

Joseph Banin

8th September 2014

Mr Ian Kemp
Programme Officer
Birmingham Development Plan 2031
49 All Saints Place
Bromsgrove
Worcestershire
B61 OAX

Dear Mr Kemp,

I respond to your letter dated 22nd August 2014 in which you allow the facility to add additional comments to those I initially raised. This letter was received by my wife, Susan, but for some reason I did not receive a similar letter, even though I made comments on the plan in the same fashion and at the same time as her. Is it possible to receive confirmation that my additional comments will receive similar attention? For your convenience, this may be done via email to

[REDACTED]

My additional comments are as follows (understandably, my concerns are very similar to my wife's):

My understanding is that almost 6000 comments were posted and registered. Planning Policy is clear in that it must allow communities back into the this process. It is clear to me that this has not happened in this instance in that:

1. None of the comments raised by local residents have been listened to. Statistically, it is unsound that none of these have been taken on board without a predisposition to ignore them.
2. The process was intentionally placed out of reach of many in the community in that it was made too complex in that we were asked to comment on whether this plan was sound or legally compliant instead of asking the community to provide feedback on current

issues or the content of the plan. This input was the general expectation.

Clearly, the principle of local communities having a greater say in where new housing goes has not been applied. Local residents have a real understanding of the area and the effect that a sustainable extension of housing and the introduction of an employment zone will have on it.

It is equally worrying and disappointing that the Council's position has been not to have taken into account our views in any way. I appreciate, however, that the mandate of a Public Enquiry is to remain independent and objective.

I would stress that ours is not a 'NIMBY' attitude and one of real concern that current services and structure are already overstretched.

Loss of our beloved green belt is distressing, this is not the overarching issue at point. It is the disastrous impact that a housing development of this scale will have on the current infrastructure and our local community.

Good Hope hospital, as I understand it, is in current consultation on transferring services to Heartlands, which in itself, not an easy journey. An additional population of circa 10,000 would exacerbate a situation that is already severely disadvantageous. This has not been mentioned in the plan.

In summary, it is of the utmost importance that before we can even contemplate examining the issue of facilities for the SUE, we must ensure that we have the correct infrastructure for our current community.

I look forward for a more positive outcome from the public examination than we have received from our Council.

Your sincerely