

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA342	Ms Jane Field	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency			See attached.	Support Revised SA.	Noted.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628611
BDPSA344		Richborough/The Gilmour Family	Colin Morrison	Turleys	See attached.	Underestimation of OAHN and consequent effects on the SA. No SA of overspill. The SA seeks to justify existing strategy. Smaller options need to be justified as reasonable alternatives which can be appraised to the same level of detail as the 5k and 10k scenarios. No links to updated historic environment evidence. Landscape, biodiversity and historic environment impacts not supported by existing evidence. Scoring errors in respect of biodiversity, landscape and transport. No comparative assessment on transportation issues. Reasons and evidence for A1 and B1 not being capable of accommodating 5,000 units not given, and by contrast that A2, B2 and C2 could accommodate such a scale of development. Lack of evidence/no additional evidence presented on which to properly base decisions, particularly newly introduced options.	See attached response.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3630440

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA8		Inland Waterways Association Bham and the Black Country			<p>E41.Reservoirs and Canals. Under reservoirs, the reference to British Waterways should be updated to Canal & River Trust. The statement that the length of canals "depends on where you draw the city boundaries " is a nonsense; the City boundaries are fixed. The statement that "the whole Birmingham Canal Navigations system extends for approximately 160 miles in total" is misleading and irrelevant; 160 miles is the extent of the canals historically owned by the Birmingham Canal Navigations Company, but many parts of this network are outside the Birmingham boundary, and the BCN does not include those parts of the Grand Union, Worcester & Birmingham and Stratford-upon-Avon canals that are within Birmingham. The relevant individual canals within Birmingham are those as listed, but with the addition of: Dudley No.2 (Lapal) Canal - which is not currently navigable but its restoration is supported by this Plan (PMM23). From published canal maps and guides, the total length of these canals within Birmingham is estimated to be approximately 37 miles. This corresponds reasonably well with Table E13 Birmingham's Historic Built Environment (page E45) which lists Canals as 57.4 km (= 36 miles). Proposed text change: Birmingham is at the centre of an extensive network of canals within the West Midlands, including the Birmingham Canal Navigations which is one of the the most intricate canal networks in the world.These waterways converge in the city centre at Gas Street Basin. The canals within the Birmingham boundary total about 36 miles and include:(Add to list: Dudley No.2 (Lapal) Canal)</p>	Reference to British Waterways should be updated to Canal & River Trust.Factual incorrections regarding length and canals.	Noted. Update reference to British Waterways and change to Canal & Rivers Trust through erratum sheet.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3541091

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA138					This is an incredibly turgid and uninformative document. How the public are expected to read, digest and understand the contents of this report is a mystery - except that obviously we are not really meant to understand it. This is just an attempt to bulldoze through the idea that destroying green belt is in anyway sustainable, which is far from the truth. Birmingham has only a limited amount of Green Belt. Removing any amount, especially the scale proposed by the council, will reduce the remaining Green Belt. If this approach is continued in the future the Green Belt will be used up and it will no longer be possible to continue this policy. Therefore the approach is unsustainable not sustainable. Just by making token gestures like dedicated bus services, hardly makes this sustainable. This document is a waste of time and a waste of money. If it looks like it is destroying the local environment and sounds like it is destroying the local environment, then it is destroying the environment. No amount of coloured diagram can make this be sustainable.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA197		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See attached.	The SA does not identify, describe and evaluate the likely effects on the environment of the implementing Plan. Disagree with the assessment of area B. No SA of overspill. Reasonable alternatives not specified and appraised, including a proposed new sub-area 'B3'.	See attached response.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612064
BDPSA196		c/o RPS (Sutton Coldfield Charitable Trust & Bishop Vesey Grammar School	Mr Tim Watton	Associate RPS Planning & Development	See attached.	The SA does not identify, describe and evaluate the likely effects on the environment of the implementing Plan. Disagree with the assessment of area B. No SA of overspill. Reasonable alternatives not specified and appraised, including a proposed new sub-area 'B3'.	See attached response.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612064

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA150					<p>The Revised Sustainability Appraisal recommends development be carried out at Areas C and D as part of the Birmingham Development Plan. This is partly because development at sites C and D is judged to have a neutral impact on biodiversity, as shown on Table 5.2 (Revised Sustainability Appraisal , p.83) and Table 5.3 (ibid, p.85). The Appraisal, as Section 5.2 (ibid, p.84) states, assesses the impact of development at Site C on the basis of information contained in pages 61 and 62 of the Birmingham Development Plan's Green Belt Assessment (2013). Similarly, Section 5.2's statement that development in 'Area D would have low... biodiversity impacts' (ibid p.84) is a judgement explicitly based on pages 70 and 71 of the Green Belt Assessment (2013). Section 4.1.2 of The Green Belt Assessment itself states that during Stage Two of the assessment of the Green Belt option areas judgements and recommendations were formed based on the information provided by the technical assessment 'Ecological Constraints and Oportunities Within Birmingham's Green Belt' carried out by URS (Green Belt Assessment 2013 , p.23). Accordingly, Section 4.5.2 of the Green Belt Assessment states 'No protected or notable species from the period 2000 to present have been received' for area C (ibid, p.62). This statement is directly taken from Section 3.3.1 of the URS technical assessment (URS, p.24). Section 6.3.3 of the Green Belt</p>	Disagree with judgement that areas C and D have a neutral impact on biodiversity.	Comments noted but disagree on the basis of the evidence submitted with the Green Belt Assessment.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>Assessment therefore considers that 'the vast majority of Area C supports habitats of lower ecological value offering limited constraints to development' (Green Belt Assessment 2013, p.95). Likewise, Section 4.6.1 of the Green Belt Assessment states that with one exception 'No other protected or notable species records from the period 2000 to present have been received' for Area D (ibid, p.71). This judgement is taken from Section 3.4.1 of the URS technical assessment (URS, p.27). Section 6.4.1 of the Green Belt Assessment therefore concludes 'The vast majority of the area has low ecological value offering limited constraints to development' (Green Belt Assessment , p.98). However, the evidence on which the Green Belt Assessment is based is incomplete and therefore inadequate. Section 2.1 of the URS technical assessment states that during the field walkover assessment of the sites 'protected and/or notable species have not been recorded, nor have notes been taken of species present within the habitats surveyed' (URS, p.12). Moreover, Section 2.2 states that the field survey was undertaken from points of public access alone, 'no other access was secured for the areas of land that were subject to survey' (ibid). Section 2.4 therefore acknowledges that due to access constraints 'data relating to habitat type may be inaccurate in places' (ibid,p.14). Since the Green Belt Assessment is based on a technical assessment which is incomplete and potentially inaccurate it follows that the Revised Sustainability</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

					<p>inadequate it follows that the Revised Sustainability Appraisal cannot base its arguments for sustainability on the Green Belt Assessment . The Revised Sustainability Appraisal's conclusion that development in Areas C and D would be sustainable and have a neutral impact on biodiversity therefore cannot be supported as it is based on inadequate evidence. The true impact of development in Areas C and D cannot currently be fully assessed using the evidence provided. Thus, the Revised Sustainability Appraisal fails to comply with national policy, as Point 157 , bullet point 7, of the National Planning Policy Framework states 'Crucially, Local Plans should identify land where development would be inappropriate, for its environmental or historical significance' (NPPF, p.38), and Point 165 of the NPPF states 'planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the local environment' (NPPF,p. 40). The arguments within the Revised Sustainability Appraisal are not therefore sound, and the Birmingham Development Plan's sustainability questionable.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA157	Mr Graham Turner	Friends of Hill Hook Local Nature Reserve			<p>The Friends of Hill Hook Local Nature Reserve are concerned about the following issues:- i) the Hill Hook Local Nature Reserve (LNR) area and boundaries are factually incorrect as currently shown in the Revised Sustainability Appraisal maps. The main error is that the plan maps are not showing the part of the LNR between Hill Hook Road and the LNR northern boundary at Blake Street. There is also an error in the Appraisal's maps when showing the position of the LNRs south western boundary. The correct Hill Hook LNR boundaries are shown in a map of Hill Hook LNR that was produced by the Birmingham City Council Planning & Regeneration Department on 21st January 2015. Unfortunately it does not appear possible to submit to you a copy of this map as part of this consultation. However a copy of this map was submitted as part of our response to the 'main modifications' Birmingham Plan consultation, but please let us know if you require a further copy. ii) Table 4.5 on Page 65 refers to Hill Hook having SINC and SLINC status. Hill Hook LNR is entirely 'LNR' status as well as 'SINC' status. Please also can reference to its Local Nature Reserve (LNR) status be added to this table, and the reference to 'SLINC' status deleted. iii) Local Nature Reserve sites appear to have been omitted from being shown in the Green Infrastructure map in Figure E9 on page E21. 3. What change (if any) do you think should be made to address your concerns ? i) Correct the Hill Hook LNRs area and boundaries in all relevant 'revised sustainability appraisal' maps. ii) Change the reference to Hill Hook in the Table 4.5 on Page 65 to read that it has both LNR and SINC status. iii) Add 'LNR' designated sites to the Green Infrastructure Network Map on Figure E9 on page E21. 4. Name Friends of Hill Hook Local Nature Reserve.</p>	The Hill Hook LNR boundary is incorrect in the Revised SA and its status is a LNR and SINC not SLINC. Same comment also submitted on the BDP Proposed Modifications.	Factual comment noted and correction to be made.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA377	Mr W Carthy	Director of Estates Aston University			See attached.	Support Revised SA.	Noted.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628040
BDPSA341	Mr M Neachell	c.oJVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd			See attached.	The Revised SA is a retrospective fit to the Plan proposals. It does not adequately justify the rejection of smaller and medium sized sites. Disagree with assessment of area A1. It is unsustainable not to meet the required housing needs of the City.	See attached response.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627286
BDPSA389	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire			See attached.	See attached.	See attached response.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626631
BDPSA158	Mr Jon Flowith	Client Jon Flowith & Partners	Mr Gary Cardin		Chapter 4 Sustainability Appraisal of the Birmingham Development Plan including at 4.7 The Need for Site Assessment including all Reasonable Alternatives. Chapter 5 Summary of Assessment Results. The Inspector requested that further work on the SA needed to be undertaken to ensure all reasonable alternatives have been assessed. The Inspector set the context for such assessments yet the Revised SA still fails to assess all sites on the same basis and objectively. Sites of 500 to 3000 units are rejected and smaller sites are not genuinely considered which given the significant shortage of housing land to meet Birmingham's housing need - it must be the case that all brownfield and where appropriate green field and Green Belt sites are assessed at this time to maximise housing delivery. There is very little support information or objectively assessed detail in the Revised SA such as the contribution that could be provided by smaller sites or the facilities provided by such well-established and thriving local centres such as Mere Green. Transport assessments are lacking with no real assessment as the provision of access to rail facilities which alternative sites and locations can provide. Similarly there is no differentiation between those guiding principles for a development of 3000 units as opposed to a site for 1000 units they are very different. Certainly the provision of a number of these to be treated comprehensively in a given location (e.g. Area A1)	Scale of appraisal is too broad brush with smaller options dismissed without justification. Smaller options need to be justified as reasonable alternatives which can be appraised to the same level of detail as the 5k and 10k scenarios.	See attached response.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					that could provide the right mix and combination to provide additional facilities to support housing growth just has been accommodated in the past in locations to the North of Mere Green. There is a distinct lack of fairness, detail on transportation (Table 5.1 in the results chapter makes statements unsupported by any evidence or modelling in relation to transportation) community issues and too much of a focus on scale and an assessment driven by certain scale of development. It is the case the Birmingham will need a range of development sites both urban and Green Belt , both large and small to meets its housing delivery to provide the maximum range of choice , locations and cater for the varying speeds of delivery of the more significant sites.			
BDPSA482	Mrs Elizabeth Allison	Chairman Sutton Coldfield Civic Society			See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636421
BDPSA314					See attached.	The RSA fails to meet the SEA Directive because it underestimates the negtaive effects of the Plan proposals and relies upon questionable evidence. The concept of a SUE and its supporting infrastructure (particularly the proposed Sprint service) is fundamentally flawed.	The rationale for a SUE in this location is set out in the BDP and is based on practice around the country. The City Council is content that taking all the evidence in the round, a SUE is the most sustainable option for accommodating significant peripheral growth for Birmingham, as demonstrated through the SA in its early stages. Detailed work on infrastructure development such as Sprint to support this type of development has been undertaken, and BCC are content that the proposals are a feasible solution to infrastructure provision.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622973

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA407					See attached.	No SA of overspill. Lack of evidence/no additional evidence presented on which to properly base decisions, particularly newly introduced options.	See attached response.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629051
BDPSA4					Please tell me how Good Hope hospital will cope with 6000 families.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA13					In the earlier report, 2011 (?) specific reference was made to the railway line that runs through Sutton Park, that this is someway will be brought back into pasenger service. The current 2015 Sunstainability report seems to shy away from mentioning it. If this project is to go foward then it should be part of this Section - certainly, of less status and importance than the Metro extension, but nonethless it should be highlighted in the Rail and Metro Section. Thank youf or your consideration of it.	Comment regarding Sutton Park Line.	Noted. Detailed comments that do not affect the conclusions of the SA.	
BDPSA16					With no additional infrastructure the rush hour congestion, already high through Walmley, epecially A38, Walmley Road and also impacting onto the M42 would become gridlocked. Not only that the additional noise and airpollution. Good Hope hospital is already at bursting point, Walmley is a "village" not a high street town with few amenities hope will this be of benefit to the existing resident. How is this a positive for "green infrastructure" by removing the last remaining agricultural land and open space.	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA29					<p>Traffic: There is an absence of any evidence which shows how the extra traffic can be accommodated. Walmley Village already grid locked throughout the day. Huge impact on A38 and M42.</p> <p>Services: Walmley has few services to offer. When the last green belt was built on 20 years ago, no new provisions were made. The current infrastructure would not cope. The Heart of England Foundation Trust plan to move acute services to Heartlands Hospital and Solihull Hospital, away from Good Hope. It can currently take an hour to travel to either of these sites from Walmley</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals.	Disagree with comment regarding lack of transport evidence. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580952
BDPSA30					<p>12,000 additional cars on our local roads as well as the additional overall traffic on the M42, A38, A5127, A4097 and Heartlands Spine Road will have a very serious negative impact on air quality CO 2 emissions and traffic congestion. The main local routes into Sutton Town such as Coleshill Road and Reddicap Hill are traffic jammed most days making a one mile journey take 45 minutes. They cannot take extra traffic. Walmley has no high shopping. Hospital service is spread over centres, Good Hope, Heartlands and Solihull increasing private transport still further. The infrastructure is already creaking. Removing grade 3 agricultural lands the last remaining in Birmingham and building 6,000 homes; 12,000 cars will not improve our environmental health.</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580891
BDPSA33					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3581763
BDPSA34					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3581734
BDPSA36					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3589719

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA31					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580883
BDPSA28					<p>Firstly, my apologies if I say the wrong thing in the wrong place on your forms. As a lay person, I find this jungle of a system almost inoperable. The infrastructure (or lack thereof) worries me. At the moment, my wife has to go to Solihull for a scan as Good Hope is full to capacity. We waited 4 hours at A&E to get a fracture sorted. How are all these extra residents going to help? Obviously they are making it worse. The fields are a community asset- we have enjoyed many a walk along the paths (even when the farmer tried to hide it a few years ago!). This is apparently the last remaining area of farm land in Birmingham. Are we saying that our nation needs less food production capability? Surely not! Space forbids me to mention various historic finds in the area, the problems of current traffic levels which will be exacerbated and all the other objections, which hopefully others will pick up on.</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580945

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA27					<p>There is difficulty getting out of Springfield Crescent at times when parental cars are accessing Holy Cross Primary School, from Springfield Road. More schools are planned, which will add to the volume of traffic at school-run times. There has already been a great deal of building within Walmley, using garden sites and a pub (Anvil) play-area. Residents have already been complaining that 'Walmley is full!' Patients needing a scan are often sent to Solihull hospital, as Good Hope cannot cope. More people in the area will make coping even more difficult. The land in the Green Belt is Grade 3 agricultural land, and the last left in Birmingham. People travelling the 914 bus route appreciate the countryside glimpsed on Langley's part of the route. I took my grand-daughter to the fields earlier this year, to see how the crop was growing. When my own children were young, and particularly when my son was chronically ill, we regularly visited the footpath across the fields.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	<p>http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580926</p>
BDPSA26					<p>The building of proposed 6,000 new dwellings and consequences projected impact of 12,000 cars/vans will be horrendous. The infrastructure will not cope. There is currently a build-up of traffic along Springfield Road from Lindridge Road into Walmley. Two sets of traffic lights cause tailbacks in both directions in particular at crossroads of Wylde Green Road, Walmley Road and Fox Hollies Road. My daughter is a child-minder living at (address supplied). She walks three children (two of whom are schooled in Walmley village) along Springfield Road and Walmley Road which gives them field views, exercise and fresh air. This will be a no, no, should green belt land be built upon. Thousands of vehicles will use these roads. Air pollution with exhaust emissions will make this walk intolerable and dangerous.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	<p>http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580914</p>

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA25					With the proposed building of 6000 homes on our green belt it follows that the impact on the areas roads will be very considerable, especially the entry to Sutton Coldfield via the A38 and M42. More private cars will result from the proposed development increasing CO 2 emissions. In addition, the infrastructure will be overloaded even more than at present from the point of view of hospitals, schools and the sewage treatment works at Minworth. In Walmley there are only limited facilities such as doctor™s surgeries and shops. In short, Walmley and Peddimore will be destroyed under the proposed development, Sutton Coldfield needs what little green space we have left.	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3580910
BDPSA42					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590203
BDPSA24					No! No building on Green Belt of Sutton Coldfield, there are plenty of Brown Sites, build on those. Why not build in Scotland, there is plenty of open land there, you could start a new town with hospitals, schools etc, just like they did in Telford. When building these estates it should be your first thoughts on building the schools, hospitals and then the houses that is the most important.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3578755
BDPSA23					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3578376
BDPSA22					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3578360
BDPSA21					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3578218

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA20					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3578196
BDPSA19					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3578184
BDPSA49					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590541
BDPSA17					<p>The assessment of the preferred strategic options to build in Walmley and Preddimore is fundamentally wrong, and as such I would like to raise the following. Such an extensive development would have adverse impact on the surrounding area as the infrastructure surrounding the proposed development is already under pressure. The road infrastructure around the proposed area is already under strain by the volume of traffic that passes through the area on a daily basis. The added addition of a further 5,000 -6,000 housing in the Walmley area along with an extensive industrial area would cause an additional on average estimated traffic of around 12,000 plus cars and Lorries. I travel from Walmley to Hams Hall each day for work a journey that should take around 15 minutes. At peak times this can already take over 45 minutes without the additional traffic from any ~new buildings™. Most of the traffic on the A38 is through traffic from areas such as Tamworth and Lichfield of commuters traveling to work in the City centre, along with Lorries traveling to both the M42 and M6 motorways. As previously stated the extent in the plan will make this the road even busier. Traffic is already often at a standstill on the A38, A5127 through Walmley village and Webster Way towards the ~Asda™ island and A4097 which causes problems when emergency services need to get through. The proposal of a ~rapid sprint™ solution, which would be far from rapid along the</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>roads! The plan contains no additional funding for road improvements apart from an entry/exists onto the A38 to gain access to the Industrial area and changes to Minworth (ASDA) Island to increase capacity, which will cause further congestion in surrounding roads. Air and noise pollution will be further impacted by the proposed development with the increase in the traffic. This will have a negative impact on the current Hospitals and Doctors surgeries that are already under pressure due to increased population. The plan contains no additional infrastructure of this nature to cope with the additional 6,000 houses. The plan states that Walmley and Pedimore have "high-order services of good quality". The amenities in this area are already strained with the already expanded population. Walmley village is mainly hairdressers and takeaways, with parking already very limited. There is only one Doctors in the area which is already heavily subscribed. The plan contains not mention of additional facilities. The NHS has been creating the centre on excellence over 3 main hospitals around the Birmingham and as such Good Hope hospital will only be dealing with certain conditions and therefore travel to Heartlands Hospital, Solihull hospital and other cased to The QE Hospital is required for treatment. The green belt land within the proposal is Grade 3 agricutual land and as such the development of this land will remove productive agricultural land some of the last remaining in Birmingham and therefore have a</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>not remaining in Birmingham and therefore have a negative impact and deplete already low natural resources. This area also has a high concentration of sites of archeological interest which over the last 15 years have conveniently been removed from the planning maps. Such areas of historical importance should be preserved for future generations and not destroyed a planning quota that has not been fully realised.</p>			

BDPSA15					<p>I am objecting to the Green Belt still being included in the plan. I commented previously that the plan fails to consider available brownfield sites adequately and this has not changed. In addition, transport infrastructure remains a problem as does school and hospital provision with all being inadequate under the revised plan. Furthermore, the consultation process has been difficult and the opportunity to comment has been restricted by Birmingham City Council.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA14					<p>The addition of so many new households will have a huge impact on local roads that are already overcrowded, particularly in the mornings. Even major routes such as the M42, A38, A5127, A4097 and Heartlands Spine Road will be affected and these are already becoming overloaded due to the Peddimore industrial sites, amongst others. Apart from the traffic, noise and air pollution levels will inevitably rise. My wife and daughter suffer from asthma and it is unacceptable that the City should make changes that will exacerbate such conditions. Walmley village is already busy and does not have capacity for such an increase in demand; the facilities are limited even for the current population. Hospitals, schools and doctors surgeries will also clearly be impacted. A further adverse impact will be felt via Minworth Sewage Plant. This already smells pretty bad it's by no means apparent how they will cope with a dramatic increase in throughput. The existing Green Belt is a fantastic resource enjoyed by many residents and visitors, either consciously or unconsciously. There are many footpaths and interesting historic sites to explore, including a moated houses and furnace / forge site. Geocaches in the area are helping to encourage families to explore and enjoy the area even more than in the past. This 'breathing space' must not be given up.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA11					<p>I am having difficulty understanding the initial figures in this Section (Theme 6). It needs to be explained in a clearer way. I have a Masters degree, so if I do not understand it, I think others will not understand it also. 35% of Managers (etc.) commute into Birmingham, compared with 23% of the city's working residents. It seems to me that can be taken 2 ways: 1 way is 23% of managers live in the city and 35% live outside the City. That would then beg the question of where do the other 42% of manager come from? That can't be what you are saying. The 2nd way is to summarize that the 23% figure quoted is for non-managers [the 23% of the city's working residents]. The next sentence says 49.4% of Birmingham's residents are employed. Again, I cannot make the 2 figure quoted prior: 35% of persons are managers + 23% non-managers = 58% (not the 49.4% quoted of employed residents. It does not add up for me. Perhaps it could be more clearly stated. Thank you.</p>	Detailed comment regarding statistics.	Noted. Detailed comments that do not affect the conclusions of the SA.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA12					<p>Under the theme of sustainable transport there is a comment about easy access to Sutton Station. It is approximately 3 miles from most of this area to Sutton Station, the car park of which is already completely full by 8 am, as are all of the stations along this line. There has been talk about reopening the Sutton Park line, where would the stations be, and accompanying car parking? The A38 and all arterial roads into Birmingham are at gridlock during rush hours already, there appears to be very limited ability to expand the road network to be able to accommodate the volume of traffic which would be generated by the lack of viable public transport. Under the theme of communities it indicates easy access to Walmley village, which is a very small and limited shopping development, with a limited library, and a church hall as the only community facilities. There is one local GP practice in Walmley which is already under extreme pressure, as are all other GP practices in the local area. Good Hope Hospital is already unable to cope with the pressures from the existing local communities of Sutton Coldfield and Tamworth.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
BDPSA18					<p>See attached.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	<p>http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3577967</p>
BDPSA3					<p>It seems short-sighted that Erdington is not considered as a transport growth area when it is: 1. the closest area to Spaghetti Junction - and therefore could link transport around the country if more Warehouse hubs were built in this area. 2. It is a primary area where Polish Migrants have settled and therefore there is a transport strain. 3. Nothing has been done about the rail link through Sutton Park - which sits not used.</p>	<p>Detailed comment regarding Erdington.</p>	<p>Comment does not relate to the SA.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA2					<p>I posted a comment this Morning, but do not see it as registered, so I am trying again. In SA7 there was the statement that car usage in Birmingham is well below the National average [can't remember the exact fgures]. My point is that we have exceedingly steep hills in the centre of Bimringham, of which Newhall Street is just one example. It should be possible to raise the pavements slightly to smooth out the steepnes for pedestrians [to some extent]. There is no necessity, say on Great Charles Street, for the pedestrians to be walking on the same level as the cars - as there is no possibility for a pedestrian to cross the road at any point on the hill anyway. The aim would be top make it easier for pedestrians to get around - reflecting, supporting the lower car ownership than the National average. Work needs to be done to bar cyclists from the pavement areas - on steep hills like this [which are similar near enough to some 1:5 pedestrian hills I have walked up in Cornwall], otherwise serious pedestrian accidents could occur at the bike speeds that could be attained on such steep hills.</p>	Detailed comment regarding steep hills in Birmingham City Centre.	Comment does not relate to the SA.	
BDPSA1					<p>Report says 'Birmingham has a relatively high percentage of households without a car: 38% compared to the English average of 27%. To that end, many people are walking. We have many very steep hills in the city centre - e.g. Newhall street, etc. Priority should be given to tring to find ways to even out some of teh extrem steep-ness of these hills over a long period. Bicycles should be strictly forced off the pavements in these areas where high speeds could result.</p>	Detailed comment regarding steep hills in Birmingham City Centre.	Comment does not relate to the SA.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA32					The inclusion of development on the green belt land should be removed from your plan completely. Unmet housing need should not outweigh harm to the Green Belt. The focus should be, to build a better Birmingham, and develop all other acceptable and available options. i.e Brownfield sites, empty homes, empty factory units on existing industrial estates. Furthermore the current congestion of traffic on the local roads is already impacting on the quality of living in the area, anymore will create gridlock. The facilities for doctors and hospitals will be effected which currently take unreasonable times to get treatment.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA37					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3589767
BDPSA38					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3589825
BDPSA39					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3589880
BDPSA40					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590120
BDPSA41					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590149
BDPSA43					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590219
BDPSA44					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590233

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA45					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590269
BDPSA46					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590308
BDPSA72					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591817
BDPSA73					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591867
BDPSA47					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590452
BDPSA48					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590514
BDPSA50					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590578
BDPSA51					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590599
BDPSA78					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3593727
BDPSA52					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590623
BDPSA80					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3593863

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA81					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3594151
BDPSA53					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590673
BDPSA83					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3597984
BDPSA84					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3597691
BDPSA85					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3595971
BDPSA54					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590679
BDPSA87					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3596489
BDPSA55					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590685
BDPSA56					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590691
BDPSA57					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590810
BDPSA58					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3592726

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA93					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598986
BDPSA59					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590840
BDPSA63					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591115
BDPSA10					The report states that no information has been identified. I wondered whether mention should be made of the fact that more wheelie bins are now in use with a greater instruction on their use. This therefore increases the amount of items being recycled and results in an increase in social and environmental responsibility.	Detailed comment regarding bins.	Comment does not relate to the SA.	
BDPSA9					In comparing areas A to D on the Langley Sustainable Urban Extension the plans do not consider noise and air pollution from Birmingham Airport at all. Area C, which has been put forward as the best site for housing, is directly under Noise Preferential Route P7 (and close to NPR P5 too). No consideration is given of the effect on the people who would be living under these flight paths, the building of a school and other recreational areas too. Areas A and B are not affected. The reason I bring this matter up now is that flight numbers have increased substantially along these routes in the last 18 months, and the problem was not so relevant when the first consultation was released. The comparison between the areas A to D should include this matter.	Detailed comment regarding air and noise pollution from Birmingham Airport.	Not a significant issue in relation to the SA.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA35					<p>My main objection to both the original and revised plans for Langley/Peddimore remains the development of precious Green Belt land. Birmingham City Council have not proven why the current situation is critical enough to destroy this valuable, vital and precious asset. As far as I can see they have made little or no effort to explain why they prefer to destroy the Green Belt rather than develop the many areas of the City which are badly in need of development and/or re-development. Walmley has suffered continuous development over the past 30 years. The population has grown four-fold during that period, so to "DUMP" 6000 houses (10,000 people) on its doorstep is unfair and unjust. I have spoken to many many residents on this subject and not one has agreed with this development. No mention of this opposition is made in the Councils original or revised plans. What is the point of public consultation if the wishes of the vast majority of those affected are to be completely ignored. The traffic situation in and around th area of Walmley Village, Walmley Ash Road and Webster Way is already chronic. There are consistent tail backs, delays and grid-locked roads, especially during the morning and evening rush hours. I am a resident Calder Green (Oak and Ash) estate and many mornings it is difficult to get off the estate and onto the mainroads. The A38, Kingsbury, Tyburn and Eachelhurst roads also suffer from chronic traffic</p>	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					jams and rush hour congestion. The addition of 6000 homes, and thus a further 10,000 cars (approx) will lead to further costly delays. There appears to be no real provision in either the original or revised plans to deal with the extra traffic, save for some minor alterations to existing roundabouts, and the addition of a further junction onto the A38 (which is already a bottleneck when it meets the Minworth island). These problems will be made worse during the construction period which coincides with the construction phase of the HS2 on contiguous road.			
BDPSA64					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591141
BDPSA97					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598314
BDPSA65					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591196
BDPSA99					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598298
BDPSA66					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591203
BDPSA67					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591217

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA102					<p>The area chosen for development (Langley and Peddimore) is entirely unsuitable. The area that has been chosen is next to already densely populated areas (Walmley, New Hall, Falcon Lodge). Traffic flow within the area is congested already and would be catastrophic if this development goes ahead. It already takes about 15 minutes to travel 400 metres at the bottom of Wylde Green Road to get to Walmley Road. This makes the connection between Boldmere, Wylde Green and Maney through to Walmley extremely difficult. In comparison, if travelling in the middle of the night, this distance would take a few seconds. Walmley Road (B4148) is already a queue of traffic all the way through Walmley and onto Springfield Road during busy times. It can take 15 minutes to travel this short distance which should only take 2 minutes. This is a single carriageway road and was built when there were only houses to the West. Since then, massive development has taken place to the East and to the North (New Hall) which has resulted in a massive increase of traffic flow. This area would become a standstill if further houses were built to the East as it is the main access to Walmley shops, Wylde Green, New Hall housing and Walmley housing. It is also the route to Good Hope hospital. Not being able to travel from one part of Sutton Coldfield to another will make residents' lives a real misery and affect their well-being when family and friends are separated</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

further by traffic congestion. I personally travel to see my parents who live in New Hall. It takes me around 7 minutes on a Sunday or in the late evening but it takes me up to 25 minutes during busy times. This would extend even further if 12,000 more cars are using these roads meaning that childcare for my son would be severely impacted. Traffic from the Walmley area which is immediately to the West of the proposed development, uses the A47 Heartlands Spine Road to get to Birmingham. This road is already severely congested during rush hour and getting off this road onto the A452 in order to progress up to the A38 is already a nightmare during rush hour with delays of 20-30 minutes. Although work is being done on the A452 to ease congestion, it is not sufficient as traffic from the A47 has to give way to traffic from the M6 heading northbound on the A452, even with the new slip road. Add 6,000 new houses to this equation and the whole of Castle Vale will come to a complete standstill and traffic from the M6 will be severely affected. Residents from this area also use the A38. Again improvements are being made at the Minworth island near Asda, but these are for current levels of traffic and will not cope with additional traffic from another 12,000 cars. Access to/from the M42 is via the A4097 Kingsbury Road. This is another severely congested area where traffic returning to Sutton Coldfield during rush hour is held up by at least 10-15 minutes. There is not the capacity for

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

least 10-15 minutes. There is not the capacity for another 12,000 cars. A feasibility study for traffic in this area has not been carried out and it is essential that traffic flow is modelled before any development of a considerable number of additional homes is considered. Add to all the above the employment zone and there will be even more cars adding to these extremely congested routes. This is not a sustainable plan. There will obviously also be environmental impacts with noise pollution from traffic, air pollution from traffic at a standstill and the negative effect on health of local people due to exhaust fumes from standstill traffic. The infrastructure within the area cannot cope. Good Hope Hospital have already said they cannot cope with additional demand of 6,000 houses with potentially 20,000 residents and it is already a zero star rated hospital. The hospital is part of a trust with many services being provided by Heartlands hospital which is in Bordesley Green meaning patients already have to travel. Local services such as dentists and doctors surgeries are already at capacity. Schools are already over-subscribed and 6,000 houses could potentially bring 3,000 primary school children and 3,000 secondary school children. That is the equivalent of 5 large primary schools and 2 large secondary schools but this capacity is not included within the plan. Shops are already far too busy with the Asda carpark often 90%+ full and parking in Walmley being very restricted too. The area is already suffering from

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

infrastructure issues since thousands of homes were built on the Oak and Ash estate, Signal Hayes area and Newhall area. No additional infrastructure was provided for any of these apart from a pub. Services in this part of Sutton Coldfield are already stretched to the limit. This development is not sustainable for green infrastructure. The agricultural land that is being removed will remove most of Birmingham's remaining agricultural land. There is no identifiable need for an employment zone in this area. This is therefore a completely unnecessary aspect of the development and a more appropriate location out of town should be found for this. I also wish to add my support to the objections being made by Project Fields and the comments that they have made in their objections to this development.

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA103					<p>A SUE for up to 6,000 can but only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or B. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development can be considered a sustainable development. It is inconceivable that a SUE here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing a quarter of our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance, we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact if this development there should have been more engagement with the community from the very start of the process. Our city council has not respected this.</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA68					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591250
BDPSA69					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591259

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA106					<p>The area chosen for development (Langley and Peddimore) is entirely unsuitable. The area that has been chosen is next to already densely populated areas (Walmley, New Hall, Falcon Lodge). Traffic flow within the area is congested already and would be catastrophic if this development goes ahead. It already takes about 15 minutes to travel 400 metres at the bottom of Wylde Green Road to get to Walmley Road. This makes the connection between Boldmere, Wylde Green and Maney through to Walmley extremely difficult. In comparison, if travelling in the middle of the night, this distance would take a few seconds. Walmley Road (B4148) is already a queue of traffic all the way through Walmley and onto Springfield Road during busy times. It can take 15 minutes to travel this short distance which should only take 2 minutes. This is a single carriageway road and was built when there were only houses to the West. Since then, massive development has taken place to the East and to the North (New Hall) which has resulted in a massive increase of traffic flow. This area would become a standstill if further houses were built to the East as it is the main access to Walmley shops, Wylde Green, New Hall housing and Walmley housing. It is also the route to Good Hope hospital. Not being able to travel from one part of Sutton Coldfield to another will make residents' lives a real misery and affect their well-being when family and friends are separated</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

further by traffic congestion. I personally travel to see my parents who live in New Hall. It takes me around 7 minutes on a Sunday or in the late evening but it takes me up to 25 minutes during busy times. This would extend even further if 12,000 more cars are using these roads meaning that childcare for my son would be severely impacted. Traffic from the Walmley area which is immediately to the West of the proposed development, uses the A47 Heartlands Spine Road to get to Birmingham. This road is already severely congested during rush hour and getting off this road onto the A452 in order to progress up to the A38 is already a nightmare during rush hour with delays of 20-30 minutes. Although work is being done on the A452 to ease congestion, it is not sufficient as traffic from the A47 has to give way to traffic from the M6 heading northbound on the A452, even with the new slip road. Add 6,000 new houses to this equation and the whole of Castle Vale will come to a complete standstill and traffic from the M6 will be severely affected. Residents from this area also use the A38. Again improvements are being made at the Minworth island near Asda, but these are for current levels of traffic and will not cope with additional traffic from another 12,000 cars. Access to/from the M42 is via the A4097 Kingsbury Road. This is another severely congested area where traffic returning to Sutton Coldfield during rush hour is held up by at least 10-15 minutes. There is not the capacity for

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

least 10-15 minutes. There is not the capacity for another 12,000 cars. A feasibility study for traffic in this area has not been carried out and it is essential that traffic flow is modelled before any development of a considerable number of additional homes is considered. Add to all the above the employment zone and there will be even more cars adding to these extremely congested routes. This is not a sustainable plan. There will obviously also be environmental impacts with noise pollution from traffic, air pollution from traffic at a standstill and the negative effect on health of local people due to exhaust fumes from standstill traffic. The infrastructure within the area cannot cope. Good Hope Hospital have already said they cannot cope with additional demand of 6,000 houses with potentially 20,000 residents and it is already a zero star rated hospital. The hospital is part of a trust with many services being provided by Heartlands hospital which is in Bordesley Green meaning patients already have to travel. Local services such as dentists and doctors surgeries are already at capacity. Schools are already over-subscribed and 6,000 houses could potentially bring 3,000 primary school children and 3,000 secondary school children. That is the equivalent of 5 large primary schools and 2 large secondary schools but this capacity is not included within the plan. Shops are already far too busy with the Asda carpark often 90%+ full and parking in Walmley being very restricted too. The area is already suffering from

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

infrastructure issues since thousands of homes were built on the Oak and Ash estate, Signal Hayes area and Newhall area. No additional infrastructure was provided for any of these apart from a pub. Services in this part of Sutton Coldfield are already stretched to the limit. This development is not sustainable for green infrastructure. The agricultural land that is being removed will remove most of Birmingham's remaining agricultural land. There is no identifiable need for an employment zone in this area. This is therefore a completely unnecessary aspect of the development and a more appropriate location out of town should be found for this.

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA107					<p>I object to the continuing inclusion of the Green Belt in the Birmingham Development Plan. There should be a presumption against the inclusion of Green Belt within the Plan and should be removed. Un-met housing need should not outweigh harm to the Green Belt - source NPPF The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. We have so little Green Belt land remaining and removing it in this area will be of significant harm to the Green Belt generally. It will also take agricultural land permanently out of use when land for food is required. How has the large number (6000) of additional houses required been reached. Is the population of Birmingham likely to increase by such an amount - where will these people come from. The countryside in this area is valued and well used and includes footpaths, bridleways as well as the Birmingham to Fazeley Canal. The area also has a rich history with various sites including Peddimore and the nearby villages of Minworth and Curdworth. It is not a low impact area. The existing services will not be able to cope with such a influx of people. The current availability includes local shopping facilities in Walmley and travel is required for shopping to other areas such as Birmingham centre, Sutton Coldfield, Tamworth or even Solihull. The local hospital, Good Hope, is part of a Trust including Heartlands and Solihull. Travel is required to all of them and I do not think they would be able to cope with such a large increase in population. Public transport would need significant increases as would schools and health centres. It would remiss, however, to assume that most people would use public transport. There is the cross city line - Lichfield to Redditch - but this could not cope either in car parking facilities or train room. The surrounding network of roads would not cope with the increase in traffic - likely to be 12,000 vehicles. The suggested alterations to the A38 would not be significant. Once onto the A 38 there would then be the problem of getting to the other roads - eg A4097. The impact on smaller roads such as Ox Leys Road, Wishaw Lane would be great. Getting to the motorway system - M42, M6 or even the Toll Road would be very difficult. On a good day, the roads are currently extremely busy and if there is any problem in the area, accident, breakdown, roadworks, the area becomes one to avoid. Not enough thought has been given to the road svstem</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>enough thought has been given to the road system which will be affected across a wide area. The impact of increasing air and noise pollution would be significant. This would be not only during construction but would also continue with the increase in domestic and commercial traffic. The effect would have a negative impact on the environment. The Council should continue to work with neighbouring councils as well as the West Midlands councils generally to look at all possible land within the connurbation. All empty houses should be bought back into use and all available land developed before considering use of Green Belt. Look at pockets of land eg land in Coleshill Road by the railway bridge in Sutton Coldfield, Eachelhurst Road by the Bagot Inn, Penns Lane near Beech Hill Road and land in other parts of the city eg Balsall Heath where there is a large terrace of erelict housing. There must be many instances of such land and empty houses across the city. There is a large amount of student housing being built and I would hope that houses used by students could be bought back to family use eg Selly Oak or even Perry Barr when the University moves. There should also be a delay of 10 years before even considering use of Green Belt and the housing situation monitored. I consider that if approval is given for use of Green Belt then this will be used first and given precedence over other areas in the city leaving them undeveloped and neglected. Not a good vision for Birmingham.</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

There needs to be a good transport assessment at various times of the day over a period of time to see is exactly what is happening now. More information should be given on the progress the council is making regarding empty houses and land.

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA108					I am a resident in Walmley and living in a very congested area at most times I am worried about the increase in traffic should the development go ahead. There is constant grid lock on the cross roads at Eachelhurst Road, Penns Lane, Walmley Ash Road and Walmley Road. The Road from Asda Minworth is also constantly congested which also causes an increase in traffic leading to the traffic lights at the Eachelhurst Road and Penns Lane cross Roads. The Shrubbery school, Walmley and The Deanery schools also lead to this same area, causing even more congestion. Bishop Walsh school traffic also adds to the congestion on Walmley Road as the road leads to The Deanery school. The sheer volume of traffic is a constant problem which needs to be addressed before adding any other housing To the area.	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA70					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591335
BDPSA71					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591616
BDPSA74					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591870

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA75					<p>I am a resident in Walmley and living in a very congested area at most times I am worried about the increase in traffic should the development go ahead. There is constant grid lock on the cross roads at Eachelhurst Road, Penns Lane, Walmley Ash Road and Walmley Road. The Road from Asda Minworth is also constantly congested which also causes an increase in traffic leading to the traffic lights at the Eachelhurst Road and Penns Lane cross Roads. The Shrubbery school, Walmley and The Deanery schools also lead to this same area, causing even more congestion. Bishop Walsh school traffic also adds to the congestion on Walmley Road as the road leads to The Deanery school. The sheer volume of traffic is a constant problem which needs to be addressed before adding any other housing To the area.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA76					<p>6000 houses will bring a minimum of 9000 cars. The roads in this area are already slow and congested at peak times. I live in a house off Walmley Ash Road - at peak times it is already difficult to turn right towards the A38 - you have to rely on someone giving way. If this goes ahead it will be almost impossible to get out. What about the additional traffic to Asda and the A38? Has anyone actually looked at Webster Way and Walmley Ash during peak times? The roads round the development are are lanes and single carriage way with nothing in the plans to change this. How will they cope with this? What about traffic joining the A446 and trying to travel in the direction of the M42? The A446 is a busy and fast road. You will just get congestion back into the residential areas. BCC have been kind enough to admit there will be more noise and polution so I don't need to comment on that. Public transport in this area is poor, There isn't a train station within walking distance. We have a bus service into Birmingham which is good but it ends at 6.30pm if you want to go into Birmingham for the evening. It does not run regularly enough fro commuters during the day therfor most of the times the buses are almost empty. The services in Sutton are poor. We have no decent theatre and the shopping centre is appaling for an area like this. For shopping the only answer is Birmingham or Solihull. Walmley itself has a poor high street with limited parking. Houses</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA113					<p>I object to the Green Belt still being included in this plan. The significant adverse impacts clearly outweigh any benefits. The Green Belt must be removed from this plan as there are still brownfield sites such as HS2 Washwood Heath available for housing. As stated in the NPPF: "Un-met housing need should not outweigh harm to the Green Belt". The true picture of housing need must be demonstrated and all options must have been exhausted before our precious Green Belt land is built upon. Once the Green belt is used for housing it is lost forever and cannot be turned back to the green state that it is at present. This is the first time I've been made aware of my ability to take part in the consultation process despite the process running from 2012. There are a number of issues relating to this proposal: Transport: Our roads are already running at capacity particularly at peak times. Walmley Road is regularly at a standstill with schools and works traffic. Reddicap Heath Road is a nightmare with parked cars dropping off and picking up Fairfax and John Willmott pupils. With thousands more school children in the proposed development the road network will collapse under the increase in traffic. Walmley Ash Road is congested and almost impassable with traffic to the primary schools. There will be wider impact on the already congested A38 around Tyburn Island and into Birmingham as the new residents try to access jobs in Birmingham City Centre. The impact on the environment will be significant.</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

Centre. The M42 is regualrly congested with stationary traffic during peak (and sometimes off peak) times. Heavy Goods Vehicles accessing Peddimore will also add traffic on to local roads not designed for them. The Plan contains no evidence on how additional traffic will be accommodated on the existing road network. Access to services The local Good Hope Hospital is already overstretched and Heartlands and Solihull Hospitals are difficult to get to now before the additional traffic generated by this development adds to congestion. Walmley does not have a shopping centre or a community centre as such. The facilities on Falcon Lodge estate are limited and designed for the needs of thoase residents. No new infrastructure or amenities were provided when the New Hall Valley and Signal Hayes green belt developments were constructed so how can we expecte the increasingly overstretched services cope with 6,000 more house (12,000+ occupants)? Pollution Vehicles using roads and stuck in traffic queues adversely affect air quality. Increased travelling to services beyond the development will increase the carbon footprint. Also, removal of trees and farmland will reduce their contribution to clean air so there is a double adverse impact on air quality. I cannot see how building on farmalnd can bring benefits to green infrastructure. Green infrastructure is about the very things are this development will remove - food production, healthy soils, fresh air and increased quality of life

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

healthy soils, recreation and increased quality of life.

The development will deplete some of the last remaining agricultural land in Birmingham? There are also implications for the Minworth Sewage Plant with 6,000 additional homes supplying human waste into the sewage system. The smell from the sewage plant is bad enough already. Impact on quality of life. The area has significant cultural associations and the plan reduces the value of historic sites such as Langley Hall and Peddimore Hall. If the plan goes ahead the area will become a building site for many years which will impact on the quality of life for existing residents some of whom (like myself) have lived here for most of my life. I object to this unnecessary erosion of our precious green belt to this development the need for which at this time has not been clearly demonstrated.

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA77					<p>I object to the continuing inclusion of the Green Belt in the Birmingham Development Plan. There should be a presumption against the inclusion of Green Belt within the Plan and should be removed. Un-met housing need should not outweigh harm to the Green Belt - source NPPF The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. We have so little Green Belt land remaining and removing it in this area will be of significant harm to the Green Belt generally. It will also take agricultural land permanently out of use when land for food is required. How has the large number (6000) of additional houses required been reached. Is the population of Birmingham likely to increase by such an amount - where will these people come from. The countryside in this area is valued and well used and includes footpaths, bridleways as well as the Birmingham to Fazeley Canal. The area also has a rich history with various sites including Peddimore and the nearby villages of Minworth and Curdworth. It is not a low impact area. The existing services will not be able to cope with such a influx of people. The current availability includes local shopping facilities in Walmley and travel is required for shopping to other areas such as Birmingham centre, Sutton Coldfield, Tamworth or even Solihull. The local hospital, Good Hope, is part of a Trust including Heartlands and Solihull. Travel is required to all of them and I do not think they would be able to</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>cope with such a large increase in population. Public transport would need significant increases as would schools and health centres. It would remiss, however, to assume that most people would use public transport. There is the cross city line - Lichfield to Redditch - but this could not cope either in car parking facilities or train room. The surrounding network of roads would not cope with the increase in traffic - likely to be 12,000 vehicles. The suggested alterations to the A38 would not be significant. Once onto the A 38 there would then be the problem of getting to the other roads - eg A4097. The impact on smaller roads such as Ox Leys Road, Wishaw Lane would be great. Getting to the motorway system - M42, M6 or even the Toll Road would be very difficult. On a good day, the roads are currently extremely busy and if there is any problem in the area, accident, breakdown, roadworks, the area becomes one to avoid. Not enough thought has been given to the road system which will be affected across a wide area. The impact of increasing air and noise pollution would be significant. This would be not only during construction but would also continue with the increase in domestic and commercial traffic. The effect would have a negative impact on the environment. The Council should continue to work with neighbouring councils as well as the West Midlands councils generally to look at all possible land within the connurbation. All empty houses should be bought back into use and all available</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>should be bought back into use and an available land developed before considering use of Green Belt. Look at pockets of land eg land in Coleshill Road by the railway bridge in Sutton Coldfield, Eachelhurst Road by the Bagot Inn, Penns Lane near Beech Hill Road and land in other parts of the city eg Balsall Heath where there is a large terrace of erelict housing. There must be many instances of such land and empty houses across the city.</p> <p>There is a large amount of student housing being built and I would hope that houses used by students could be bought back to family use eg Selly Oak or even Perry Barr when the University moves. There should also be a delay of 10 years before even considering use of Green Belt and the housing situation monitored. I consider that if approval is given for use of Green Belt then this will be used first and given precedence over other areas in the city leaving them undeveloped and neglected. Not a good vision for Birmingham.</p> <p>There needs to be a good transport assessment at various times of the day over a period of time to see is exactly what is happening now. More information should be given on the progress the council is making regarding empty houses and land.</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA115					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599410
BDPSA79					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3593782
BDPSA117					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599534
BDPSA118					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599586
BDPSA119					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599605

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA120					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599613
BDPSA82					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598013
BDPSA86					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3596502
BDPSA123					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599716
BDPSA124					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599722
BDPSA89					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598940
BDPSA126					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599735
BDPSA90					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598921
BDPSA128					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599765
BDPSA91					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598863
BDPSA130					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599820

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA131					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599834
BDPSA92					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598411
BDPSA133					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599846
BDPSA94					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598372
BDPSA135					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3600322
BDPSA60					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3590865
BDPSA61					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3592731
BDPSA62					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3591063
BDPSA96					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598321

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA140					Although we object to the general idea of building development in the Green Belt, when brownfield sites remain vacant and when the Empty Homes Policy remains unfulfilled, we do support the sustainable transport proposals: in particular we wish to encourage the developers to include charging points for electric vehicles, with solar canopies and battery storage; plus the establishment of regular bus services and the opening of stations on the rail line that crosses Sutton Park and runs through Walmley (after all the cross city line through Sutton is a good service).	Green Belt development is unsustainable.	Noted. Detailed comments that do not affect the conclusions of the SA.	
BDPSA98					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598302
BDPSA143					I object to the Langley SUE development of up to 6,000 houses. The development will have a negative impact and put pressure on the existing infrastructure. I believe there are more suitable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. I have great concerns about the affect on the road network not just in the vicinity but also the impact on the roads further afield e.g. the A38 , M42, A5127, A4097 and Heartlands Spine Road. This is not the right location for a SUE and there will be many negative consequences including the loss of precious agricultural land if the development goes ahead. I have found the consultation process very difficult to comprehend. I am sure that many people would feel excluded and unable to make their views known. I would also like to mention the timing of the consultation which began in the last two weeks of the school holidays meaning that many people away from home would have a reduced consultation time. BCC surely realised the timing was not ideal.	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA100					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598272
BDPSA101					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598247
BDPSA104					<p>A SUE for up to 6,000 can but only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or B. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development cant be considered a sustainable development. It is inconceivable that a SUE here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing a quarter of our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries.Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance, we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact if this development there should have been more engagement with the community from the very start of the process. Our city council has not respected this.</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

BDPSA105					<p>I object to the continuing inclusion of the Green Belt in the Birmingham Development Plan. There should be a presumption against the inclusion of Green Belt within the Plan and should be removed. Un-met housing need should not outweigh harm to the Green Belt - source NPPF The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the surrounding area. We have so little Green Belt land remaining and removing it in this area will be of significant harm to the Green Belt generally. It will also take agricultural land permanently out of use when land for food is required. How has the large number (6000) of additional houses required been reached. Is the population of Birmingham likely to increase by such an amount - where will these people come from. The countryside in this area is valued and well used and includes footpaths, bridleways as well as the Birmingham to Fazeley Canal. The area also has a rich history with various sites including Peddimore and the nearby villages of Minworth and Curdworth. It is not a low impact area. The existing services will not be able to cope with such a influx of people. The current availability includes local shopping facilities in Walmley and travel is required for shopping to other areas such as Birmingham centre, Sutton Coldfield, Tamworth or even Solihull. The local hospital, Good Hope, is part of a Trust including Heartlands and Solihull. Travel is required to all of them and I do not think they would be able to</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
----------	--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>cope with such a large increase in population. Public transport would need significant increases as would schools and health centres. It would remiss, however, to assume that most people would use public transport. There is the cross city line - Lichfield to Redditch - but this could not cope either in car parking facilities or train room. The surrounding network of roads would not cope with the increase in traffic - likely to be 12,000 vehicles. The suggested alterations to the A38 would not be significant. Once onto the A 38 there would then be the problem of getting to the other roads - eg A4097. The impact on smaller roads such as Ox Leys Road, Wishaw Lane would be great. Getting to the motorway system - M42, M6 or even the Toll Road would be very difficult. On a good day, the roads are currently extremely busy and if there is any problem in the area, accident, breakdown, roadworks, the area becomes one to avoid. Not enough thought has been given to the road system which will be affected across a wide area. The impact of increasing air and noise pollution would be significant. This would be not only during construction but would also continue with the increase in domestic and commercial traffic. The effect would have a negative impact on the environment. The Council should continue to work with neighbouring councils as well as the West Midlands councils generally to look at all possible land within the connurbation. All empty houses should be bought back into use and all available</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>should be bought back into use and an available land developed before considering use of Green Belt. Look at pockets of land eg land in Coleshill Road by the railway bridge in Sutton Coldfield, Eachelhurst Road by the Bagot Inn, Penns Lane near Beech Hill Road and land in other parts of the city eg Balsall Heath where there is a large terrace of erelict housing. There must be many instances of such land and empty houses across the city. There is a large amount of student housing being built and I would hope that houses used by students could be bought back to family use eg Selly Oak or even Perry Barr when the University moves. There should also be a delay of 10 years before even considering use of Green Belt and the housing situation monitored. I consider that if approval is given for use of Green Belt then this will be used first and given precedence over other areas in the city leaving them undeveloped and neglected. Not a good vision for Birmingham. There needs to be a good transport assessment at various times of the day over a period of time to see is exactly what is happening now. More information should be given on the progress the council is making regarding empty houses and land.</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA109					<p>My main objection to both the original and revised plans for Langley/Peddimore remains the development of precious Green Belt land. Birmingham City Council have not proven why the current situation is critical enough to destroy this valuable, vital and precious asset. As far as I can see they have made little or no effort to explain why they prefer to destroy the Green Belt rather than develop the many areas of the City which are badly in need of development and/or re-development. Walmley has suffered continuous development over the past 30 years. The population has grown four-fold during that period, so to "DUMP" 6000 houses (10,000 people) on its doorstep is unfair and unjust. The traffic situation in and around th area of Walmley Village, Walmley Ash Road and Webster Way is already chronic. There are consistent tail backs, delays and grid-locked roads, especially during the morning and evening rush hours. I am a resident Calder Green (Oak and Ash) estate and many mornings it is difficult to get off the estate and onto the mainroads. The A38, Kingsbury, Tyburn and Eachelhurst roads alsosuffer from chronic traffic jams and rush hour congestion. The addition of 6000 homes, and thus a further 10,000 cars (approx) will lead to further costly delays. There appears to be no real provision in either the original or revised plans to deal with the extra traffic, save for some minor alterations to existing roundabouts, and the additoin of a further junction onto the A38 (which is already a bottleneck when it meets the Minworth island</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA110					<p>The assessment of the preferred strategic options to build in Walmley and Preddimore is fundamentally wrong, and as such I would like to raise the following: Such an extensive development would have adverse impact on the surrounding area as the infrastructure surrounding the proposed development is already under pressure. The road infrastructure around the proposed area is already under strain by the volume of traffic that passes through the area on a daily basis. The added addition of a further 5,000 -6,000 housing in the Walmley area along with an extensive industrial area would cause an additional on average estimated traffic of around 12,000 plus cars and Lorries. I travel from Walmley to Birmingham city centre each day for work a journey that should take around 20 minutes. At peak times this can already take over 45 minutes without the additional traffic from any ~new buildings™. Most of the traffic on the A38 is through traffic from areas such as Tamworth and Lichfield of commuters traveling to work in the City centre, along with Lorries traveling to both the M42 and M6 motorways. As previously stated the extent in the plan will make this the road even busier. Traffic is already often at a standstill on the A38, A5127 through Walmley village and Webster Way towards the ~Asda™ island and A4097 which causes problems when emergency services need to get through. Air and noise pollution will be further</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>impacted by the proposed development with the increase in the traffic. This will have a negative impact on the current Hospitals and Doctors surgeries that are already under pressure due to increased population. The plan contains no additional infrastructure of this nature to cope with the additional 6,000 houses. The plan states that Walmley and Pedimore have "high-order services of good quality". The amenities in this area are already strained with the already expanded population. Walmley village is mainly hairdressers and takeaways, with parking already very limited. There is only one Doctors surgery in Walmley, which is already heavily subscribed. The plan contains not mention of additional facilities. . The green belt land within the proposal is Grade 3 agricultural land and as such the development of this land will remove productive agricultural land - some of the last remaining in Birmingham and therefore have a negative impact and deplete already low natural resources. This area also has a high concentration of sites of archeological interest which should be preserved for future generations and not destroyed.</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA111					<p>The addition of so many new households will have a huge impact on local roads that are already overcrowded, particularly in the mornings. Even major routes such as the M42, A38, A5127, A4097 and Heartlands Spine Road will be affected and these are already becoming overloaded due to the Peddimore industrial sites, amongst others. Apart from the traffic, noise and air pollution levels will inevitably rise. Walmley village is already busy and does not have capacity for such an increase in demand; the facilities are limited even for the current population. Hospitals, schools and doctors surgeries will also clearly be impacted. A further adverse impact will be felt via Minworth Sewage Plant. This already smells bad it's by no means apparent how they will cope with a dramatic increase in throughput.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
BDPSA112					<p>As a daily commuter on the M42, M6 and A38, I can assure you that the traffic is already very heavy between 7.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. and 4.00 p.m. to 7 p.m. and there is no quick fix for the surrounding infrastructure. So with an additional 6,000 dwellings the situation would deteriorate even further. Major long term changes to the infrastructure are required and there appear to be no detailed plans available for this.</p>	<p>Adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

BDPSA141					<p>I believe the decision to build in Walmley and Peddimore is wrong for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Walmley is a village with the road classification you would expect for a rural environment including lanes of historic note. With the recent housing developments in Newhall and Harvestfields and no change to infrastructure the volume of traffic has increased significantly over recent years. Traffic heading towards and into Birmingham clogs not only the main route into Walmley but also the surrounding road networks including all major roads beyond the village. Traffic from neighbouring towns e.g.Lichfield and Tamworth via the A38, can be stationary for lengthy periods of time. In and around the village side roads become rat runs as city bound traffic attempts to avoid hold ups at traffic lights on the main roads. Traffic calming has been introduced into the centre of Walmley village and this is the most direct route into Birmingham via Spaghetti Junction. How can a traffic calmed route possibly be considered suitable as it will inevitably be used as the main route from Langley Sue into the centre of Birmingham? As a retired person I avoid driving on the local roads until after 9.20 in the morning because of the high volume of traffic. Due to continued heavy traffic I often have to wait some time to move from my drive onto Springfield Road and then can still experience heavy traffic and hold ups in Walmley village. In winter the Oxleys Road becomes impassable on</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

very cold mornings. Hedges result in delayed thawing of frozen lanes. Vehicles are unable to get a grip on the inclined road and can do no more than slide backwards. Additional traffic is then forced to travel via the Asda roundabout to access the motorway network. Further development in this area would only exacerbate an already difficult traffic problem and the plan to bring additional traffic into the area with an employment development at Peddimore promises to bring complete chaos to the area. How can a "Sprint"/Rapid Transit service be deliverable in these traffic and road conditions? In addition to the increased, slow moving traffic air and noise pollution cannot be ignored. There are grave concerns about air pollution brought about by the move to diesel petrol. Respiratory infections are on the increase and it is estimated that many deaths will be the result of unacceptable emissions from vehicles. How does this situation dovetail with the council's 'green' expectation that walking and cycling become the preferred mode of transport? The future generation is being poisoned as they make their way to school or work. Light pollution must also be given consideration. The open fields give access to open skies. This was very evident with the recent total lunar eclipse. The sky at night with star, planetary and lunar activity can be accessed and enjoyed by all. The proposed development would deprive the community of this unique resource. The cycle lane designated to

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

unique resource. The cycle lane designated to Penns Lane is one way. If lucky enough to navigate around cars parked across the pavement and cycling lane without incident there is no way back!!! All cycle lanes should be made safe with the addition of double yellow lines. How serious are BCC about a green environment? The roads just don't have the capacity for cycle lanes where cyclists can feel safe. The drainage on Springfield Road is another cause for great concern. Heavy rainfall converts the road into a river within minutes making it a hazard for drivers and pedestrians alike. I have seen many pedestrians completely drenched as they try to make their way along this hazardous stretch of road. I have seen a manhole cover lifted and supported above ground level on a powerful jet of water from the overstretched drainage system. Walmley shopping facilities are extremely limited. An increased demand on the small run of convenience shops and the lack of parking will only add to the village centre traffic congestion as drivers circle Crawford Avenue, the service road and main road waiting for a free parking space. Walmley cannot cope with the demands that the proposed development would result in. To shop with choice it is recognised that residents have to travel to Tamworth, Solihull or the City Centre these options are not compatible with the 'green' lifestyle being advocated. Doctors' surgeries are working to capacity and the reorganisation of hospitals and resulting centres of

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

excellence all require increased travel to the other side of the city. This is not compatible with a 'green' lifestyle. Schools are working to capacity. Anyone working in education will know that new pupils joining a school can be disruptive to a settled class - imagine the affect of a continuous flow of new pupils on the area's schools and league tables. How will an influx of secondary school children impact on the annual confusion and disarray with secondary school places? In so many ways this proposed development is of the greatest concern. It is not sustainable and will only bring misery to all who live in the area - not just Walmley but all of Sutton Coldfield

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA154					Where I live in Walmley is already chocked with traffic.The roads cannot cope with the traffic we already have. The extra traffic will also impact badly on arterial roads such as M42,A38 and A5127. The local Schools and the Good Hope Hospital will not be able to cope with the influx of people if the houses are built. There is also poor air quality in the area due to all the traffic at the moment,especially the diesel engines Spint bus services will not be of any use as they will just get stuck in the same traffic jams as all the cars. Previous Housing projects such as The Oak and Ash,Signal Hayes and the New hall Valley were all built without any extra infrastructure added at the time. At the moment all the Schools in the affected area have large waiting lists for new pupils every year.They cannot cope all the exting levels. The only Hospital in the area Good Hope is at it's capacity already. It is very difficult to park and it could not cope with a large influx of people of in the area. The Sewage farm which serves the area is Seven Trent sewage works. It is already at capacity and no extra room for expansion.	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA114					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599315
BDPSA156					I am also concerned around the impact to agricultural land in the area. This development will deplete natural resource and will stop productive agriculture on one of the last remaining agricultural lands in Birmingham. This has to be seen as a negative impact.	Object to loss of agricultural land.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA116					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599504
BDPSA121					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599690

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA122					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599708
BDPSA159					<p>The building of homes along the Green Belt of Langley and Peddimore will have a significant negative impact on the infrastructure on the following roads M42, A38 A5127, A4097 and the Heartlands Spine Roads. At present these roads are very congested at peak times and if this planning application is approved I am of the opinion that the roads will be gridlocked during the busy periods of the day. This will add to the air and noise pollution for residents in the Walmley area. It will also impact on the infrastructure such as doctors, schools and hospitals in the area. At present it is very hard to travel in and out of Sutton Coldfield at peak times now so how are we expected to cope with the situation after these houses are built. The development of large stores at Castle Vale, Chester Road (Sainsbury's Argos Comet etc) proves how the environment is damaged, since the buildings were erected it is constant gridlock along this section of the road and this is not just at peak hours. The addition of cars will increase the CO2 emissions immensely and will significantly reduce the air quality, even Birmingham City Council acknowledges this to be so. There is also a lack of amenities in Walmley for the residents at present let alone any further residents. These 6000 dwellings will impact on the air quality and add to pollution. The land is Agricultural (Grade 3) as such it should not be depleted from the scarce agricultural land that we have. The planning application has not been properly thought out and it appears to be a case of building houses at whatever the cost to the environment and the local residents.</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA125					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599733

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA127					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599752
BDPSA129					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599781
BDPSA132					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599842
BDPSA164					<p>I remain against the proposed redevelopment proposals to the Green Belt around Sutton Coldfield and on particular the Walmley / Peddimore area for a number of reasons which the proposals fail to address. Un Met housing needs should not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The green belt should be REMOVED from the plan and only considered when all brownfield sites are built on. All empty houses should be repopulated as per the Governments policy. The existing plans fail to recognise this. The HS 2 Washwood Heath site should also be developed before the green belt is developed. We have very little green belt left and it should remain protected as I believe at least 6,000 homes across the whole of the city can be delivered without impacting on the infrastructure needs by utilising areas currently in existence within the city without the need to redevelop green belt. The plans fail to provide adequate provision for the increase in cars both now and in the future. The building of 6,000 homes will create 12,000 growing to 24,000 cars as children of parents have no choice but to drive. Roads like Braunstone Close already have too many cars for the size of the roads as household have 3-4 cars. These roads are dangerous for children. The congestion this creates will be all the way into Birmingham and the motorway network. Getting through Walmley anytime of the day is not possible due to the congestion. The plans are therefore</p>	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>negligent and underfunded. Failure to provide additional or widen existing roads will mean the A38 and A452 will be impossible to drive down. They are already. The Asda Island and links around there are already overloaded all weekend and through our peak times during the week. The A452 to the motorway is already heavily congested the additional cars will make links onto the m M6 and M42 impossible. It will lead to more accidents so creating additional problems on all the roads and the associated tailbacks will cause. It will be miserable for the residents. Poor communication and increased commuter and general business traffic will act as a disincentive to attract additional investment into the city, making places like Manchester more attractive. Grand Central will become a white elephant. There is a serious health risk to those living on the area and an increase in cancer rates. This can only be due to the pollution of cars driving slowly. Air quality along the M42 was improved when the stop start traffic was removed by the controlled motorway. Walmley has the same air quality problem with the volume of stop start traffic. It should be pedestrianised. The plan fails to address this issue.</p> <p>If the planning authority approve a housing development on green belt failing to address the congestion and the air quality issues knowing that they lead to cancer and other illnesses then the council could be responsible for creating a health problem. Currently the 115 bus has been removed</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>problem. currently the 119 bus has been removed reducing the public transport to links to Aston and then Birmingham, making it more difficult to move away from the car. The car industry is the major employer in the City and the plan seems to discourage car ownership this seems nonsense There is no provision for a tram line direct into the City Centre, and there is no provision for a train station on the hearty of this new town. There is no certainty the train station in Walmley would ever be opened and nowhere for the cars to park or adequate provision for busses. The existing resources are already overstretched such as Walmley Doctors surgery and Good hope hospital. The schools are already overcrowded and new provision will be needed at all age levels.</p>			
BDPSA165					<p>When you look are the proposal I cannot see this being advantageous to the areas which significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Being involved with the flow of products within manufacturing industry I would like to clearly understand how a Walmley and Peddimore with additional 6,000 new dwelling, with no additional facilities can function in an acceptable and harmonious manner. If you assume 6,000 new dwelling, which you are going to have at least 18,000 extra people, 8,000 more cars. How can the village cope with this extra stress with the additional stress on M/A/B roads, schools, hospital, doctors surgery, shops, etc. When travelling around the Midlands I see significant amount of disused/brown field land on the outside of Birmingham boundary which can be used for urban extension, before developing on green field land. It is shame there is no œout of the box or creative thinking@Just because a proposal is easy to implement it may not be the correct approach for long term future of the village and region.</p>	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA134					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3600311
BDPSA136					<p>I wish to object to the decision for plans to build in Walmley and Peddimore. The assessment that this is a suitable area for a massive housing and industrial project are wrong and I outline several major factors that have not been considered seriously and will wholly impact on the community in a negative manner. Firstly the transport and accessibility to facilities will be greatly compromised with a huge population increase in the area. Good Hope Hospital is already understaffed and under resourced, shipping speciality care out to other services such as Solihull. With more people accessing services this will greatly impact on an already strained NHS in the area. GP practices and dental practices in Walmley are also scarce thus could not support additional populations. The main access routes to Walmley consist of many narrow single lane roads and the impact of more around 12,000 extra vehicles will bring Walmley and the surrounding suburbs to a standstill. Essentially there is already a bottleneck through the high street which is at a standstill majority of the day. Rush hour is particularly horrendous and will not get any better. For people who need to travel into the City centre and already rely on public transport this will impact severely. The bus services that serve Springfield Road are so infrequent, could not cope with the additional population. Overall the infrastructure of Walmley is insufficient. Air quality is already one of the worst in the country with the</p>	Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA95					<p>sewage works a few miles away and the associated illnesses this contributes to. Air pollution with the additional traffic will further be compromised. The project will not only have a negative impact on small roads but also on the major links to Birmingham and the surrounding area.. The M42, A38, A5127, and A4097. This will cause additional congestion. Removal of grade 3 agricultural land, the last in Birmingham is a terrible decision to make and leaves nothing for future generations. Children in Birmingham are already missing out on so many advantages to access to green space and striving on inter city life. I believe the removal of land and building of more housing will lead to increasing crime and anti social behaviour, something Birmingham is already renowned for nationally. Education facilities in and around Walmley will not cope with the further influx of families and current education standards in schools will be compromised. Finally I want to mention the landscape. The council believe that Walmley and Peddimore offer low landscape impact. I think this is a disgusting comment to make. The land in Walmley is one of the last remaining in Birmingham and should be recognised as a beauty spot. The Green belt should be protected, what else do we have to offer the future generations?</p>	Green belt development is unsustainable.	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	<p>http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3598323</p>

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA137					<p>I object to the decision to build in Walmley and Peddimore. The development will have a negative impact on Walmley and the surrounding area. Transport arond Walmley will not cope with the curret infrastructue of the roads in Walmley and this will have a negative effect on surroundig major transport links, the A38 and M42. Air quality and air pollution will also suffer. 12,000 extra cars will bring traffic to a standstill, and the roads throug Walmley are aledy suffering from congestion. I am also concerned about the strain on amenities in Walmley with an additonal 6000 households. GPs hospitals which are already strained will not be able to cope.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
BDPSA171					<p>The building on Walmley and Peddimore is wrong. There is no good reason to build on the green belt while there are still other brownfield sites. The congestion on the surrounding areas is quite ridiculous at all times of day but especially at peak times. Living by the Asda Minworth island and the A38 a 20 minute journey can easily become an hour long. Thats before the proposed plans. Building 6000 homes will increase traffic by 12000 cars plus many more HGV's. The HGV's already hold up traffic when they have made a wrong turn onto Minworth, something that happens daily. I myself have seen a lorry reversing back onto the island and this with an increase of traffic will make the area extremely dangerous. Residents will be forced to drive everywhere meaning even more cars on the road leading to more pollution. It creates so much pollution as it is at the moment that we dont have our windows open living so close by. Thats not even mentioning the noise pollution from living next to the island. The increase in residents will not be able to be met by the local doctors where its already near impossible to get an appointment, as well as Good hope hospital and the local schools where residents already can't get their child into their first choice of infant school. It really isnt fair on anyone already living here to build so many houses within such a small area. The area will not be able to cope with this increase. And the enviroment will be severely effected.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

BDPSA142					<p>Local roads would be unable to cope with an additional 6000 houses. There are already problems with traffic congestion at the moment. At the commuter rush-hour there are long queues of traffic on Walmley Road/Eachelhurst Road through Walmley Village, and also on Webster Way/Walmley Ash Road. Additional housing would simply exacerbate these problems. The Green Belt is not just pretty countryside for local residents to enjoy (although this is important), it is also productive agricultural land. This farmland has been under continuous cultivation for hundreds of years, and once it is built on it will be lost forever. It cannot be sustainable to remove productive farmland at a time when Britain has to import 30% of its food. The loss of farmland and the additional traffic from new housing would lead to a deterioration in air quality which would be bad for wildlife and for local residents. Overall, there would be a significant negative impact on quality of life for current residents.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, loss of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA144					<p>6000 homes would equate to around 12000 cars in an already congested area of Walmley and Peddimore, short journies can already take in excess of 15-20mins on the Walley Rd and Thimble End Rd. This traffic is ultimately trying to get onto the surrounding A5127, A4097, M42, A38 and Heartlands spine roads. There is no talk of improving the roads other than an entry/exit onto the A38. There is already a lack of amenities in and around Walmley with schools and doctors over subscribed. Proximty to services is an issue in Walmey aready as we have no access to a local shopping centre and the hospitals are spread over three sites Good Hope/Heartlands and Solihull. When the green belt was last used in Sutton 20 years ago no new provisions were provided. There is now talk of an additional 6000 homes and still no mention of extra provisoions of schools, doctors, dentists, hosptial places and road building. Walmley is not even served by a train station that could reduce traffic congestion. Air/Noise pollution will also be an issue with an additional 12000 vehicles moving around the area. The land around Walmley is agricultural and if used for building will remove productive agricultural land that is the last in Birmingham.</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA145					<p>A38 DUAL CARRIAGEWAY WILL BECOME A BERLIN WALL Building on the land at Area C at Walmley will completely remove all accessible/viewable countryside from residents in Sutton Coldfield, Walmley and parts of Erdington, because the A38 will become a barrier preventing anyone seeing countryside ever again in this area. The A38 will be be like a Berlin wall or perhaps a Berlin ditch. We must not build on this last available open land as we are unable to access the land on the other side of the A38. We don't want to be closed in.</p> <p>REFERENDUM SHOULD BE HELD The proposals to build 6,000+ homes (for 15,000 people) will have such a significant effect on Sutton Coldfield, Walmley and Wylde Green that we should be entitled to a referendum. Where is "localism" here? Residents' concerns are being completely ignored by Birmingham City Council. Why are we not having any input? A referendum should be held. Where is "localism" in action here?. CONFLICT OF INTEREST</p> <p>With regard to the land at Peddimore it is my understanding that the land is owned by Birmingham City Council. It is a conflict of interest for the Council to be involved in the proposals for Peddimore and Area C. I cannot see that we have been properly informed about this. If the Council does own the land then they have a duty to act in the best interests of the people, i.e. the Council tax payers and residents of Sutton, Walmley and Wylde Green, as effectively these people own the land. The Council should be acting as our servants not as our oppressors . The Council will make huge profits from any land sale, but how are we to benefit from this?</p>	Comment regarding impact of development on the A38.	Noted. Detailed comments that do not affect the conclusions of the SA.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA146					<p>I wish to object in the strongest terms to the proposed industrialisation of Peddimore. Over the last 20 years Minworth village has become increasingly surrounded by significant industrialisation and enough is enough. The local Infrastructure already struggles to cope with the existing huge volume of traffic and further development would only make things even worse. In my view, the wide ranging objections that were advanced in the 1990s remain valid. Our green belt is precious and should be protected, it is there for a reason and the council should more fully explore alternative sites before going for easy pickings at Peddimore.</p>	Green Belt development at Peddimore is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA147					<p>I am objecting strongly at the use of green belt still being included in this plan. At present there is no reason or excuse for the destruction of green belt land which would impact so adversely on the environment. The benefits and importance of green belt land significantly and clearly outweigh the benefits of development , "unmet housing should not outweigh harm to the green belt" Source: NPPF All brown field sites should be identified and used first including all surplus brown field public sector land and brown field sites outside Birmingham's boundaries. All empty houses exhausted as per "Policy May 2010-2015 government policy : house building" Currently 45,000 houses are being made available. When this supply has been delivered research needs to be done to discover the true picture of housing need. There is also the HS2 Washwood Heath site which could be used first before using Peddimore. Only when all alternative options have been exhausted and the true picture of housing need realised should a review be undertaken to consider the use of green belt land. Once it's gone it's gone and the adverse impacts incalculable. The use of green belt land should be absolutely the last resort. As a separate issue I think that the whole consultation process has been very difficult. I am quite sure that a lot of people who object just as strongly as me will have been put off either because they did not know how to object or they were not consulted. I</p>	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

					strongly suspect that most people do not know what is going on and will not until the developers move in when it will be too late. The process needs revising so that everybody in relevent areas is fully informed in writing.			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

BDPSA148					<p>I wish to object against the decision that the preferred strategic option is to build in Walmley and Peddimore for the following reasons: This development would have a very negative impact on the local roads; specifically the M42, A38, A5127, A4097 and Heartlands Spine Road. I work in Walmley and traffic queues around Walmley Road and Fox Hollies Road at peak times are often miles long. A journey from home to Walmley, which is a matter of only 2.5 miles would normally take around 6 minutes; however at peak times this journey increases to as much as 20 minutes. The addition of another 12,000 cars in the locality would only make the traffic problems significantly worse. The additional traffic that development in this area would attract would impact greatly on air and noise pollution. There are a huge number of adults and children already suffering from asthma and other respiratory diseases whose quality of life would be greatly reduced by increased air pollution and numbers of sufferers would also potentially increase. Doctors' surgeries are at capacity; it is already often difficult to book appointments. Hospital services are spread over three centres of excellence, hence residents in the locality have to travel to Heartlands and Solihull, as well as Good Hope, for treatment - again leading to an increase in private transport to these other hospitals, causing an increase in the carbon footprint. Schools in Walmley are very oversubscribed and would most</p>	<p>Green Belt development at Langley is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure, such as hospitals and schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

certainly be unable to offer places for the number of additional children in 6000 new homes. There have been no new schools in the area since the Oak and Ash, Signal Hayes and Newhall estates were built. Traffic congestion around local schools is already an ongoing issue; the increase in population that additional housing would bring would only add to the dangers near schools, with more children and more cars. Walmley 'village' has few services and amenities for the local community. There is no high street, shopping centre or proper community centre. How would the infrastructure cope with the building of an extra 6000 homes? Local residents are already forced to travel to Tamworth, Birmingham or Solihull to have a good choice of shops. The green belt land is agricultural land and by building on it natural resources will be depleted. There is a wealth of history in the area, which would be diminished by the building of the new homes. The outlook would that of a building site for the next 15 years, significantly impacting on roads, many of which are already in a poor state of repair, due to the increased volume in heavy goods and construction vehicles. I strongly urge you to reconsider building on green belt land in Sutton Coldfield.

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA151					<p>The existing transport infrastructure has not been considered including the impact currently that the closing of one major road has on the overall area. Twice during the weekend 11th October the A38 has been closed and this has resulted in journey times more than doubling. All those cars and lorries and polluting the area for twice as long as normal effecting the health of all residents. This would be increased further by the proposed development when NO real infrastructure changes and impact have been considered. Public transport in the area and to surrounding towns is already struggling to provide a reliable service. The 110 bus to/from Sutton Coldfield/Tamworth is regularly 10-20 minutes later due to the amount of traffic on what should be a 30 minute journey. Further cars and lorries will only increase this impact so that the area becomes increasingly grid locked which will make it less attractive for people to live in the area and result in many of the 6000 houses being unoccupied. The loss of irreplaceable green belt should be a last resort after all other considerations have been considered.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA149					<p>This development is unsustainable. The roads are already gridlocked at most times of day. The additional traffic (realistic estimate 12000 extra cars) will be unimaginable, as well as the air and noise pollution caused by all the extra traffic. Walmley road is blocked whatever time of day and the proposed "sprint/rapid" solution is ironic as the last thing it will be is rapid. There is very little proposed improvements in the plan to address these problems. We have very little in the way of services in Walmley. We don't have a high street a shopping centre or community centre. The hospital and schools are bursting. We just don't have the infrastructure to deal with an additional 6000 homes containing a possible 20000 extra people in Walmley. The whole plan is totally ignoring the wellbeing of us, the existing residents, of Walmley. Surely our feelings should be priority, as we're the ones who will have to live with the consequences of this ill conceived plan.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA152					<p>I object to the proposed development of the Green Belt land around Walmley and Peddimore. The inevitable increase of cars in the area (upward of 10,000) will have a negative impact on the already crowded roads in the local area, as well as major roads such at the M42, A38, A5127 and A4097. I regularly sit in queues on Walmley Road heading for Walmley village (some tail back to Holy Cross Church) and also on Webster Way and surrounding roads heading for the A38 (resulting in late arrival of my children at school and myself to work). The current roads will not cope with such an influx of traffic. An increase in road traffic will a further negative impact on the already poor air and noise pollution in the area. The ~Sprint/Rapid™ public transport solution will not be able to sprint anywhere, there are too many roads at a standstill at key times of the day. A dedicated cycle network would also be difficult to implement as many of the roads around the Walmley area are too narrow. It is highly unlikely that people would choose to use a bicycle or Sprint/Rapid system. A very low percentage of people would choose to cycle to work, etc. We live in a demanding, selfish and time poor society where the car rules. There will be a negative impact on the already overstretched Good Hope hospital, already full schools will not be able to cater for any further children in the local area, doctors surgeries have their patient lists full and the amenities that Walmley provides will not be able to cope with the further influx of people.</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>able to cope with a further influx of people. No new provisions of infrastructure were made when the last green belt section was built on (Oak and Ash, Signal Hayes & Newhall Valley). How will the area cope with 6,000 new dwellings and no extra infrastructure? How ironic that the council believe that the development will bring benefits with respect to green infrastructure. In destroying the Green Belt they are taking away the already existing green infrastructure of food production, better air quality, clean water and healthy soils and the social, economic and environmental health of the surroundings. Natural resources and productive agricultural land (some of the last remaining in Birmingham) will be lost. Our environmental health will not be improved by 6,000 houses and 12,000 cars. The landscape surrounding Walmley and Peddimore is of great value. The Peddimore site is surrounded by historic lanes which must be preserved. During the 1980s, I would often visit my friend's family who lived and farmed at Peddimore Hall. It was a quiet and peaceful place with uninterrupted views of the land they farmed. This would be lost for many other people if the development is permitted The open site is of outstanding beauty for that very fact. Seasonal changes bring fields full of poppies, yellow rape and golden corn. The scenes of birds circling and following the plough can all be observed and enjoyed on this exceptional site. We will be depriving future generations of these uplifting</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					depriving future generations of these uplifting scenes. My children love to see how the surrounding fields change from season to season, and year to year; discussing with us how farming works and learning where their food comes from. These experiences will be lost for their children if the Green Belt is lost to housing development. Scenes like these feed and uplift the mind and soul. It is important to consider the recognised link between mental and physical health. The development of Green Belt land around Walmley and Peddimore should be removed from the plan.			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA153					<p>I object to the proposed development of the Green Belt land around Walmley and Peddimore. The inevitable increase of cars in the area (upward of 10,000) will have a negative impact on the already crowded roads in the local area, as well as major roads such at the M42, A38, A5127 and A4097. The surrounding network of roads would not cope with the increase in traffic - likely to be 12,000 vehicles. The suggested alterations to the A38 would not be significant. Once onto the A 38 there would then be the problem of getting to the other roads - eg A4097. The impact on smaller roads such as Ox Leys Road, Wishaw Lane would be great. Getting to the motorway system - M42, M6 or even the Toll Road would be very difficult. On a good day, the roads are currently extremely busy and if there is any problem in the area, accident, breakdown, roadworks, the area becomes one to avoid. Not enough thought has been given to the road system which will be affected across a wide area. An increase in road traffic will a further negative impact on the already poor air and noise pollution in the area. The "Sprint/Rapid"™ public transport solution will not be able to sprint anywhere, there are too many roads at a standstill at key times of the day. A dedicated cycle network would also be difficult to implement as many of the roads around the Walmley area are too narrow. It is highly unlikely that people would choose to use a bicycle or Sprint/Rapid system. A very low percentage of</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

people would choose to cycle to work, etc. We live in a demanding, selfish and time poor society where the car rules. There will be a negative impact on the already overstretched Good Hope hospital, already full schools will not be able to cater for any further children in the local area, doctors surgeries have their patient lists full and the amenities that Walmley provides will not be able to cope with a further influx of people. No new provisions of infrastructure were made when the last green belt section was built on (Oak and Ash, Signal Hayes & Newhall Valley). How will the area cope with 6,000 new dwellings and no extra infrastructure? How ironic that the council believe that the development will bring benefits with respect to green infrastructure. In destroying the Green Belt they are taking away the already existing green infrastructure of food production, better air quality, clean water and healthy soils and the social, economic and environmental health of the surroundings. Natural resources and productive agricultural land (some of the last remaining in Birmingham) will be lost. Our environmental health will not be improved by 6,000 houses and 12,000 cars. The landscape surrounding Walmley and Peddimore is of great value. The Peddimore site is surrounded by historic lanes which must be preserved. During the 1980s, I would often visit my friend's family who lived and farmed at Peddimore Hall. It was a quiet and peaceful place with uninterrupted views of the land they farmed

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>with uninterrupted views of the land they farmed. This would be lost for many other people if the development is permitted The open site is of outstanding beauty for that very fact. Seasonal changes bring fields full of poppies, yellow rape and golden corn. The scenes of birds circling and following the plough can all be observed and enjoyed on this exceptional site. We will be depriving future generations of these uplifting scenes. My children love to see how the surrounding fields change from season to season, and year to year; discussing with us how farming works and learning where their food comes from. These experiences will be lost for their children if the Green Belt is lost to housing development. Scenes like these feed and uplift the mind and soul. It is important to consider the recognised link between mental and physical health. The development of Green Belt land around Walmley and Peddimore should be removed from the plan.</p>			
BDPSA155					<p>The congestion in peak times around Walmley is terrible I cannot find any evidence to show how this will be taken into account if the proposed development goes ahead. In fact it can only become worse. 6,000 new homes on this land will create even more congestion, it can take 15-20 mins to travel though Walmley village now, tihs will get considerably worse and no provision has been made for the local area.</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	
BDPSA185					<p>See attached.</p>	<p>Green belt development is unsustainable.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	<p>http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613987</p>

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA166	Project Fields Project Fields				<p>Response to Revised Sustainability Appraisal (SA) provided by Birmingham City Council for consultation. Reference: Section 5, all (pages 75-86) Appendix A, pages A8 & A9 only Appendix B, all (pages B1-B10) Appendix C, pages C6 - C28 only Appendix D, pages D14 - D16 only Non-Technical Summary, Table Headed "Choice of Options over reasonable alternatives in respect of the SUE and Strategic Employment Sites" on pages viii " ix We make no apologies for the approach and manner of our response to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The following comments are in addition to those made in the examination document on the SA where we: Objected to the scoring when testing the scale of the sustainable urban extension (SUE). Believed that Birmingham City Council has yet to consider all reasonable alternatives in the wider housing market area (HMA). - Any development cannot be considered sustainable due to the fact our city is veering towards urban sprawl. There is already enormous stress on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. - We believe that the planning for an SUE is not just "bad planning" but is based on no planning; the approach has just been about filling in gaps. - We believe that any new development should not be based on the pressure to build houses, but a decision based on how we</p>	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

					<p>can sustain future growth within Birmingham and the wider HMA. Growth based on positive environmental, social and economic sustainable credentials and not one based only on the best-case scenarios of negative sustainable credentials of any of the reasonable alternatives. - The introduction to the SA states the need for a well-planned SUE in the right location. Land has only been considered for the SUE with the city boundaries as it is the only available land as opposed to a well-planned SUE in the right location - With regard to the land in Peddimore, Birmingham City Council own the land and have been actively promoting so it is questionable whether the choice of this sites is based on the right location or is about generating revenue for a cash stripped city council. - Our understanding is that planning policy suggests that councils should seek to meet their housing needs within their HMA before looking elsewhere which the city council has done identifying 45,100 dwellings. But we believe due to the fact there remains a 43,900 shortfall, there is an absence of the identification of reasonable alternatives sites within the totality of the HMA. We find this a surprising omission when there are many sites in the wider HMA which have in fact been promoted for development. - We note that within the SHNS Phase 3 that it defines an SUE as a development proposal which provides at least 500 new homes and a maximum of 5 000. Any proposal</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>new homes and a maximum of 3,000. Any proposal must also be of a scale appropriate to the existing (nucleus) settlement. Any proposals which are larger than 5,000 new homes or were out of proportion to the existing settlement are considered to be new settlements. For clarity, can it be made clear to us whether the assessments in the SA are as a SUE with a view to a long-term settlement which will include Areas A and B? Or have the City Council got a different interpretation of what a SUE is to that of its consultants Peter Brett. I note the very same consultants that were used in the preparation of the Birmingham Development Plan. - Whilst the SHNS Phase 3 report falls short of admitting that building on the green belt is inappropriate, it does, in fact, confirm that the Langley SUE is not developable within the plan period. - This further confirms that at one stage the BDP online document stated that market capacity is 3,000 for the SUE. This was subsequently removed from the plan online. Minutes from a Vesey ward meeting November 13, 2013, David Carter, the then Head of Planning Strategy confirms the site will be for 3,000. The timing of this being after the plan had been agreed by the local cabinet. I have sent these to the Inspectors office for his reference and attached below. - Further supporting our view that the plan to build on the green belt is not about strategic planning but gap filling, the number of dwellings required being misrepresented for</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

					<p>decision making. - We cannot accommodate 43,900 within our city boundaries therefore in 10-15 years™ time when the BCC, or a combined authority, plan for the next local plan, the simple fact is in 2031 it does not matter what the size is of the housing need we will not be able to accommodate it within our city boundaries. This will only be possible if there is a significant volume of brownfield windfall sites or releasing the remaining few hectares of green belt. The shortfall will have to be absorbed into the wider HMA and/or new combined authority. Any decision to deal with the perceived deficit, will, of course, lead to tough and challenging decision™s, not only in the wider HMA but beyond. The SHNS phase 3 confirms this. Our questions to the City Council and Inspector are as follows: Should there be an independent review of brownfield site availability in Birmingham and only when we are satisfied that this has been completed and all options exhausted should we consider œa filling in the gap œplanning approach to fulfilling the housing shortfall? Should Birmingham and the wider HMA be facing these tough and challenging decisions now and not in the future to find sustainable locations? Is their approach, in fact short-sighted? Should we be exploring all sustainable options and the bigger more pressing issue of future growth and long-term need?™- The SHNS Phase 3 confirms our view that œlf new settlements are to be part of the</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>solution beyond the current plan period, local planning authorities should start to identify locations now - A dialogue should be undertaken now with the wider HMA with a view to garden cities, establishing new settlements or a combination of SUE™s which long term can grow into new settlements. These have to be identified now as any new settlements can only be fully established long term, 10-15 years when the infrastructure needs catches up with the development. The BDP SA document also confirms this timeline for the Langley SUE which won™t demonstrate sustainable credentials until at least plan end and so to plan for larger settlements beyond 2031 has to start now. - New settlements are clearly needed now and should be a priority to address all future growth. We will be facing an equal if not significant shortfall of homes within the Birmingham HMA when we come to plan for beyond 2031. The CLG 2012 household projections are readily available providing official HRR™s for the next 25 years, therefore the local authority has sufficient information to forecast potential growth. - We should not be encouraging inappropriate development which will render our city at capacity and start to see Birmingham merge into surrounding towns and cities. We should be planning to ensure swathes of open space and strategic gaps exist to ensure our cities øretain their green lungs. Additional comments to previous examination response on</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

					<p>comments to previous examination response on SA: - As you will see from the many comments from residents it is questionable how many homes can be delivered before the development hits major infrastructure constraints with the need for more capacity in schools, hospitals, train services and high order services. These concerns need to be addressed not by presenting a plan as a fait accompli but by working and listening to their concerns. - EXAM146D outlined that Areas A and B are in fact closer to high order services and transport services yet the appraisal suggests otherwise. A £15million pound retail development in Area A has been overlooked by the BCC in when making their assessments. - We, of course, say this not with the intent to encourage development in Area A or B as we have argued with clarity that any development can now only be deemed inappropriate and has no sustainable credentials. But we highlight this as it is very clear the information to rate sustainability credentials between the strategic options has been based on missing and incorrect information. - The development is in the heart of Area A with very close links to Area B. It will be ~anchored™ by a Marks and Spencer Food store and Boots chemists. The scheme will create 60,000 sq. ft. of new retail space on a three-acre site. Both these services and a residential development in Area A are close to train links of Four Oaks Station and Butlers Lane as this area in on the train line. The areas are close to</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>important road networks and have access to the entry-exit points of the toll road. It is close to the ceto be expansion of light industrial units by the M6 toll road - The SA has not considered the environmental or transport issues on an already established community living next to a construction site which is as the SUE is deliverable beyond end of plan it will be a construction site for 15 years. -</p> <p>The infrastructure delivery schedule has not considered how construction traffic will enter /exit either location to minimise the impact on the surrounding community. Until such times that any proposed new road links we are only aware of one (entry/exit from A38 to Peddimore) are established the construction traffic will have a significant impact on the noise and air quality. - Many comments may have lacked the detailed knowledge of planning speak but they were in fact written as subject matter experts on their knowledge of the area and expected concern and highlighted the enormous pressure this development will bring to their community, whether as a construction site or SUE. Conclusion - Any development of this scope and scale will have no sustainable credentials due to the fact we are a city of urban sprawl. That SUE™s have been considered as they are the quickest development option. The SA is not about appraising a site in the right location, but an SA appraisal on a site in North East Birmingham split into four areas as it is the only land available.</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>Birmingham is at a tipping point. We strongly believe more clarity is now required in how to deal with a situation where a city is verging on capacity, one of urban sprawl. Planning Policy and this local authority assume that a swathe of green belt exists around Birmingham when actually we are veering towards capacity and a city of urban sprawl with no green lungs. The consideration of any of the sites within the SA is only based on the best of what can only be negative impacts. the</p>			
					<p>North East Birmingham split into four areas as it is the only land available. Birmingham is at a "tipping point". We strongly believe more clarity is now required in how to deal with a situation where a city is verging on capacity, one of urban sprawl. Planning Policy and this local authority assume that a swathe of green belt exists around Birmingham when actually we are veering towards capacity and a city of urban sprawl with "no green lungs." The consideration of any of the sites within the SA is only based on the best of what can only be negative impacts.</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA160	Councillor Rob Pocock				The existing infrastructure surrounding the proposed SUE is not adequate to serve the proposed development and cannot be described as 'high order services of good quality'. There is an existing insufficiency that is not adequately appreciated in the proposed infrastructure developments outlined in the 2031 Plan and Sustainability Appraisal. The impact of the infrastructure needed to adequately support the SUE development is not properly or fully considered. The removal of agricultural land will lead to a net loss of 'green infrastructure' notwithstanding the proposals within the SUE. The net effect will not be a net benefit, as suggested by the Appraisal, but an overall net detriment. If the SUE were to be replaced by a separate Garden City development model, then this problem would be more fully overcome.	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA189					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613546

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA161					<p>The decision to build on green belt is fundamentally flawed for numerous reasons: transport: Traffic in and around the Walmley area is heavy throughout the week and gridlocked at rush hour and peak times. Planning to build thousands more houses without any planned investment in the road network is utterly foolish and will lead to massive increases in congestion and pollution. I live just off Springfield Road and have a young family with children at Holy Cross primary school. My youngest daughter has asthma and I worry about the impact of the added pollution from thousands more cars crowding onto the existing roads. I am also concerned at how much longer it will take me to commute to work every morning. I travel through Walmley and already have to queue for 20-30 minutes every morning along Walmley Road, which is busy with commuters and cars on the school run. With more cars and no additional investment in the road network, gridlocked roads will become the norm in Walmley. Local services: services were not improved when the green belt was last built on 20 years ago. Schools are incredibly difficult to get into (I know this from experience as a parent of young children), doctors surgeries are oversubscribed and we have no main high street for shopping. We have around 5 hairdressers, 2 newsagents, 3 fish & chip shops, 2 estate agents, and that's it. We have to travel into Birmingham city centre or out to</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>Tamworth for any main shopping. Hospital services are spread over three centres of excellence which require travel outside Sutton Coldfield (Heartlands, Solihull). Travelling there will be even harder given the increase in traffic with thousands of new houses. In addition, all this travel to hospitals outside the area will be an additional contributor to pollution levels. Green infrastructure: the green belt land proposed for development is grade 3 agricultural land, among the last remaining in Birmingham. Its removal would represent a significant negative impact, depleting natural resources, open space and affecting existing residents. 15 years of building work would significantly impact quality of life and the green environment for local residents. Landscape: I have lived in Walmley all my life, nearly 35 years, and in my time I have seen significant development and removal of green belt areas. It saddens me that those responsible for these proposals think so little of the green belt area that they consider it unimportant to local residents. We value and appreciate the little green belt land that remains: from dog walkers to ramblers to families with children, we all make use of the land and appreciate its presence.</p>			
BDPSA191					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612325

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA162					<p>The assessment which leads you want to build in Walmley/Peddimore is wrong. There is already congestion on the A4097, M42, A38, and A5127, Living next to the Minworth island there are times of the day when the traffic is queuing past our own road and we are unable to get out let alone onto the island. Traffic often backs up from this island going the other way and down Webster way. The air and noise pollution is so high especially making those of us with asthma at risk. How can children play outside in such an environment? The roads around here and the Asda minworth island could not be safer with 12000 more cars on the road and the increase in HGV's. There is no way that local schools (both primary and secondary) and the doctors/Good hope hospital could cope with 6000 more homes and such an increase in residents. Minworth is already surrounded by industrial estates and its unfair to remove the greenbelt and in effect completely destroying the beauty of this area.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA163					<p>This proposed development would have a huge negative impact in and around Walmley and for the local roads. It would also have an adverse impact on the M42, A38, A5127, A4097 and Heartlands Spine Road. The roads in and around Walmley are already terribly congested during rush hour and school times. I have two children who I take to school and it can easily take 20 minutes just to get through Walmley Village from Fox Hollies Road. Fox Hollies Road is often at a standstill all the way back to the junction with Thimble End Road. The alternative route would be Walmley Road, but this queues for even longer, as much as 30 minutes all the way back to (and past) the Holy Cross church. There is no way that this local road network could cope with the proposed increased volume of traffic. Public transport would also be adversely affected, due to the queues. There would be an appalling impact on the environment with increased air and noise pollution, with the extra 12,000 cars expected. The land in question is Grade 3 agricultural land and these proposals would remove this productive agricultural land thus creating a negative impact. It would also deplete precious natural resources, how does Birmingham City Council believe that this will benefit our green infrastructure? It would reduce food production significantly, have a detrimental effect on air quality, and remove our last greenbelt land. This development can only have a negative impact on</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure and loss of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
------------	--	----------------------	------------	----------------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

					<p>existing residents, as we would be living in a building site for 15 years, this would significantly impact adversely on our quality of life. I would also add that local schools are already over subscribed and have long waiting lists and the same goes for doctors surgeries and Good Hope Hospital is already at capacity. There is already a lack of amenities in Walmley to serve the current residents. Walmley does not have a high street or a shopping centre, the local shops have very limited and very congested parking. We already have to travel to shop and would typically go to Solihull for a good selection of shops. The decision to allow development on this Green Belt land is wrong and has not been assessed correctly in my opinion.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA167					<p>A sustainable urban extension for up to 6,000 can but only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or B. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development can't be considered a sustainable development. It is inconceivable that a development of this size here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing a quarter of our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact of this development there should have been more engagement with the community. Our city council has not respected this.</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA168					<p>A sustainable urban extension for up to 6,000 can but only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or B. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development can't be considered a sustainable development. It is inconceivable that a development of this size here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing a quarter of our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact of this development there should have been more engagement with the community. Our city council has not respected this.</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA169					<p>A sustainable urban extension for up to 6,000 can but only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or D. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development can't be considered a sustainable development. There is no viable proposal for upgraded, medical, educational, basic required services or road infrastructure within this plan that enables the expansion in Sutton Coldfields to progress. Roads, hospitals and schools are already at a critical overload point. An additional 6000 houses will not be able to be accommodated by the surrounding infrastructure. It is inconceivable that a development of this size here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact of this development there should have been more engagement with the community. Our city council has not respected this. This consultation is flawed as it cannot be accurately interpreted by the people it affects due to poor explanation & consultation process.</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA170					<p>I object to the addition of housing and industrial area in the Walmley / Sutton Coldfiels areas (A,B,C & D) as it is not a viable option to destroy green belt land when so much brownfield site stands unused within the boundaries of Birmingham. A sustainable urban extension for up to 6,000 homes can will only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or D. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development can't be considered a sustainable development. It is inconceivable that a development of this size here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing a quarter of our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact of this development there should have been more engagement with the community. Our city council has not respected this.</p>	<p>Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.</p>	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA139					<p>These comments relate to the potential transport issues arising from the proposed development of Green Belt land at Walmley. There is no evidence in the plan that shows how the additional traffic can be accommodated. The roads around Walmley, particularly those in and out of Birmingham are extremely congested already. Proposals to create a sprint/rapid service are ludicrous, as given the current conditions, this is just an expression of hope, with what appears to be a lack of research. Has anyone from the Council been to Walmley village in the rush hour. Comments about re-opening the Sutton Park railway line sound good but there is a complete lack of detail. This would require massive investment, so how would this be funded. The proposed development would see an additional 10000 cars in the Walmley area. The only funded change will be an entry/exit onto the A38 and changes at the Minworth island. This will not be sufficient to cope with the increased volume of traffic. These additional vehicles will also increase pollution in the area. As it stands the proposed transport provision is not sustainable. Far more detail is required as to how the roads will cope, what viable alternatives there will be to encourage more use of public transport and how the costs of providing this will be met.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA174					<p>6000 Homes by Birmingham City Councils figure of 1.75 people per home will mean 10,500 more people in Sutton Coldfield without any guarantee of infra-structure improvements in transport, health, education and amenities. Past performance of building in Sutton Coldfield has been slow stragulation of the area by increased population without investment. The preaset plans for building on the Greenbelt should be rejected in favour of developing brownfield sites where hosues are needed and the infrastucture already exists</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA175					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614293
BDPSA201					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610815
BDPSA202					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610804
BDPSA176					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614275
BDPSA177					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614251
BDPSA205					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610547
BDPSA214	Mrs Louise Baudet	Parish Council Clerk		Curdworth Parish Council	See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607697
BDPSA1039		EDEN PROPERTIES			See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681088
BDPSA432					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633732
BDPSA204					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610594

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA255					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA256					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA236					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604909
BDPSA215					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607676
BDPSA506					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638073
BDPSA509					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638112
BDPSA235					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604927
BDPSA203					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610756
BDPSA474					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636294
BDPSA209					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3609433

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA329					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623364
BDPSA194					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612085
BDPSA555					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640660
BDPSA180					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614228
BDPSA347					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614220
BDPSA231					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606360
BDPSA512					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638238
BDPSA513					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638248
BDPSA444					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA348					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614224

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA273					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614505
BDPSA395					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625408
BDPSA515					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638518
BDPSA187					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613546
BDPSA186					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613546
BDPSA445					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA182					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614010
BDPSA450					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA464					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635535
BDPSA479					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636352

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA211					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3609121
BDPSA254					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA233					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3605276
BDPSA291					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3620795
BDPSA298					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622349
BDPSA484					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636444
BDPSA216					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607663
BDPSA491					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637814
BDPSA183					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614010
BDPSA357					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629938

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA514					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638255
BDPSA510					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638114
BDPSA220					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607565
BDPSA333					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625038
BDPSA480					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636368
BDPSA470					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635760
BDPSA259					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA392					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626178
BDPSA516					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638519
BDPSA232					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3605749
BDPSA336					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624931

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA239					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604576
BDPSA327					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623262
BDPSA302					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622413
BDPSA473					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636111
BDPSA269					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601154
BDPSA330					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623371
BDPSA536					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640541
BDPSA386					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627389
BDPSA463					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635512
BDPSA226					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606766

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA421					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627492
BDPSA234					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604963
BDPSA492					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637816
BDPSA247					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA263					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA523					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639278
BDPSA228					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606507
BDPSA178					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614236
BDPSA181					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614104
BDPSA243					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA438					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA210					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3609411
BDPSA451					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634203
BDPSA241					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604233
BDPSA253					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA188					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613546
BDPSA276					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA266					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601154
BDPSA295					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3621244
BDPSA268					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601154

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA296					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3621262
BDPSA381					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627756
BDPSA460					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634812
BDPSA217					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607631
BDPSA258					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA433					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633732
BDPSA280					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA279					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA472					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635795
BDPSA435					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633747

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA434					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633747
BDPSA272					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3600836
BDPSA440					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA461					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634820
BDPSA249					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA494					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA541					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640608
BDPSA498					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA503					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA248					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA486					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636496
BDPSA465					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635636
BDPSA300					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622393
BDPSA301					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622405
BDPSA505					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638066
BDPSA476					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636324
BDPSA489					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637805
BDPSA490					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637811
BDPSA511					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638232
BDPSA430					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625939

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA446					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA448					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA252					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA369					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628486
BDPSA308					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA517					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638528
BDPSA524					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639287
BDPSA456					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634442
BDPSA190					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612350
BDPSA520					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639241

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA299					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622389
BDPSA507					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638084
BDPSA195					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612077
BDPSA439					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA382					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627616
BDPSA419					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627827
BDPSA313					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA359					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629854
BDPSA289					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3620587
BDPSA361					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629800

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA362					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629624
BDPSA385					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627416
BDPSA267					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601154
BDPSA290					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3620793
BDPSA199					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3611035
BDPSA326					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623252
BDPSA271					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601108
BDPSA270					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601108
BDPSA265					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601154
BDPSA264					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601280

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA244					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA245					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA246					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA250					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA251					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA257					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA260					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA261					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA262					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3601393
BDPSA242					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604208

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA240					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604496
BDPSA238					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604796
BDPSA356					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3630135
BDPSA237					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3604898
BDPSA173					<p>I have spent 2 hours filling in comments only to find this site with less than 1/2 hour to comment is this a deliberate attempt to claim people are not interested/ I object to the proposed developments on Green belt land around Walmley & Peddimore as I believe that the consequences have not been carefully considered, Removing Green belt land to provide 6,000 homes & a large industrial estate will cause long term harm to the environment. Birmingham City Council claim to believe that it will bring benefits to the green infrastructure but how can removing agricultural land improve food production, air quality, sustainable energy production, clean water & healthy soils & increased quality of life through recreation in & around towns & cities. They are proposing to put thousands more cars on the roads (that are already gridlocked for much of the day). The existing services are already overstretched. It is almost impossible to get Doctors or Dentists appointments unless in an emergency (I haven't seen my own GP for over 3 years!). It is almost impossible to park at Good Hope now. How are they going to cope with patients from another 6,000 homes. The new proposals will turn Walmley & Peddimore into a building site with traffic problems so bad that no one will want to live or work there. The pollution on Kingsbury road is already contravening the EU regulations it will apply to all the A38 around Minnworth & Walmley too.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA172					<p>A sustainable urban extension for up to 6,000 can but only have a negative impact whether it is put in Areas, A, B, C or B. There is pressure on the current infrastructure and air and pollution without even the consideration of the sustainability credentials of 45,000 additional homes and an urban extension of 6,000 homes. The appraisal has failed to take these current infrastructure pressures into account. More importantly as we are a city of urban sprawl, any new development can't be considered a sustainable development. It is inconceivable that a development of this size here in Sutton Coldfield can ever have positive impacts in terms of the environment, air and pollution as you are removing a quarter of our remaining countryside leaving Birmingham as a city of Urban Sprawl. We believe there are more viable sustainable locations on brownfield sites outside of the city boundaries. Until these have been considered the option to build a sustainable urban extension should be removed from the plan. This consultation, as per previous, has not been accessible. It is very unclear how, without guidance we were expected to interpret the Sustainability appraisal. Due to the scale and impact of this development there should have been more engagement with the community. Our city council has not respected this.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	
BDPSA343					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3630425
BDPSA412					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628421

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA218					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606480
BDPSA229					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606506
BDPSA227					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606756
BDPSA225					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606782
BDPSA224					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606841
BDPSA223					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3606874
BDPSA222					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607076
BDPSA221					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607116
BDPSA219					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3607622
BDPSA213					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3608930

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA212					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3609111
BDPSA208					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3609467
BDPSA207					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3609578
BDPSA206					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610217
BDPSA200					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3610831
BDPSA198					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3611226
BDPSA193					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612089
BDPSA192					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3612132
BDPSA355					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613868
BDPSA354					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613964

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA353					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3613999
BDPSA345					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614048
BDPSA184					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614010
BDPSA346					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614219
BDPSA349					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614226
BDPSA179					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614228
BDPSA274					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614505
BDPSA275					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA277					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA278					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA281					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA282					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA283					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA284					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3615726
BDPSA285					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3618276
BDPSA286					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3619014
BDPSA288					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3619274
BDPSA287					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3619274
BDPSA350					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3619349
BDPSA351					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3619350
BDPSA352					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3619354
BDPSA292					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3621140

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA293					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3621140
BDPSA294					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3621226
BDPSA297					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622247
BDPSA230					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622546
BDPSA335					See Attached	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624950
BDPSA303					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA304					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA305					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA306					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA307					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA309					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA310					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA311					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA312					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622714
BDPSA315					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3622985
BDPSA316					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623008
BDPSA317					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623008
BDPSA318					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623008
BDPSA319					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623053
BDPSA320					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623053
BDPSA321					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623092
BDPSA322					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623092

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA323					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623130
BDPSA324					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623130
BDPSA325					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623130
BDPSA328					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3623360
BDPSA340					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624776
BDPSA339					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624796
BDPSA337					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624874
BDPSA338					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624849
BDPSA334					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3624980
BDPSA332					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625069
BDPSA331					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625140

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA400					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625205
BDPSA399					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625320
BDPSA396					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625408
BDPSA397					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625408
BDPSA398					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625408
BDPSA394					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625571
BDPSA393					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3625586
BDPSA429					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626015
BDPSA428					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626087
BDPSA391					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626364
BDPSA427					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626367

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA426					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626448
BDPSA425					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626504
BDPSA390					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626505
BDPSA424					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626645
BDPSA388					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626648
BDPSA431					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3626826
BDPSA423					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627036
BDPSA387					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627338
BDPSA422					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627440
BDPSA384					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627442
BDPSA383					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627485

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA420					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627725
BDPSA380					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627769
BDPSA379					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627949
BDPSA418					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627966
BDPSA378					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3627973
BDPSA417					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628001
BDPSA416					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628035
BDPSA376					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628075
BDPSA375					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628087
BDPSA372					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628110
BDPSA373					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628110

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA374					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628110
BDPSA415					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628272
BDPSA414					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628331
BDPSA413					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628352
BDPSA411					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628501
BDPSA370					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628486
BDPSA371					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628486
BDPSA410					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628587
BDPSA409					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628605
BDPSA408					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3628991
BDPSA367					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629955

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA365					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629010
BDPSA368					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629010
BDPSA364					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629048
BDPSA406					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629652
BDPSA405					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629673
BDPSA404					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629803
BDPSA403					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629834
BDPSA402					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629863
BDPSA401					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629914
BDPSA366					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3629989
BDPSA363					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3630004

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA360					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3630043
BDPSA358					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3630107
BDPSA436					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633747
BDPSA437					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633747
BDPSA441					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA442					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA443					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA447					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA449					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3633801
BDPSA452					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634227
BDPSA453					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634379

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA454					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634393
BDPSA455					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634409
BDPSA457					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634773
BDPSA458					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634792
BDPSA459					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634800
BDPSA462					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634838
BDPSA466					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635676
BDPSA467					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635719
BDPSA468					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635733
BDPSA469					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635750
BDPSA471					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3635765

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA475					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636317
BDPSA477					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636327
BDPSA478					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636336
BDPSA481					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636390
BDPSA483					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636433
BDPSA485					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636461
BDPSA487					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3636502
BDPSA488					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637700
BDPSA493					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637826
BDPSA495					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA496					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA497					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA499					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA500					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA501					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA502					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3637850
BDPSA504					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638056
BDPSA508					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638104
BDPSA518					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638643
BDPSA533					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638985
BDPSA538					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639139
BDPSA542					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639190

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA543					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639203
BDPSA519					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639231
BDPSA547					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639249
BDPSA521					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639257
BDPSA550					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640426
BDPSA557					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640510
BDPSA531					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640515
BDPSA537					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640563
BDPSA540					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640582
BDPSA551					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640647
BDPSA802					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA951					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658158
BDPSA568					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641047
BDPSA561					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640730
BDPSA983					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660475
BDPSA643					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644420
BDPSA642					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644400
BDPSA838					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA1020					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680652
BDPSA831					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA835					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA607					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642331

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA897					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648923
BDPSA895					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648905
BDPSA566					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640940
BDPSA808					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA605					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642302
BDPSA588					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641789
BDPSA787					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA591					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641858
BDPSA682					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA718					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA733					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA636					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644209
BDPSA896					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648913
BDPSA677					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA875					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648367
BDPSA957					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658406
BDPSA703					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA637					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644219
BDPSA654					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644782
BDPSA1029					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3679922
BDPSA674					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647319
BDPSA656					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3597691

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA597					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642185
BDPSA941					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3655953
BDPSA940					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3655946
BDPSA969					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3614251
BDPSA1012					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648711
BDPSA892					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648711
BDPSA596					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642176
BDPSA639					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644225
BDPSA567					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641038
BDPSA569					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641081
BDPSA1037					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681077

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA103 1					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680900
BDPSA103 2					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680920
BDPSA687					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA920					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654685
BDPSA686					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA544					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640631
BDPSA545					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639208
BDPSA737					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA635					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644193
BDPSA660					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645369
BDPSA624					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642404

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA623					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642371
BDPSA937					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3634442
BDPSA963					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658704
BDPSA679					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA852					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645375
BDPSA886					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648652
BDPSA685					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA900					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648954
BDPSA662					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645993
BDPSA661					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645383
BDPSA901					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648966

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA667					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646891
BDPSA1030					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3679915
BDPSA924					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654756
BDPSA947					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3656942
BDPSA600					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642233
BDPSA666					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646254
BDPSA923					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654748
BDPSA953					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658337
BDPSA981					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3717619

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA88			Mr Colin L F Marriott		<p>34 Heath Croft Road, Sutton Coldfield, Monday 5 th October 2015 West Midlands, B75 6RL. Dear Sirs, OBJECTION TO GREEN BELT INCURSION Please take this letter as my objection to Birmingham Council's proposed plans for incursion into Sutton Coldfield Green Belt as follows:- Maintaining the Environment The Green Belt was established for sensible reasons by people of foresight and was intended to be sacrosanct. This was ostensibly to prevent uncontrolled sprawl. I feel that even though the population of the country is expanding at an alarming rate, destruction of this safeguard of the green belt would surely be a retrograde step. It would be the start of a slippery slope into the eventual creation of a vast faceless area where nobody would choose to live. The situation NOW. Sutton Coldfield and district is over-populated NOW. Traffic jams every day (It can take an hour to motor less that 4 miles). Hospitals fully loaded. (Particularly Good Hope). Patients re-directed to Heartlands or Solihull. (Having to travel through some of the worst traffic in the Midlands to get there). So how can an extra 6000 houses possibly be accommodated? Scheme not viable The proposed Birmingham Council's scheme for 6000 houses would accommodate say 6000 families of 2 adults + children (assuming 2.2 per household). That would soon mean 12000 + 13200 = 25200 persons. If each adult has a motor vehicle we would have initially 12000 extra vehicles on the roads. This is a massive increase in traffic and would be a disaster for the area. I am sure that the Council will be aware of the impact of this increase in traffic and the impact on the environment. I am sure that the Council will be aware of the impact of this increase in traffic and the impact on the environment. I am sure that the Council will be aware of the impact of this increase in traffic and the impact on the environment.</p>	Green Belt development is unsustainable due to adverse impact on air quality, increase in traffic congestion, lack of adequate supporting infrastructure.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>roads locally. In say 20 years time each of the children would want a car. That could mean 12000 + 25200 = 37200 extra cars on the road locally. Taking into account the fact that some of the original adults will have ceased driving, the figure may be modified to say 35000 extra cars on the road in this area by year 2030 due to the scheme. I do not see how this staggering increase could function in this area. Even if it where argued that the above figures are wildly incorrect, (which I would doubt), the result would be a living hell not only in Sutton Coldfield, but in the whole of the north side of Birmingham. Infrastructure required by such a scheme An additional hospital (Or a vastly extended Good Hope “ where is the space “ what about parking?). Additional Schools. What about Further Education? Fire Service, Police, Ambulance, Care homes etc. I understand it is envisaged that some sort of employment facilities should be included such as a large trading estate (Or will the residents be expected to travel through a traffic log-jam into Birmingham?). Alternative ways to provide more homes A railway passenger travelling into Birmingham from Sutton Coldfield can see large tracts of waste land not fit for anything, but which could be made into suitable dwelling areas. The same story is only too obvious to a walker on the the tow paths of Birmingham's historic canals. So here might be a partial answer to the problem. For a more complete solution I agree with those who prefer to look more seriously at the</p>			

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
					<p>with those who prefer to look more seriously at the possible establishment of a dormitory town or village some reasonable distance out from the West Midlands conurbation. This could have a high standard road link to Birmingham and maybe rail. In this situation it may also make sense to revert to the original target of 10000 houses or even more as appropriate. Rather than just another suburb, a new village or town could be expected to develop its own culture and centre of activity in which residents would be taking a serious interest and pride. (As per Sutton Coldfield in days gone by!). I say Birmingham Council should ditch the Green Belt scheme and rethink their strategy. Yours faithfully, John Warren.</p>			
BDPSA966					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3599834
BDPSA965					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3600322
BDPSA880					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648424
BDPSA978					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/2896666
BDPSA918					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638878

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA530					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638960
BDPSA532					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3638976
BDPSA546					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639235
BDPSA522					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639265
BDPSA525					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639301
BDPSA526					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639314
BDPSA527					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639323
BDPSA528					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639336
BDPSA529					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3639341
BDPSA548					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640401
BDPSA549					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640412

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA552					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640427
BDPSA553					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640434
BDPSA554					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640444
BDPSA556					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640505
BDPSA535					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640532
BDPSA558					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640669
BDPSA559					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640696
BDPSA560					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640716
BDPSA562					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640739
BDPSA563					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640831
BDPSA564					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640843

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA565					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3640847
BDPSA570					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641094
BDPSA571					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641111
BDPSA572					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641160
BDPSA573					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641300
BDPSA574					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641483
BDPSA575					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641514
BDPSA576					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641519
BDPSA577					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641527
BDPSA578					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641572
BDPSA579					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641590

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA621					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641603
BDPSA580					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641602
BDPSA581					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641615
BDPSA582					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641622
BDPSA583					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641632
BDPSA584					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641654
BDPSA585					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641661
BDPSA586					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641674
BDPSA587					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641686
BDPSA589					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641825
BDPSA590					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3641844

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA592					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642118
BDPSA593					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642128
BDPSA594					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642162
BDPSA595					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642165
BDPSA598					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642191
BDPSA599					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642196
BDPSA601					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642252
BDPSA602					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642268
BDPSA1027					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642268
BDPSA603					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642282
BDPSA604					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642297

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA606					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642312
BDPSA622					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642338
BDPSA608					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642357
BDPSA609					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642357
BDPSA610					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642357
BDPSA625					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3642849
BDPSA611		Gardender Catkins Garden Services			See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643010
BDPSA626					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643184
BDPSA627					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643197
BDPSA913					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643197
BDPSA628					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643219

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA629					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643376
BDPSA630					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643389
BDPSA631					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643635
BDPSA612					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3643961
BDPSA632					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644130
BDPSA633					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644136
BDPSA634					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644156
BDPSA613					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644197
BDPSA638					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644224
BDPSA614					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644230
BDPSA640					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644244

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA615					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644371
BDPSA641					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644376
BDPSA616					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644393
BDPSA617					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644421
BDPSA644					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644455
BDPSA618					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644503
BDPSA645					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644500
BDPSA646					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644515
BDPSA619					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644684
BDPSA647					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644695
BDPSA620					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644707

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA648					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644704
BDPSA649					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644718
BDPSA650					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644750
BDPSA651					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644757
BDPSA652					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644768
BDPSA653					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644778
BDPSA655					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3644788
BDPSA849					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645305
BDPSA657					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645299
BDPSA850					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645324
BDPSA658					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645323

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA851					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645347
BDPSA659					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645348
BDPSA853					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645409
BDPSA854					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645820
BDPSA855					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645846
BDPSA856					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645866
BDPSA857					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645983
BDPSA858					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3645994
BDPSA663					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646182
BDPSA859					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646187
BDPSA860					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646211

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA664					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646205
BDPSA861					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646220
BDPSA665					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646225
BDPSA862					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646251
BDPSA863					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646256
BDPSA864					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646676
BDPSA668					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3646993
BDPSA669					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647014
BDPSA670					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647034
BDPSA671					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647118
BDPSA865					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647126

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA866					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647144
BDPSA672					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647151
BDPSA867					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647275
BDPSA673					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647276
BDPSA868					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647297
BDPSA869					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647320
BDPSA870					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3647410
BDPSA871					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648286
BDPSA675					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA872					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648295
BDPSA873					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648299

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA676					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA874					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648301
BDPSA678					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA876					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648372
BDPSA877					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648379
BDPSA878					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648389
BDPSA680					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA879					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648413
BDPSA681					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA881					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648509
BDPSA683					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA684					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA882					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648613
BDPSA883					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648636
BDPSA884					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648638
BDPSA885					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648643
BDPSA887					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648668
BDPSA888					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648683
BDPSA889					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648693
BDPSA890					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648700
BDPSA891					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648707
BDPSA688					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA689					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA690					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA893					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648895
BDPSA1013					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648895
BDPSA894					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648900
BDPSA691					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA898					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649020
BDPSA692					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA693					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA899					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648943
BDPSA694					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA902					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649009
BDPSA695					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA696					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA903					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649020
BDPSA697					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA904					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649022
BDPSA905					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649034
BDPSA698					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA906					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649060
BDPSA907					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649077
BDPSA908					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649082

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA699					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA700					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA909					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649114
BDPSA910					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3649622
BDPSA701					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA702					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA704					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA705					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA706					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA707					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA708					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA709					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA710					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA711					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA712					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA713					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA714					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA715					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA716					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA717					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA719					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA720					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA721					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA722					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA723					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA724					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA725					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA726					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA727					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA728					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA729					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA730					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA731					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA732					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA734					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA735					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA736					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA738					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA739					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA740					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA741					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA742					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA743					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA744					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA745					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA746					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA911					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654420
BDPSA747					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA748					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA912					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654429
BDPSA749					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA914					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654542
BDPSA750					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA915					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654551
BDPSA916					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654554

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA917					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654569
BDPSA751					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA752					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA753					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA919					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654639
BDPSA754					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA755					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA921					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654729
BDPSA756					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA757					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA922					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654739

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA758					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA759					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA760					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA761					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA925					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654772
BDPSA762					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA926					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654801
BDPSA927					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654805
BDPSA928					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654806
BDPSA929					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654813
BDPSA930					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654828

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA931					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654842
BDPSA932					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654851
BDPSA933					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654868
BDPSA763					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA764					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA765					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA766					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA767					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA934					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654921
BDPSA768					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA769					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA935					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654968
BDPSA936					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3654985
BDPSA770					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA938					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3655011
BDPSA771					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA772					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA773					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA774					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA775					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA776					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA777					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA778					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA779					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA939					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3655935
BDPSA942					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3655972
BDPSA943					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3656304
BDPSA944					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3656853
BDPSA945					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3656884
BDPSA946					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3656902
BDPSA948					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3656952
BDPSA949					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3657014
BDPSA780					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA781					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA782					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA783					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA784					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA785					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA786					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA788					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA789					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA790					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA791					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA792					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA793					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA794					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA795					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA796					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA797					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA798					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA799					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA800					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA801					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA803					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA804					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA805					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA806					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA807					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA809					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA810					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA811					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA812					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA813					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA814					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA815					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA816					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA950					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658147
BDPSA817					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA818					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA819					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA820					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA821					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA822					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA823					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA824					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA952					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658321
BDPSA825					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA826					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA827					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA954					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658380
BDPSA828					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA829					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA955					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658390
BDPSA830					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA956					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658403
BDPSA958					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658411
BDPSA959					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658421
BDPSA960					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658424

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA832					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA833					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA834					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA961					See attached. See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658626
BDPSA836					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA962					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658635
BDPSA837					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA839					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA840					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA841					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA842					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA843					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA964					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658717
BDPSA844					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA845					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA967					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658738
BDPSA846					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA847					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA848					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA968					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658911
BDPSA970					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658917
BDPSA971					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658923

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA972					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658933
BDPSA973					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658945
BDPSA974					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658990
BDPSA975					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660127
BDPSA976					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660189
BDPSA977					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660225
BDPSA979					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660459
BDPSA980					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660468
BDPSA982					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660473
BDPSA984					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660482
BDPSA985					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660487

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA986					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660617
BDPSA987					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660625
BDPSA988					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3660634
BDPSA989					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661780
BDPSA990					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661791
BDPSA991					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661795
BDPSA992					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661797
BDPSA993					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661813
BDPSA994					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661832
BDPSA995					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661839
BDPSA996					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3658411

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA997					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661875
BDPSA998					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661925
BDPSA999					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3661935
BDPSA1000					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662244
BDPSA1001					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662284
BDPSA1002					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662289
BDPSA1003					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662304
BDPSA1004					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662395
BDPSA1005					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662408
BDPSA1006					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662419
BDPSA1007					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3662423

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA1008					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663739
BDPSA1009					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663763
BDPSA1010					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663780
BDPSA1011					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663826
BDPSA1014					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663835
BDPSA1015					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663843
BDPSA1016					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663859
BDPSA1017					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663862
BDPSA1018					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663872
BDPSA1019					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3663877
BDPSA1028					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3679947

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA102 6					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3679960
BDPSA102 5					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680524
BDPSA102 4					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680536
BDPSA102 3					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680559
BDPSA102 2					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680591
BDPSA102 1					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3680629
BDPSA103 3					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681016
BDPSA103 4					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681037
BDPSA103 5					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681036
BDPSA103 6					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681058
BDPSA103 8					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681078

Comment ID	Full Name (private individual names removed)	Organisation Details	Agent name	Organisation Details	Full Comment	Summary of comment	City Council Response	Web link
BDPSA1040					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681152
BDPSA1041					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681204
BDPSA1042					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681237
BDPSA1043					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681244
BDPSA1044					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3681253
BDPSA1045					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3648294
BDPSA1046					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3719672
BDPSA1047					See attached.	Green belt development is unsustainable.	Comments noted. The SA has been produced in line with a statutory process and confirms that the Council's approach is sustainable.	http://birmingham.objective.co.uk/file/3719672