

## **Matter D Hearing Statement – Mr Paul Gilmour (186064)**

*In response to the inspectors guidance I do not feel it necessary to rehash my previous representations to address the main issues & question.*

*However, below I set out my additional comments:*

**THURSDAY 23 OCTOBER 2014, PM**

***Matter D: About Birmingham, Vision, Objectives, Strategy and general policies (BDP sections 2 & 3, policies PG2-3)***

*Main issues: Do sections 2 and 3 of the Plan set out a sound basis for its policies and proposals? Are the provisions of policies PG2 and PG3 justified and effective?*

*Questions:*

- 2) *Are policies PG2 and PG3 effectively drafted to achieve their intended purpose and do they provide a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal?*

***No, they do not provide a frame work for considering which is more important density or place making.***

***With a cold reading of this Policy I could suggest that place making to achieve the highest possible standards was important yet as can be seen from Birmingham's responses to the land owners within the Langley SUE it appears subordinate to density.***

***At the new SUE and elsewhere I believe the blanket requirement for 40dph and higher densities elsewhere will drive the design and reduce the effectiveness of this Policy. Good design takes space, good public realm takes more.***