

BIRMINGHAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATION

**MATTER N: EDUCATION, HEALTH, IMPLEMENTATION,
VIABILITY AND MONITORING (BDP POLICIES TP35- 36,
SECTIONS 10 & 11)**

**STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF BIRMINGHAM CITY
COUNCIL**

Main issue: Are the Plan's policies towards education and health justified and effective? Is the implementation of the Plan economically viable? Does the Plan set out effective arrangements for implementing and monitoring the achievement of its policies and proposals?

Issue 1

Are policies TP35 and TP36 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?

- 1.1 These policies deal with education and health. These are both essential services and ensuring that adequate provision is made for both is important in the context of the projected growth in the City's population. This is a particularly immediate issue in relation to education where the young age structure of the City's population already means that there is pressure on school provision in a number of parts of Birmingham.
- 1.2 In the case of health, the transfer of responsibility for public health from the health authorities to local authorities has created an opportunity to 'reconnect' planning and public health, which was originally one of the main drivers for the development of a planned approach to urban growth. There has been extensive liaison with the public health service in the preparation of the Plan and this policy results from that.
- 1.3 The Council considers that both policies are effectively drafted and that they do provide clear guidance on how decision makers should react to development proposals.

Issue 2

Are the arrangements set out in the Implementation section of the Plan likely to be effective in securing the implementation of its policies and proposals?

- 2.1 The Implementation section of the BDP sets out the broad strategy which the City Council will use to deliver the BDP. This is considered to provide a robust framework which allows the City Council to react to a number of scenarios to support the delivery of new development through a range of powers and mechanisms. It largely reflects the range of activities that the City Council already undertakes to enable development.
- 2.2 The specific actions referred to can and have had a big impact in securing development in the City. The City Council works with a wide range of partners to deliver regeneration from both the public and private sectors, including flagship schemes such as Paradise Circus in the City Centre and the regeneration of Longbridge. . The Planning Management service has supported development to come forward, and the City Council has used its compulsory purchase powers where necessary to help implement these schemes.

- 2.3 There has been much success in attracting additional funding to support development, with many project- specific examples referenced in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IMP1). Since the publication of the BDP, the Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership has agreed a Growth Deal with Government which will further support the delivery of proposals within the BDP.
- 2.4 The supporting evidence base for the BDP demonstrates that the policies and proposals have a realistic prospect of delivery. This includes the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (H11 and EXAM6), Site Delivery Plan (IMP2 and EXAM26) and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IMP1). These documents support the Implementation section of the BDP by demonstrating that the wide range of development sites across the City are capable of delivery and that there are proposals in place to make sure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to enable this growth. No showstopper issues have been identified and the City Council will keep these documents under review to measure progress and ensure funding, initiatives and action are targeted.
- 2.5 Based on this, the City Council considers that the policies and proposals contained in the BDP are capable of being successfully implemented. Where required, the City Council will make use of Area Action Plans, Supplementary Planning Documents and regeneration frameworks to provide local and site specific policy and promote a comprehensive approach to development initiatives.

Issue 3

Should the Implementation section recognise the Police and Crime Commissioner for the West Midlands as a partner in delivering infrastructure (para 10.3), and include police infrastructure, and measures to support the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, as items capable of funding by CIL (para 10.14)?

- 3.1 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IMP1) (IDP) identifies the range of infrastructure needed to support the successful delivery of the BDP. This includes summaries of infrastructure issues for both heritage assets and emergency services, with reference to the various agencies and departments that have a role to play in the delivery of this infrastructure. The Implementation section of the BDP makes reference to partnership working that already happens and will need to take place to deliver the Plan's policies and proposals (including paragraph 10.16), and includes examples of stakeholders that will be part of this approach. The City Council is therefore committed to working in partnership with organisations to deliver the BDP (including those referenced in the IDP), despite the lack of specific reference in the Implementation section to the Police and Crime Commissioner and it is not considered that a specific reference is needed.
- 3.2 The City Council has no detailed information on police infrastructure requirements and so it is not possible to include this at this stage. However the Council has no

objection to the inclusion of police infrastructure requirements in future iterations of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

- 3.3 Paragraph 10.14 of the BDP references the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and includes a list of examples of infrastructure that this funding could be used for. This is not intended to be a comprehensive list and needs to be read in the context of the City Council's ongoing work to develop a CIL, and the range of infrastructure requirements identified in the IDP.

Issue 4

Is there evidence to show that the applicable local and national standards and other requirements of planning policy will facilitate development throughout the economic cycle, and will not put implementation of the Plan at serious risk?

- 4.1 In broad terms the policies in the BDP have taken account of viability considerations and key mechanisms are identified to enable their delivery. This has been informed by the evidence base underpinning the plan, which has considered local and national standards as well as local viability consideration. This includes the Affordable Housing Viability Study (H6).
- 4.2 The ongoing work on the development of the Community Infrastructure Levy (IMP3 and IMP 4) is also relevant to consider. The viability assessments that underpin the emerging CIL considered the impacts of planning policy requirements (including 35% affordable housing provision), and demonstrate that it is possible to charge CIL across the city, with different charges by type and location of those developments. In September 2014 the City Council started the consultation on its revised draft charging schedule (EXAM26), taking account of views of stakeholders and updated viability appraisals. This has broadly come to the same overall conclusions, with some variations proposed to the amount of CIL to be applied to various types of development. A copy of this document and the revised Viability Assessment (EXAM27) are attached.
- 4.3 Certain policies, including TP30 on Affordable Housing, are structured in a way to ensure that decisions on planning applications can take viability considerations into account. This allows the City Council to agree to reduce the required standards to enable the development to proceed where justified on viability grounds. This provides a flexible framework which can then take account of changing market conditions and priorities.
- 4.4 In addition, the City Council already operates a flexible approach to section 106 contributions to enable the implementation of development, as referenced in the Site Delivery Plan (IMP2 –page 101). This flexible approach has had a positive impact on the viability of development, particularly during the recent recession, whilst still ensuring the collection of essential contributions.

Issue 5

Does the Monitoring section of the Plan set out appropriate indicators to enable the achievement of its policies and proposals to be effectively measured?

- 5.1 The monitoring section sets out a comprehensive set of indicators showing how progress on delivering each of the policies within the Plan will be measured. Where appropriate the policies themselves contain targets against which performance can be assessed.
- 5.2 In most cases the City Council already collects the data necessary to undertake this monitoring process. The main mechanism for reporting on progress will be the Authorities Monitoring Report.