<td>Transport and Infrastructure Evidence Base and Strategy 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA18</td>
<td>Birmingham City Centre Vision for Movement 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA19</td>
<td>Intelligent Transport Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA20</td>
<td>Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA21</td>
<td>Birmingham Eastern Fringe Bus Study 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA22</td>
<td>Birmingham Eastern Fringe Rail Study 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA23</td>
<td>Minworth Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA23</td>
<td>Minworth Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA23</td>
<td>Minworth Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA23</td>
<td>Minworth Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA24</td>
<td>Tyburn Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA24</td>
<td>Tyburn Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference: Project Fields/Suzanne Webb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document SJW2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA24</th>
<th>Tyburn Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA24</td>
<td>Tyburn Roundabout Option Development and Appraisal Report Part 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA25</td>
<td>Peddimore Access Modelling Final Report Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA25</td>
<td>Peddimore Access Modelling Final Report Part 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA26</td>
<td>Peddimore Access Modelling Access Option 2 Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA26</td>
<td>Peddimore Access Modelling Access Option 2 Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA27</td>
<td>M42 Junction 9 Base Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA26</td>
<td>M42 Junction 9 Initial Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA27</td>
<td>Green Belt Travel Demand Model Report Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA28</td>
<td>Green Belt Travel Demand Model Report Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA29</td>
<td>Green Belt Travel Demand Model Report Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP01</td>
<td>Infrastructure Development Plan June 2014 Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP02</td>
<td>CIL Prelim Draft Charging Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP03</td>
<td>CIL Economic Viability Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning for Growth

Housing Targets Technical Paper (2013) (Size: 53.57KB)

Duty to Cooperate Statement (2013) (Size: 53.57KB)

Sustainability Appraisals and Habitat Assessments

Issues & Options - Sustainability Appraisal Scotland

Issues & Options - Sustainability Appraisal (2013)

Consultation Draft - Sustainability Appraisal (2013)

Consultation Draft - Habitats Regulations Assessment

Options Consultation - Sustainability Appraisal

Options Consultation - Interim Sustainability Appraisal

Options Consultation - Proposed Site Allocation

Options Consultation - Habitats Regulation Assessment

Pre-Submission Sustainability Appraisal (2013)
Spatial Delivery of Growth

Transport Analysis of Green Belt Options (2014)

Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to Develop
Type: PDF

Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to Develop
Type: PDF

Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to Develop
Type: PDF

Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to Develop
Type: PDF

Green Belt Option Areas - Landscape Character

Green Belt Option Areas - Landscape Character

Green Belt Option Areas - Archaeology & History

Green Belt Option Areas - Archaeology & History
Green Belt Option Areas - Landscape Character

Green Belt Option Areas - Archaeology & History

Housing Delivery on Green Belt Options (2012)

Green Belt Options Assessment (2013) (Size: 335 Kb Type: pdf)

Environment & Sustainability

Waste Capacity Study (2010)

Total Waste Strategy (2011)

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2012)

Leisure Study (2004)

Playing Pitch Strategy (2011) (Size: 335 Kb Type: pdf)

A Strategy for the Conservation and Enjoyment

Green Living Spaces (2013)


Climate Change Adaptation Plan 2012+ (2012)
Technical Paper 1 - Carbon Dioxide Emissions

Technical Paper 2 - National Contribution to Local Carbon Reduction Targets

Birmingham & Black Country Biodiversity Action Plan

Economy & Network of Centres

Employment Land Review (2012)

Employment Land Study for the Economic Zone

Employment Land & Office Targets Study (2013)

Retail Needs Assessment (2009)

Retail Needs Assessment Update (2013)

City Centre Retail Assessment (2013)

Local Centres Strategy (2006) (Size: 1.73 Mb Type: pdf)

Homes and Neighbourhoods

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

Local Housing Strategy (2011-2014)
Housing Growth Plan - to be considered at Cabinet

Connectivity

Transport Evidence Base - Stage 1 Scoping (2010)

Transport Evidence Base - Stage 2 Context (2011)

Transport Evidence Base - Stage 3 Initial Results (2011)

Transport Evidence Base - Stage 4 Emerging (2013) [PDF]

Rights of Way Improvement Plan (2007)

Cycle City Ambition Bid (2013)

West Midlands Local Transport Strategy 2011

Towards a World Class Integrated Transport Network

West Midlands Metropolitan Freight Strategy (2012)

Parking Policy (2010)

Low Carbon Transport Strategy (2012)

Smart City Vision (2012)
Site Delivery Plan (2013) (Size: 11.4 Mb Type: PDF)

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2013) (Size: 4.03 Mb Type: PDF)

Monitoring

Local Development Framework - Annual Monitoring

Evidence of Previous Stages of Consultation

Details of previous consultations can be found

Other Supporting Documents

Big City Plan (2011)

Aston Newtown & Lozells Area Action Plan (2013 Draft)

Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration Framework

Bordesley Park Area Action Plan (2013 Draft)

Longbridge Area Action Plan (2009)

Sustainable Management of Urban Rivers & Floods

Parks & Open Space Strategy SPD (2006)

Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration Framework

Bordesley Park Area Action Plan (2013 Draft)

Longbridge Area Action Plan (2009)


Parks & Open Space Strategy SPD (2006)


Loss of Industrial Land to Alternative Uses SP11

Car Parking Guidelines SPD (2012)

Sustainable Communities Strategy - Birmingham

Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act

Big City Culture 2010-2015 (2010)

Last Updated : 20th January 2014
Shortcut to this page: www.birmingham.gov.uk/

In order to pull together the policies contained within the Plan, a number of studies were undertaken to establish the context in which the Plan should sit.
2. Submission Plan

SUB1 - Pre-Submission Document - Part 1 (2013)
SUB1 - Pre-Submission Document - Part 2 (2013)
SUB1 - Pre-Submission Document - Part 3 (2013)
SUB2 - Modifications Following Pre-Submission
SUB3 - Submission Plan Sustainability Appraisal
SUB4 - Submission Policies Map (inc minor modifications)
SUB5 - Pre Submission Sustainability Appraisal
SUB6 - Pre-Submission Habitat Regulations Assessment
SUB7 - Pre-submission Comments (2014) (Size: 1.46 MB)
SUB8 - Evolution of the Sustainability Appraisal
SUB9 - Pre-submission - Summary of Comments
SUB10 - Council Response to Comments on Local Plan
Type: PDF
SUB11 - Consultation Statement (2014) (Size: 2.15 MB)
STRAT3 - Overall Approach Paper (2014) (Size: 641K)

4. Planning for Growth

PG1 - Green Belt Assessment (2013) (Size: 615K)

PG2 - Green Belt Assessment Addendum (2010)

PG3 - Housing Delivery on Green Belt Options

PG4 - Sutton Coldfield Green Belt Sites Phase 2

PG5 - Green Belt Option Areas - Landscape Character

PG5 - Green Belt Option Areas - Landscape Character

PG6 - Green Belt Option Areas - Archaeology

PG7 - Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to (Size: 696K)

PG7 - Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to (Size: 696K)

PG7 - Ecological Constraints & Opportunities to (Size: 696K)
5. Duty to Cooperate

DC1 - Duty to Cooperate Statement (2013) (Si)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Statement (2014) (Si)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Appendices 1-6 (2014)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Appendices 7-12 (2014)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Appendices 13-17 (2014)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Appendices 18-20 (2014)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Appendices 21-27 (2014)
DC2 - Duty to Cooperate Appendices 28-31 (2014)

6. Spatial Delivery of Growth

G1 - Big City Plan (2011)
G2 - Aston Newtown & Lozells Area Action Plan
G3 - Sutton Coldfield Town Centre Regeneration
7. Environment & Sustainability

ES1 - Sustainable Management of Urban Rivers

ES2 - Parks & Open Spaces Strategy SPD (2007)

ES3 - Public Open Space in New Residential Developments

ES4 - Natural Environment & Rural Communities

ES5 - Waste Capacity Study (2010)

ES6 - Update to Waste Capacity Study Addendum

ES7 - Total Waste Strategy (2011)

ES8 - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level

ES9 - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level


ES11 - Playing Pitch Strategy (2011)
8. Economy & Network of Centres

EMP1 - Loss of Industrial Land to Alternative Uses
EMP2 - Employment Land Review (2012)
EMP3 - Employment Land Study for the Economy
EMP4 - Employment Land & Office Targets Study
EMP5 - Retail Needs Assessment (Volumes 1 & 2)
EMP6 - Retail Needs Assessment Update (Vol 1 & 2)
EMP7 - City Centre Retail Assessment (2013)
EMP10 - Birmingham City Centre Enterprise Zone

9. Homes & Neighbourhoods

H1 - Housing Targets 2011-31 Technical Paper

H2 - Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

H3 - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

H4 - Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment

H5 - Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople Assessment

H6 - Affordable Housing Viability Study (2010)

H7 - Housing Growth Plan (2013)


H9 - Private Sector Empty Property Strategy 2015

H10 - 5 Year Land Supply (2014)

H11 - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
10. Connectivity

TA1 - Birmingham Mobility Action Plan (BMAP)

TA2 - Car Parking Guidelines SPD (2012)

TA3 - Transport Analysis of Green Belt Options

TA4 - Transport Evidence Base - Stage 1 Scope

TA5 - Transport Evidence Base - Stage 2 Consultation

TA6 - Transport Evidence Base - Stage 3 Transport Policy

TA7 - Transport Evidence Base - Stage 4 Green Belt

TA8 - Transport & Infrastructure Evidence Base

TP9 - Rights of Way Improvement Plan (2007)
TA12 - Towards a World Class Integrated Transport Strategy

TA13 - West Midlands Metropolitan Freight Strategy

TA14 - Parking Policy (2010)


TA16 - Smart City Vision (2012)

TA17 - Smart City Blueprint – Best Practice Note

TA18 - Birmingham City Centre Vision for Movements

TA19 - Intelligent Transport Strategy (2010)

TA20 - Creating Growth, Cutting Carbon (2011)

TA21 - Birmingham Eastern Fringe Bus Study

TA22 - Birmingham Eastern Fringe Rail Study

TA23 - Minworth Roundabout - Option Development

TA23 - Minworth Roundabout - Option Development (PDF)
TA24 - Tyburn Roundabout - Option Development

TA24 - Tyburn Roundabout - Option Development
PDF

TA24 - Tyburn Roundabout - Option Development
Type: PDF

TA25 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Final Report

TA25 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Final Report

TA25 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Final Report

TA25 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Final Report

TA25 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Final Report

TA26 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Access Statement
PDF

TA26 - Peddimore Access Modelling - Access Statement

TA27 - M42 Junction 9 Base Model - Local Model
11. Implementation

IMP1 - Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014) (Size: 14.5 Mb)
IMP2 - Site Delivery Plan (2013) (Size: 11.4 Mb)
IMP3 - CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
IMP4 - CIL Economic Viability Assessment (2013)

12. Monitoring

MON1 - Local Development Framework – Annual
MON2 - Local Development Framework - Authority

13. History

HTY1 - Statement of Community Involvement (2014)
HTY2 - Core Strategy Issues and Options (2005)
HTY3 - Core Strategy Issues and Options (2011)
13. History

HTY1 - Statement of Community Involvement (2005)
HTY2 - Core Strategy Issues and Options (2006)
HTY3 - Core Strategy Issues and Options Summary
HTY4 - Core Strategy Issues and Options Summary
HTY5 - Core Strategy Issues and Options Context
HTY6 - Core Strategy Issues and Options - Interactive Map
HTY7 - Core Strategy 2026 Consultation Draft
HTY8 - Core Strategy Preferred Options - Interactive Map
HTY9 - Core Strategy - Habitats Regulations Assessment
HTY10 - Core Strategy Consultation Draft – Consultation Draft
14. Examination Documents

EXAM1 - Inspector's Procedural Correspondence

EXAM2 - Councils respond to the Inspectors Preliminary Report

EXAM2A - BDP Proposed Main Modifications

EXAM2B - BDP Proposed Additional Modifications
Appendix 3 is contained within Project Fields Matter E Statement
Dear Ms Webb

Please find below your Question and Response at the City Council Meeting on 16 September 2014.

A Questions from Members of the Public to any Cabinet Member or District Committee Chairman

7 Ms Suzanne Webb to the Cabinet Member for Development, Transport and the Economy, Councillor Tahir Ali

“Hello, good afternoon, the consultation process used for the Birmingham Development plan is considered:

- Woefully inadequate and restricted in its duration.

The consultation was not about a planning application, but 80,000 dwellings, which included an urban extension the size of any Ward in Birmingham. The scale of the proposals therefore warranted a more detailed and effective consultation.

Why no comments were taken on board is also unclear;

- Most were articulate and considered.
- Explaining that Sutton is already at saturation point and its infrastructure at capacity.
- That the proposal for 400 hectares of development was not sustainable.

Since 2012 communities are supposed to be allowed back into planning and not excluded as this process has done.

I can assure you that the proposed housing development for Sutton is too significant for residents to accept the weaknesses of this consultation process.

To this end I would like to ask Sir Albert Bore to explain why only the bare minimum consultation techniques were used and that despite the volume of public comments little or no changes were made to the plan?”

Councillor Tahir Ali in reply

“Thank you Lord Mayor, and I would like to thank Suzanne Webb for asking the question. As it falls within my portfolio, I will be answering the question today. The consultation
undertaken on the Birmingham Development Plan has far exceeded the statutory minimum requirements as set out by the present Government. The most recent formal consultation process began on 6 January and ended on 3 March 2014, a period of 8 weeks. However, the pre-submission plan and all background evidence and supporting information were publicly available from 21 October 2013. The Cabinet meeting approving the document, for consideration by full Council over 2 months before the start of the formal consultation. A letter was also sent out to all those on the consultation database including all those who had previously commented on the core strategy. Officers also presented the proposals in advance of the consultation at a very well attended meeting of the Sutton Coldfield New Hall Ward Committee on 29 November 2013. The formal consultation process included formal letters being sent out to all those on the consultation database and all those who had commented on the previous stages. The draft plan document was available at libraries and neighbourhood offices and notice was placed in the Birmingham Mail. An article was included in ‘The Forward’ the Council’s own newspaper which is delivered to all homes across the City. All the documentation was provided on the Council’s website. Sessions were held on several occasions including weekends in Walmley and Sutton Coldfield libraries to provide advice and assistance to people wishing to respond. Similar sessions were also held in a number of libraries elsewhere in the City and there were representations to District Committees and Ward Committees on request. This included meetings on all Ward Committees in the Sutton Coldfield area. Officers also attended other meetings organised locally, a total of 1,524 people and organisations responded to the consultation. It was possible to comment on more than one section or policy of the plan making the total number of responses to 5,863. Comments were received on all aspects of the plan but the largest number relate to the proposals for the green belt development. The Council has considered all of these responses and has concluded no major modification to the plan are required. The Plan has now been submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration an examination in public is scheduled to commence on 21 October where those who are objecting to the proposals in the Birmingham Development Plan will have the opportunity to make their case to the inspector. Thank you Lord Mayor.”

Kind Regards

Baljinder Chauhan
Committee Services
0121 675 5853
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