

MARCH 2014

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 Schedule of Minor Changes to Submission Document



Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4

Schedule of Minor Changes to Submission Document

March 2014

The schedule below is intended to record and highlight minor editorial corrections, amendments, factual updates and clarifications to the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 as it appeared when submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. These alterations are not considered to represent changes that would need to be consulted upon as they do not have any material effect on the meaning or direction of the plan and its policies. They represent instead an opportunity to make minor alterations to the plan to improve its readability, clarity and accuracy and are commended to the Inspector on that basis.

The page and paragraph references relate to those in the **Proposed Submission** version of Local Plan No.4, as some alterations to the Submission version of the Plan have caused page numbers to alter.

To accompany this schedule of changes, there is an additional document (Schedule of changes to the adopted Proposals Map, March 2014), which identifies where changes have been made to the Policies Map, Key Diagram and Indicative Vision Maps.

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
Whole document	-	Inclusion of paragraph numbering throughout Local Plan document	Clarification and ease of reference
Contents page	-	Page numbering altered to reflect changes throughout Local Plan document	Clarification and ease of reference
Contents page	Appendix 1: Glossary and Abbreviations	Appendix 17: Glossary and Abbreviations	Typo
P.2, Diagram amendments	Submission to Planning Inspectorate – November/December 2013 Pre Examination Meeting – February 2014 Commencement of the Examination Period – April 2014 Receipt of Binding Report – July 2014 Adoption – September 2014	Submission to Planning Inspectorate – November/December 2013 <u>March 2014</u> Pre Examination Meeting – February <u>March</u> 2014 Commencement of the Examination Period – April <u>June</u> 2014 Receipt of Binding Report – July <u>September</u> 2014 Adoption – September <u>November</u> 2014	Time table slipped due to additional work being undertaken. Explained fully in next document change below
P.4 Local Challenges	<p>➤ Creating safe and attractive places to live and work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redditch suffers from a poor perception of crime and anti-social behaviour. The implementation of improved design or designing out crime can help reverse this perception. 	<p>➤ Creating safe and attractive places to live and work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Some areas of</u> Redditch suffers from a poor perception of crime and anti-social behaviour. The implementation of improved design or designing out crime can help reverse this perception. 	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
P.5 para 4	In addition, Redditch has worked with other Local Authorities, which although are not directly adjacent to Redditch may have strategic matters that have implications for the preparation of the Local Plan. In particular, Redditch Borough Council and Birmingham City Council have jointly acknowledged there is strategic planning matter	In addition, Redditch has worked with other Local Authorities, which although are not directly adjacent to Redditch may have strategic matters that have implications for the preparation of the Local Plan. In particular, Redditch Borough Council and Birmingham City Council have jointly acknowledged there is strategic planning matter with regard to	In the interests of consistency with South Worcestershire Development Plan - Inspectors main modification

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	<p>with regard to Birmingham being unable to accommodate all of its own housing needs. This issue will need to be dealt with during the preparation stage of the next Redditch Local Plan (i.e. the next plan period), or when a review of the development plan may be needed to consider these cross boundary matters. This will be dependent on the outcome of recently commissioned work to understand the issues, and further work on allocation for Birmingham's growth. The mechanism for dealing with this would be through the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).</p>	<p>Birmingham being unable to accommodate all of its own housing needs. <u>As required by the Duty to Co-operate, due consideration will be given, including through a review of the BORLP4 where appropriate, to the housing needs of another local planning authority in circumstances when it has been clearly established through collaborative working that those needs must be met through provision in Redditch.</u> This issue will need to be dealt with during the preparation stage of the next Redditch Local Plan (i.e. the next plan period), or when a review of the development plan may be needed to consider these cross boundary matters. This will be dependent on the outcome of recently commissioned work to understand the issues, and further work on allocations for Birmingham's growth. <u>With regard to Birmingham City Council, the mechanism for dealing with Birmingham's unmet housing needs this will</u>ould be through the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP).</p>	<p>suggestions</p>
p. 5 para.5	<p>The policies and strategies of the Local Authority members of the two LEP's have been checked for consistency with Redditch Borough Council's aims which ensures that this aspect of the Duty to Cooperate has been fulfilled LEP.</p>	<p>The policies and strategies of the Local Authority members of the two LEP's have been checked for consistency with Redditch Borough Council's aims which ensures that this aspect of the Duty to Cooperate has been fulfilled-LEP.</p>	<p>Typing error</p>
P.6, Policy 1			<p>Relocated to end of chapter (new P.23), adjacent key diagram and rest of</p>

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
			policies
P.7, 'Sustainability Appraisal'	All Local Plans must be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Draft Sustainability Appraisals were produced alongside every stage of the Plan and also with this Local Plan.	All Local Plans must be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal, which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). Draft Sustainability Appraisals were produced alongside every stage of the Plan and also with this Local Plan.	Text not needed as this is the Submission track-changed version to be adopted
P.7, 'Consultation'	<p>Consultation on the Proposed Submission Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 commences on 30th September 2013 until 11th November 2013, lasting a total of six weeks.</p> <p>Details of the consultation can be found on Redditch Borough Council's website at www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan. Your response forms should be received no later than 5pm on Monday 11th November 2013.</p>	<p>Consultation on the Proposed Submission Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 commences on 30th September 2013 until 11th November 2013, lasting a total of six weeks.</p> <p>Details of the consultation can be found on Redditch Borough Council's website at www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan. Your response forms should be received no later than 5pm on Monday 11th November 2013.</p>	Deleted as text related to previous consultation period

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
P.10, para.3	<p>Redditch Borough has similar crime levels in comparison to the national average of England and Wales, but the number of offences per 1000 population is increasing in Redditch. It has increased from 20.3 offences per 1000 population in Redditch, compared to the England and Wales average of 24.9 in 2006 to 44 offences per 1000 population in Redditch, compared to the England and Wales average of 45 in 2009/10. 95% of people feel safe walking around Redditch Town Centre and the street where they live during the day; at night, this falls to 61% for the Town Centre and 73% for the home street (CHYM Redditch).</p>	<p>Redditch Borough has similar crime levels in comparison to the national average of England and Wales, but the number of offences per 1000 population is increasing in Redditch. It has increased from 20.3 offences per 1000 population in Redditch, compared to the England and Wales average of 24.9 in 2006 to 44 offences per 1000 population in Redditch, compared to the England and Wales average of 45 in 2009/10. 95% of people feel safe walking around Redditch Town Centre and the street where they live during the day; at night, this falls to 61% for the Town Centre and 73% for the home street (CHYM Redditch). <u>Recorded crime rates for Redditch have fallen substantially since 2005/06 (92.2 offences per 1000 population in 2005/06 to 57.7 offences per 1000 population in 2012/13), although they remain above the average for Worcestershire. Perceptions of anti-social behaviour in Redditch have also remained consistently above the average for Worcestershire and the latest data for 2013 shows that nearly twice as many Redditch residents feel unsafe when out after dark in their local area when compared with residents in the rest of the County.</u></p>	<p>Changed in response to Community Safety Rep and to present more accurate and up to date crime figures</p>
P.10, para.4	<p>The Borough has 24 Special Wildlife Sites and there is also more than 87ha of land designated as Local Nature Reserves, comprising five separate sites of semi-natural ancient woodland.</p>	<p>The Borough has 24 <u>Local</u> Special-Wildlife Sites and there is also more than 87ha of land designated as Local Nature Reserves, comprising five separate sites of semi-natural ancient woodland.</p>	<p>Change of reference to wildlife sites</p>

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
P.12, para.1	Redditch Borough has good transport links, with the M42 (Junction 3) located under 5 miles away and the M5 around 6 miles from Redditch Town Centre.	Redditch Borough has good transport links, with the M42 (Junctions <u>2 and 3</u>) located under 5 miles away and the M5 around 6 miles from Redditch Town Centre.	Changed in response to Highways Agency Rep
P.12, para.3	-	<u>There are a range of issues that need to be tackled to achieve modal shift including perceptions of safety and security. Choose How You Move research indicates that a significant number of people feel unsafe walking to bus stops, waiting for buses and travelling on buses. Close to 4% of people cite “feeling unsafe walking” as being a main reason stopping them from walking more often. A similar percentage stated that “feeling unsafe cycling” was a main reason stopping them from doing so more often.</u>	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
P.13, para.1	A number of District Centres (Church Hill, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow) suffer from a poor image as their inappropriate design means that they are inward looking and have crime and anti-social behaviour problems. Work has commenced on the re-development of Church Hill District Centre.	A number of District Centres (Church Hill, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow) suffer from a poor image as their inappropriate design means that they are inward looking and prone to having crime and anti-social behaviour problems. <u>Lessons have been learnt from Council and Partnership projects that can be implemented when re-development occurs.</u> Work has commenced on the re-development of Church Hill District Centre.	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
Sustainable Places to Live which Meet our Needs			
P.22	The policies in this chapter will deliver the Objective: "To have sufficient homes meeting	The policies in this chapter will deliver the Objectives: "To have sufficient homes meeting demographic	To clarify that Plan policies meet the Objectives

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites"	needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites" " <u>To have demonstrated compliance with the "duty to cooperate" by providing for Redditch's growth across Local Authority boundaries"</u> "	
P.23, Policy 2, bullet point 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feckenham is a small, rural settlement predominantly set within the Green Belt, which offers limited local facilities but has important conservation and historic merit. In order to conserve and enhance these characteristics, development within or adjacent to the settlement boundary, as defined on the Policies Map, will provide for locally identified affordable housing and other development needs only, in accordance with the most up-to-date guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and Parish Housing Needs Survey. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feckenham is a small, rural settlement predominantly set within the Green Belt, which offers limited local facilities but has important conservation and historic merit. In order to conserve and enhance these characteristics, development within or adjacent to the settlement boundary, as defined on the Policies Map, will provide for locally identified affordable housing and other <u>locally identified</u> development needs only, in accordance with the most up-to-date guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and Parish Housing Needs Survey. 	Clarification of wording following recent planning application comments
P.26, Policy 4, para 2	Around 3,000 dwellings can be accommodated within Redditch Borough. There is limited capacity within Stratford-on-Avon District in the vicinity of the former A435 ADR to contribute towards Redditch's housing target should comprehensive delivery of this site be achievable. A minimum of 3,400 is to be accommodated in Bromsgrove District (see Appendix 1, Redditch Cross Boundary Development). Details of the sites expected to	Around 3,000 dwellings can be accommodated within Redditch Borough. There is limited capacity within Stratford-on-Avon District in the vicinity of the former A435 ADR to contribute towards Redditch's housing target should comprehensive delivery of this site be achievable. A minimum of <u>Approximately 3,400 dwellings are</u> is to be accommodated in Bromsgrove District (see Appendix 1, Redditch Cross Boundary Development). Details of the sites expected to contribute to meeting the Borough's	Wording aligned with BDC cross boundary policy (RCBD.1) and following comments from SOADC as potential development within the A345 ADR within SOA District would

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	contribute to meeting the Borough's housing needs can be found in Appendix 2 and are shown on the Policies Map and Key Diagram.	housing needs can be found in Appendix 2 and are shown on the Policies Map and Key Diagram.	not contribute towards Redditch's needs
P.26-27, Policy 4, RJ para 1	Land identified which could contribute towards housing provision indicates that around 3,000 dwellings could be accommodated within the Borough boundary. However, evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates that this will not meet the Borough's housing needs up to 2030. It has therefore been necessary to collaborate with Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council to identify land in these Districts, in the vicinity of Redditch, which is capable of accommodating Redditch's land supply shortfall.	Land identified which could contribute towards housing provision indicates that around 3,000 dwellings could be accommodated within the Borough boundary. However, evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates that this will not meet the Borough's housing needs up to 2030. It has therefore been necessary to collaborate with Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council to identify land in <u>these Bromsgrove</u> Districts, in the vicinity of Redditch, which is capable of accommodating Redditch's land supply shortfall.	Amendment made following comments from SOADC as potential development within the A345 ADR within SOA District would not contribute towards Redditch's needs
P.27, Policy 5, criterion i	i. the reuse and regeneration of Previously Developed Land (PDL) will be actively encouraged. Where the economic viability of a scheme on PDL is questionable, and can be fully demonstrated by the applicant, the Borough Council may negotiate a more appropriate level of infrastructure provision, or deferred payment scheme with the applicant, in order to secure beneficial reuse of a site. Development proposals on contaminated land should demonstrate that the site is capable of appropriate remediation without compromising development viability or the delivery of sustainable development;	i. the reuse and regeneration of Previously Developed Land (PDL) will be actively encouraged. Where the economic viability of a scheme on PDL is questionable, and can be fully demonstrated by the applicant, the Borough Council may negotiate a more appropriate level of infrastructure provision, or deferred payment scheme with the applicant, in order to secure beneficial reuse of a site. Development proposals on contaminated land should demonstrate that the site is capable of appropriate remediation without compromising development viability or the delivery of sustainable development;	Changes made in response to EA Rep
P.28, Policy 5,	-	<u>Development proposals on land likely to be affected</u>	Changes made in

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
para 6		<u>by contamination should demonstrate that the site is capable of appropriate remediation without compromising development viability or the delivery of sustainable development.</u>	response to EA and Worcestershire Regulatory Services Reps
P.28, Policy 5, RJ para 2	Proposals also need to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or is put at unacceptable risk from ground contaminants. The SHLAA and Employment Land Review (ELR) identify PDL potential within the Borough.	Proposals also need to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or is put at unacceptable risk from ground contaminants. The SHLAA and Employment Land Review (ELR) identify PDL potential within the Borough.	Changes made in response to EA Rep
P.29, Policy 5, RJ new para after para 2	-	<u>Proposals also need to ensure that new development does not contribute to, or is put at unacceptable risk from ground contaminants. Where sites are suspected of contamination, the Council will require the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and, if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme.</u>	Changes made in response to EA Rep
P.31, Policy 6, para 4 bullet point	On all sites of 5-9 dwellings (net), a 30% financial contribution towards affordable housing provision will be sought on completion of the development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On all sites of 5-9 dwellings (net), <u>a 30% affordable housing provision by way of a financial contribution towards affordable housing provision</u> will be sought on completion of the development. 	Changes made following meeting with Three Dragons (Viability Assessment Consultants) to clarify commuted sums approach within policy
P.32, Policy 7, para 3	Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are considered inappropriate development.	Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are considered inappropriate development.	Change made in response to National Federation of Gypsy's rep.
P.33, Policy 7, RJ	A review of the Gypsy and Traveller	A review of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation	Project delayed,

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
para 2	Accommodation Assessment for Worcestershire is being completed in 2013 and will inform a future Site Allocations DPD.	Assessment for Worcestershire is being completed in <u>2014</u> 2013 and will inform a future Site Allocations DPD.	new completion date
P.36, Policy 10, title	Policy 10 Agricultural Workers Dwellings	Policy 10 Agricultural <u>Rural</u> Workers Dwellings	Change made as suggested by South Worcestershire Councils to align with NPPF terminology
P.37, Policy 10, criterion C	C. The Borough Council will use conditions to restrict the occupancy of dwellings permitted by this policy to agricultural workers. Applications to remove such conditions will not be permitted unless the applicant can demonstrate there is no longer any realistic agricultural need for the restriction to remain.	C. The Borough Council will use conditions to restrict the occupancy of dwellings permitted by this policy to agricultural <u>rural</u> workers. Applications to remove such conditions will not be permitted unless the applicant can demonstrate there is no longer any realistic agricultural need for the restriction to remain.	Change made as suggested by South Worcestershire Councils to align with NPPF terminology
P.37, Policy 10, RJ para 1	Proposals for agricultural workers dwellings in the Green Belt must be supported by evidence that development is essential and outweighs Green Belt considerations.	Proposals for agricultural <u>rural</u> workers dwellings in the Green Belt must be supported by evidence that development is essential and outweighs Green Belt considerations.	Change made as suggested by South Worcestershire Councils to align with NPPF terminology
P.37, Policy 10, RJ para 5	Conditions restricting the occupancy of dwellings to agricultural workers have been applied to previous planning permissions and will be applied to dwellings permitted under this policy.	Conditions restricting the occupancy of dwellings to agricultural <u>rural</u> workers have been applied to previous planning permissions and will be applied to dwellings permitted under this policy.	Change made as suggested by South Worcestershire Councils to align with NPPF terminology
P.39, Policy 11, RJ para 2	A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Borough will be completed which identifies and assesses the existing Green Infrastructure network and	A Green Infrastructure Strategy for the Borough <u>is being</u> will be completed which identifies and assesses the existing <u>Green Infrastructure</u> network	First stage GI baseline audit has been completed

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	make recommendations on how the network can be enhanced and maintained and managed in the future.	and make recommendations on how the network can be enhanced and maintained and managed in the future.	
Creating and Sustaining a Green Environment			
P45, Policy 15, criterion ii	ii the energy efficiency of the development must be maximised through its siting and orientation, and through the adoption of energy conservation measures, including natural ventilation, heating, and lighting;	ii the energy efficiency of the development must be maximised through its siting and orientation, and through the adoption of energy conservation measures, including natural ventilation, heating, <u>street trees</u> and lighting;	From the Woodland Trust rep – They considered the policy should reflect para 96 of the NPPF in terms of minimising energy consumption, and take account of the role of street trees and woodland in combatting climate change
P.49, Policy 17, para 2	Any development sites that are located in areas that are subject to flood risk will need to demonstrate that there are no other reasonable locations for development in accordance with the ‘Sequential Approach’ and ‘Exception Test’ (where appropriate) as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Redditch.	Any development sites that are located in areas that are subject to flood risk will need to demonstrate that there are no other reasonable locations for development in accordance with the ‘ Sequential Approach <u>Test</u> ’ and ‘Exception Test’ (where appropriate) as set out in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and have regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Redditch.	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.49, Policy 17, RJ para 1	If, once the Sequential Test has been applied, insufficient sites are identified the ‘Exception Test’ (as defined in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework) can be	If, once the Sequential Test has been applied, insufficient sites are identified the ‘Exception Test’ (as defined in the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework) can be applied	Amendment made in line with EA rep

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	applied where necessary. This may, in certain circumstances, justify development taking place in Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3.	<u>where necessary.</u> This may, in certain circumstances, justify development taking place in Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3.	
P.49, Policy 17, RJ para 2, bullet point 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the risk of flooding arising from the development in addition to the risk of flooding to the development; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the risk of flooding arising from the development in addition to the risk of flooding <u>from all sources</u> to the development; 	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.49, Policy 17, RJ para 2, bullet point 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the vulnerability of those that could occupy and use the development, taking account of the Sequential and Exception Tests and the vulnerability classification as per the Technical Guidance to the NPPF, including arrangements for 'safe development' including setting of appropriate Finished Floor Levels, with flood proofing techniques considered (where appropriate), and safe access; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the vulnerability of those that could occupy and use the development, taking account of the Sequential and Exception Tests and the vulnerability classification as per the Technical Guidance to the NPPF, including arrangements for 'safe development' <u>having regard to the FRA requirements within the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for Redditch (2012)</u> including setting of appropriate Finished Floor Levels, with flood proofing techniques considered (where appropriate), and safe access; 	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.49, Policy 17, RJ para 2, bullet point 8	consider the effects of a range of flooding events including extreme events on people, property, the natural and historic environment and river and coastal processes;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the effects of a range of flooding events including extreme events on people, property, the natural and historic environment and river <u>and coastal processes</u>; 	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.55, Policy 19, RJ para 8	The transport network must be maintained and managed in a way that preserves strategic routes, and supports business efficiency which is critical to Redditch's competitiveness. The Primary Route Network (PRN) is central to this and designates routes between major settlements and important destinations. Routes	The transport network must be maintained and managed in a way that preserves strategic routes, and supports business efficiency which is critical to Redditch's competitiveness. <u>The Strategic Road Network (SRN) and Primary Route Network (PRN) are central to this by providing routes between major settlements and important destinations. Motorways</u>	Amendment made in line with comments from the HA – to refer to motorways and trunk roads correctly as being part of the SRN

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	<p>consist of motorways, trunk roads and other primary routes, however in Redditch the PRN is formed only of 'A' roads and is taken from the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan No.3 Network Management Plan – Figure 2.1) and consists of the A441, A4023 and the A448, and can also be identified on the Transport Map.</p>	<p><u>and trunk roads make up the SRN and other primary routes represent the PRN.</u> The Primary Route Network (PRN) is central to this and designates routes between major settlements and important destinations. Routes consist of motorways, trunk roads and other primary routes, however in <u>In</u> Redditch the PRN is formed only of 'A' roads and is taken from the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan No.3 Network Management Plan – Figure 2.1) and consists of the A441, A4023 and the A448, and can also be identified on the Transport Map.</p>	
<p>P.59, Policy 20, RJ para 6</p>	<p>Transport evidence prepared in support of a planning application must be prepared to the satisfaction of the Borough Council and Worcestershire County Council (WCC) Highways Department. Worcestershire County Council owns and maintains a range of transport models and information, which it makes available for use by developers to test the impacts of proposed developments on Worcestershire's transport networks.</p>	<p>Transport evidence prepared in support of a planning application must be prepared to the satisfaction of the Borough Council and Worcestershire County Council (WCC) Highways Department <u>and where appropriate the Highways Agency.</u> Worcestershire County Council owns and maintains a range of transport models and information, which it makes available for use by developers to test the impacts of proposed developments on Worcestershire's transport networks.</p>	<p>Requested by the HA as a statutory consultee and key stakeholder in relation to highway impacts to assess whether development impacts are acceptable.</p>
<p>Creating a Borough where Businesses can Thrive</p>			
<p>P.63</p>	<p>The policies in this chapter will deliver the Objective:</p> <p>"To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels"</p>	<p>The policies in this chapter will deliver the Objectives:</p> <p>"To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels"</p>	<p>To clarify that Plan policies meet the Objectives</p>

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
		<p><u>“To have demonstrated compliance with the “duty to cooperate” by providing for Redditch’s growth across Local Authority boundaries”</u></p>	
<p>P.64, Policy 23, Para 2</p>	<p>The Redditch Eastern Gateway has been identified as a key initiative for employment provision to meet Redditch related employment needs. Around 10 hectares will be accommodated in Bromsgrove District at the former Ravensbank ADR and a minimum of 12 hectares will be accommodated within Stratford-upon-Avon District at Gorcott and Winyates Green Triangle.</p>	<p>The Redditch Eastern Gateway has been identified as a key initiative for employment provision to meet Redditch related employment needs. Around 10 hectares will be accommodated in Bromsgrove District at the former Ravensbank ADR and a minimum of 12 hectares <u>further employment provision</u> will be accommodated within Stratford-upon-Avon District at Gorcott (<u>around 7 hectares</u>) and Winyates Green Triangle (<u>around 12 hectares gross</u>).</p>	<p>Following progress on the Eastern gateway Initiative, there was a need to be more specific with regard to provision levels within the specific areas which make up this site</p>
<p>P.64, Policy 23, Para 3</p>	<p>The Redditch Eastern Gateway aims to provide a significant enhancement to the employment land supply through the creation of a high-profile and accessible employment scheme to take advantage of the demand of the M40/M42 corridor. The site should develop as a high quality business park to support both existing businesses and to provide the opportunity to diversify the employment base of Redditch and the surrounding areas through attracting businesses that are not currently provided for within the existing supply of sites. Comprehensive development of the three areas that comprise this initiative should:</p>	<p>The Redditch Eastern Gateway aims to provide a significant enhancement to the employment land supply through the creation of a high-profile and accessible employment scheme to take advantage of the demand of the M40/M42 corridor The site should develop as a high quality business park to support both existing businesses and to provide the opportunity to diversify the employment base of Redditch and the surrounding areas through attracting businesses that are not currently provided for within the existing supply of sites. Comprehensive development of the three areas that comprise this initiative should:</p>	<p>Minor modification – changed accepted to clarify that this is not the intention of the policy</p>
<p>P.74, Policy 29, para 1</p>	<p>In order to support the expansion of electronic communications networks, (including</p>	<p>In order to support the expansion of electronic communications networks, (including</p>	<p>Requested by WCC to cover the</p>

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	<p>telecommunications and high speed broadband) all developments should make provision for the service infrastructure required at the design stage of any proposal. Infrastructure should be designed to ensure minimal disruption, should the need for maintenance, adaption or upgrades arise.</p>	<p>telecommunications and high speed broadband) all developments should make provision for the service infrastructure required at the design stage of any proposal <u>suitable for occupiers of all development.</u> <u>For the provision of broadband, developers should work with a recognised network carrier to design a bespoke duct network, wherever practicable, for the development.</u> <u>Developers should also consider the inclusion of other forms of infrastructure, such as facilities necessary to support mobile broadband where possible and where it is viable to do so.</u></p> <p>All <u>service</u> hinfrastructure should be designed to ensure minimal disruption, should the need for maintenance, adaption or upgrades arise.</p>	<p>provision of broadband infrastructure in more detail.</p>
Improving the vitality and viability of Redditch Town Centre and District Centres			
P.76	<p>The policies in this chapter will deliver the Objectives:</p> <p>“To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch’s cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium”</p> <p>“Reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow District Centres”</p> <p>“To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night”</p>	<p>The policies in this chapter will deliver the Objectives:</p> <p>“To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch’s cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium”</p> <p>“Reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow District Centres”</p> <p>“To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night <u>by promoting a vibrant mix of uses including residential</u>”</p>	<p>Typo, missing text needs to align with Objective text</p>

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
P.78, Policy 30, RJ para 3	The Council has identified specific roles for each of the centres and will use planning policies to maintain and, where necessary and appropriate having regard to national guidance, improve the shopping function and environment of these centres. Whilst in many instances this will serve to maintain their position within the retail hierarchy, it is recognised that the role, function and relative importance of centres may change over time in pursuit of this Objective.	The Council has identified specific roles for each of the centres and will use planning policies to maintain and, where necessary and appropriate having regard to national guidance, improve the shopping function and environment of these centres. Whilst in many instances this will serve to maintain their position within the retail hierarchy, it is recognised that the role, function and relative importance of centres may change over time in pursuit of this Objective. <u>District Centres are the equivalent to the definition of 'Local Centres' in the NPPF by virtue of the types of facilities they provide.</u>	Additional wording to clarify definition of District Centres.
P.85, Policy 34, Introductory para	The District Centres in Redditch Borough were identified as a significant issue for the Plan to consider, particularly in relation to the District Centres at Church Hill, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow, because of their poor image, issues of anti-social behaviour and inappropriate design which is making them suffer.	The District Centres in Redditch Borough were identified as a significant issue for the Plan to consider, particularly in relation to the District Centres at Church Hill , Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow, because of their poor image, issues of anti-social behaviour and inappropriate design which is making them suffer.	Church Hill District Centre has now received planning permission for redevelopment and work has commenced.
P.86, Policy 34, RJ para 1	The Council will look favourably on development proposals that will help revitalise and improve the shopping and community facilities of District Centres providing they are in keeping with their primarily retailing role and actively support the redevelopment of, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow District Centres and their status as Strategic Sites. In relation to the types of shopping facilities they provide, District Centres are the equivalent to the definition of 'Local Centres' in the NPPF.	The Council will look favourably on development proposals that will help revitalise and improve the shopping and community facilities of District Centres providing they are in keeping with their primarily retailing role and actively support the redevelopment of, Matchborough, Winyates and Woodrow District Centres and their status as Strategic Sites. In relation to the types of shopping facilities they provide, District Centres are the equivalent to the definition of 'Local Centres' in the NPPF.	District Centres provide a wider range of facilities than just retail.

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
Protecting and Enhancing Redditch's Historic Environment			
P.90, Policy 36, para 1	Designated heritage assets including listed buildings, structures and their settings; conservation areas; and scheduled ancient monuments, will be given the highest level of protection and should be conserved and enhanced. Non-designated nationally important archaeological remains and locally listed heritage assets, and their setting will also need to be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance and contribution to the historic environment.	Designated heritage assets including listed buildings, structures and their settings; conservation areas; and scheduled ancient monuments, will be given the highest level of protection and should be conserved and enhanced. Non-designated <u>heritage assets</u> , nationally important archaeological remains and locally listed heritage assets, and their settings will also need to be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance and contribution to the historic environment.	Requested by English Heritage to ensure that the policy covers all non-designated assets, as per the intention suggested in the reasoned justification.
Creating Safe and Attractive Places to Live and Work			
P.101, Policy 40, criterion iv	iv. include where appropriate, public art that is well designed, integrated within the overall design and layout of the development, located where it can be easily observed, improves public outdoor space and legibility and creates landmarks;	iv. include where appropriate, public art that is well designed, <u>takes into account the risk of crime</u> , is integrated within the overall design and layout of the development, located where it can be easily observed, improves public outdoor space and legibility and creates landmarks;	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
P.101, Policy 40, criterion v	v. aid movement by ensuring all development areas benefit from accessibility, connectivity, permeability and legibility, particularly aiding sustainable modes of movement such as walking, cycling and access to public transport;	v. aid movement by ensuring all developments <u>areas</u> benefit from accessibility, connectivity, permeability and legibility, particularly aiding sustainable modes of movement such as walking, cycling and access to public transport;	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
P.102, Policy 40, RJ para 4	When correctly designed and sited, public art can also make a significant contribution to reducing crime and promoting community safety;	When correctly designed and sited, public art can also make a significant contribution to reducing crime and promoting community safety ; ;	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
P.101, Policy 40, RJ para 4	-	<u>Risks of crime to public art can include theft, deliberate damage and arson. Designs will need to take these risks into account and mitigate against</u>	Changed in response to Community Safety

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
		<u>them.</u>	Rep
P.104, Policy 42, criterion iv	iv. they would not be an obstruction to surveillance cameras; and	iv. they would not impede natural surveillance, be an obstruction <u>security</u> to surveillance cameras; and	Changed in response to Community Safety Rep
Strategic Sites			
P.113, Policy 46, Introductory para	This strategic site is currently greenfield as has been previously designated as Green Belt in parts; however exceptional circumstances exist to allocate this site to meet development needs.	This strategic site is currently greenfield <u>and</u> as has been previously designated as Green Belt in parts; however exceptional circumstances exist to allocate this site to meet development needs.	
P.113, Policy 46, Para 1	A Strategic Site at Brockhill East is appropriate for a high quality mixed use development comprising around 1,000 dwellings, employment (8.45ha) and relevant community facilities and services including, a District Centre (including convenience retail store), a first school and a sustainable public transport network.	A Strategic Site at Brockhill East is appropriate for a high quality mixed use development comprising around 1,000 <u>1,025</u> dwellings, employment (8.45ha) and relevant community facilities and services including, a District Centre (including convenience retail store), a first school and a sustainable public transport network.	Typo correction
P.114, Policy 46, new criterion xv	- <i>Inclusion of new criterion has resulted in renumbering of existing criteria xv to xvii</i>	<u>xv. proposals should demonstrate that there is no adverse risk of pollution to controlled waters through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme;</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.115, Policy 46, new criterion xviii	-	<u>xviii drainage proposals for the site should include appropriate pollution prevention measures to avoid risks to controlled waters.</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.115, Policy 46, final sentence	All aspects of the Brockhill East Strategic Site delivery must be in accordance with other policies and proposals contained within this Local Plan.	All aspects of the Brockhill East Strategic Site delivery must be in accordance with other policies and proposals contained within this Local Plan.	For consistency with other Strategic Site policies
P.116, Policy 46,	-	<u>The site is underlain by the Mercia Mudstone Group.</u>	Amendment made in

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
RJ new para 9		<u>which is classified as a secondary aquifer. Development proposals must demonstrate that there is no adverse pollution risk to the aquifer through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme.</u>	line with EA rep
P.120, Policy 47, new criterion ix	- <i>Inclusion of new criterion has resulted in renumbering of existing criteria ix to xiii</i>	<u>ix proposals should demonstrate that there is no adverse risk of pollution to controlled waters through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme;</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.120, Policy 47, new criterion xv	and xiii incorporate any necessary infrastructure identified for the effective delivery of the site.	and <u>xiv incorporate any necessary infrastructure identified for the effective delivery of the site; and xv drainage proposals for the site should include appropriate pollution prevention measures to avoid risks to controlled waters.</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.120, Policy 47, first para after final criteria	Land immediately south of the Alexandra Hospital is <u>not</u> included within the Strategic Site boundary and will be safeguarded for health related purposes, this should be considered when formulating proposals for the Strategic Site.	Land immediately south of the Alexandra Hospital is not included within the Strategic Site boundary and will be safeguarded for health related purposes, this should be considered when formulating proposals for the Strategic Site.	Amendment made following completion of NHS Trust Joint Service Review, which determined that this land was no longer needed for health related purposes
P.120, Policy 47, second para after final criteria	This Strategic Site is expected to be delivered 6-10-years following Local Plan adoption. The Borough Council will issue further strategic planning guidance in order to guide and	This Strategic Site is expected to be delivered 6- <u>within 5</u> years following Local Plan adoption. The Borough Council will issue further strategic planning guidance in order to guide and accelerate the	Amendment made following completion of NHS Trust Joint Service Review,

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	accelerate the sustainable delivery of this Strategic Site.	sustainable delivery of this Strategic Site.	which determined that this land was no longer needed for health related purposes. Therefore availability for development is more likely earlier in the Plan period
P.120, Policy 47, RJ para 1	The NHS Trust has indicated that the land immediately south of the hospital (which is not within the Strategic Site boundary) must be safeguarded for future health related development associated with the hospital. This also aligns with Policy 44 Health Facilities which seeks to ensure this land is protected for health purposes.	The NHS Trust has indicated that the land immediately south of the hospital (which is not within the Strategic Site boundary) must be safeguarded for future health related development associated with the hospital. This also aligns with Policy 44 Health Facilities which seeks to ensure this land is protected for health purposes.	Amendment made following completion of NHS Trust Joint Service Review, which determined that this land was no longer needed for health related purposes
P.122, Policy 47, RJ para 11	-	<u>The site is underlain by the Mercia Mudstone Group, which is classified as a secondary aquifer. Development proposals must demonstrate that there is no adverse pollution risk to the aquifer through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme.</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.125, Policy 48, new criterion xi	- <i>Inclusion of new criterion has resulted in renumbering of existing criteria x to xviii</i>	<u>xi development proposals should address contamination associated with any previous uses on the site, including the disused sewage works, through the submission of an appropriate risk assessment and if necessary, a site investigation and mitigation scheme;</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
P.128, Policy 48, RJ para 8	-	<u>Development of this site provides an opportunity to address the remediation of any potential contamination as a result of the former sewage works located within the site boundary.</u>	Amendment made in line with EA rep
P.132, Policy 49, RJ para 1	Development Type - This Strategic Site is capable of accommodating around 220 dwellings at a minimum density of between 30-50 dwellings per hectare.	Development Type - This Strategic Site is capable of accommodating around 220 <u>180</u> dwellings at a minimum density of between 30-50 dwellings per hectare.	Typo correction
Appendix 1: Policy RCBD1 Redditch Cross Boundary Development			
RCBD1.2	Two sustainable mixed use urban extensions (Foxlydiat and Brockhill) are proposed adjacent to the west and north of Redditch Town which will deliver two new sustainable communities. The two development sites, as shown on Page 44, will provide a minimum of 3400 dwellings and comprehensive provision of associated new infrastructure to meet some of Redditch's housing requirements up to 2030. These sites are currently designated as Green Belt; however exceptional circumstances exist to allocate these sites to meet development needs. These developments will create balanced communities that fully integrate into the existing residential areas of Redditch, addressing the social, economic and environmental elements of sustainable development, whilst being sympathetic to the surrounding rural areas of Bromsgrove.	Two sustainable mixed use urban extensions (Foxlydiat <u>Foxlydiat</u> and Brockhill) are proposed adjacent to the west and north of Redditch Town which will deliver two new sustainable communities. The two development sites, as shown on Page 44, will provide a minimum of 3400 dwellings and comprehensive provision of associated new infrastructure to meet some of Redditch's housing requirements up to 2030. These sites are currently designated as Green Belt; however exceptional circumstances exist to allocate these sites to meet development needs. These developments will create balanced communities that fully integrate into the existing residential areas of Redditch, addressing the social, economic and environmental elements of sustainable development, whilst being sympathetic to the surrounding rural areas of Bromsgrove.	Correction
RCBD1.3	Site 1 Foxlydiat is located to the north western side of Redditch within the Parish of Bentley	Site 1 Foxlydiat is located to the north western side of Redditch within the Parish of Bentley	Greater detail in relation to ground

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	<p>Pauncefoot and will provide opportunities to improve facilities and services in the wider Webheath area. It also offers the opportunity to extend existing bus services and through the provision of facilities within development has the potential to reduce the need to travel.</p>	<p>Pauncefoot and will provide opportunities to improve facilities and services in the wider Webheath area. It also offers the opportunity to extend existing bus services and through the provision of facilities within development has the potential to reduce the need to travel. <u>The site has a sensitive hydrogeological setting and the aquifer below the site is overabstracted. There are Source Protection Zones¹ 1, 2 and 3 located on the site and the historic landfill¹ presents a potential source of contamination. Development and surface water drainage will need to be carefully located and designed to avoid pollution risks to controlled waters and maximise recharge to the underlying aquifer. For example, to achieve the water quality objective of the WFD, SuDS on the site may need to provide multiple levels of treatment to avoid pollution risks. To address the quantitative issues with the groundwater body SuDS should be designed so to maximise recharge to the aquifer.</u></p> <p>¹ Map of the extent of the Source Protection Zones and location of the historic landfill is available at: http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk ²Map of the site geology is available at: http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html</p>	<p>water</p>
RCBD1.5.1-	Consultation Feedback	Consultation Feedback	Text not required in

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
RCBD1.5.2	<p>RCBD1.5.1 A wide range of consultation responses were received in relation to the policy and in particular the choice of site allocations. Across all of the sites a range of issues were raised including traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure, loss of greenfield/Green Belt land, impact on biodiversity and pollution. However, it is considered that many of the matters can be addressed through the implementation of this policy, for example the policy seeks to retain important biodiversity features and implement a strategy to manage traffic. Some infrastructure requirements will be provided as part of any new development and where appropriate planning contributions will be sought to deliver new and improved infrastructure. It is acknowledged that development will result in the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land, however there is a lack of suitable brownfield alternatives and there is a high level of unmet housing need in the Borough.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>RCBD1.5.2 The policy performs well against a number of SA objectives for several reasons including the delivery of affordable housing, job creation and access to facilities and services. The policy performs less favourably against some of the environmental objectives due to the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land. However, given the lack of brownfield alternatives available this is</p>	<p>RCBD1.5.1 A wide range of consultation responses were received in relation to the policy and in particular the choice of site allocations. Across all of the sites a range of issues were raised including traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure, loss of greenfield/Green Belt land, impact on biodiversity and pollution. However, it is considered that many of the matters can be addressed through the implementation of this policy, for example the policy seeks to retain important biodiversity features and implement a strategy to manage traffic. Some infrastructure requirements will be provided as part of any new development and where appropriate planning contributions will be sought to deliver new and improved infrastructure. It is acknowledged that development will result in the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land, however there is a lack of suitable brownfield alternatives and there is a high level of unmet housing need in the Borough.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>RCBD1.5.2 The policy performs well against a number of SA objectives for several reasons including the delivery of affordable housing, job creation and access to facilities and services. The policy performs less favourably against some of the environmental objectives due to the loss of greenfield and Green Belt land. However, given the lack of brownfield alternatives available this is inevitable. The recommendation for mitigation is the</p>	final version of the Plan

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	inevitable. The recommendation for mitigation is the creation of a detailed Masterplan that addresses a full range of issues including biodiversity and green infrastructure.	creation of a detailed Masterplan that addresses a full range of issues including biodiversity and green infrastructure.	
RCBD1.1	RCBD1.1 Policy Redditch Cross Boundary Development	RCBD1.1 Policy Redditch Cross Boundary Development	Correction
RCBD1.6	Two mixed use urban extensions are proposed (as shown on Map 10 RCBD1 page 44) across two sites adjacent to Redditch and are appropriate to deliver a minimum of 3400 dwellings and comprehensive provision of associated new infrastructure to meet some of Redditch's housing requirements up to 2030.	Two mixed use urban extensions are proposed (as shown on Map 10 RCBD1 page 44) across two sites adjacent to Redditch and are appropriate to deliver a <u>minimum of approximately</u> 3400 dwellings and comprehensive provision of associated new infrastructure to meet some of Redditch's housing requirements up to 2030.	To address inconsistency with Redditch Local Plan No.4
RCBD1.7	Site 1 Foxlydiat will include a minimum of 2800 dwellings, a first school and a Local Centre, including associated community infrastructure.	Site 1 Foxlydiat will include a minimum of <u>approximately</u> 2800 dwellings, a first school and a Local Centre, including associated community infrastructure.	To address inconsistency with Redditch Local Plan No.4
RCBD1.8	Site 2 Brockhill will contain a minimum of 600 dwellings which will integrate with the Strategic Site at Brockhill East, as shown in the Redditch Local Plan No.4 and should integrate well into the existing urban fabric of Redditch.	Site 2 Brockhill will contain a minimum of <u>approximately</u> 600 dwellings which will integrate with the Strategic Site at Brockhill East, as shown in the Redditch Local Plan No.4 and should integrate well into the existing urban fabric of Redditch.	To address inconsistency with Redditch Local Plan No.4
RCBD1.9	VI. Flood risk from the Spring Brook on Site 1 Foxlydiat and the Red Ditch on Site 2 Brockhill East should be managed through measures that work with natural processes to improve the local water environment. Surface water runoff must be managed to prevent flooding on, around and	VI. Flood risk from the Spring Brook on Site 1 Foxlydiat and the Red Ditch on Site 2 Brockhill East should be managed through measures that work with natural processes to improve the local water environment. <u>Any necessary measures to mitigate flood risk are to be implemented and flood modelling</u>	Provide further detail in relation to ground water quality and SuDS.

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	<p>downstream of the both sites through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). A supporting risk assessment will be provided as SuDS techniques may be limited due to Source Protection Zones within Site 1 Foxlydiate.</p> <p>VII. Proposals for development will need to ensure that sufficient capacity of the sewerage systems for both wastewater collection and treatment is provided through engagement with Severn Trent Water Ltd and the Environment Agency and delivered at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>VIII. All development must be of a high quality design and locally distinctive to its surrounding rural and urban character; contribute to the areas' identity and create a coherent sense of place; and respect and enhance the setting of any heritage asset. There should be a continuous network of streets and spaces, including the provision of public open spaces, creating a permeable layout with well-defined streets.</p> <p>IX. In preparing development proposals, provision should be made for any necessary infrastructure for the effective delivery of the site.</p> <p>X. Any proposals for development on either site must not individually or cumulatively jeopardise the future use of any other part of the site (s) or</p>	<p><u>will be required, which must be outlined in a site specific Flood Risk Assessment. Surface water runoff must be managed to prevent flooding on, around and downstream of both sites through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Surface water runoff must be managed to prevent flooding on, around and downstream of the both sites through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). A supporting risk assessment will be provided as SuDS techniques may be limited due to Source Protection Zones within Site 1 Foxlydiate.</u></p> <p>VII. <u>SuDS proposals on Site 1 must provide an appropriate level of treatment to avoid pollution risks to controlled waters, and be designed to achieve the greenfield rate of run-off, maximise recharge to the underlying aquifer and support water levels in the Bow Brook. In accordance with the objectives of the Water Framework Directive, development should ideally contribute towards the improvement of, but as a minimum not have a deteriorative effect on, the water bodies associated with the site.</u></p> <p>VIII. <u>An appropriate assessment of the pollution risks to controlled waters on Site 1 Foxlydiate will be produced taking account of any previous contaminative uses on the site including the historic landfill, and the risks associated with the proposed uses</u></p> <p>VII. IX. Proposals for development will need to</p>	

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
	impede the delivery of the two sustainable communities.	<p>ensure that sufficient capacity of the sewerage systems for both wastewater collection and treatment is provided through engagement with Severn Trent Water Ltd and the Environment Agency and delivered at the appropriate stage.</p> <p>VIII. <u>X.</u> All development must be of a high quality design and locally distinctive to its surrounding rural and urban character; contribute to the areas' identity and create a coherent sense of place; and respect and enhance the setting of any heritage asset. There should be a continuous network of streets and spaces, including the provision of public open spaces, creating a permeable layout with well-defined streets.</p> <p>IX. <u>XI.</u> In preparing development proposals, provision should be made for any necessary infrastructure for the effective delivery of the site.</p> <p>X. <u>XII.</u> Any proposals for development on either site must not individually or cumulatively jeopardise the future use of any other part of the site (s) or impede the delivery of the two sustainable communities.</p>	
Appendix 2: Schedule of Housing Site			
Table i, Site 153	1.43 Ha	1.43 <u>1.40</u> Ha	Site area aligned to GIS area calculations
Table i, Site 155	0.74 Ha	0.74 <u>1.31</u> Ha	Site area amended to reflect area covered by planning

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
			application boundary
Table i, Site 156	1.36 Ha	1.36 <u>1.02</u> Ha	Site area altered to reflect removal of part of the site from development
Table i, Site 200	0.47 Ha	0.47 <u>0.71</u> Ha	Site area amended to reflect area covered by planning application boundary
Table i, Site 203	3.95 Ha	3.95 <u>7.27</u> Ha	Site area amended to reflect area covered by planning application boundary
Table i, Site 206	2.25 Ha	2.25 <u>1.23</u> Ha	Site area amended to reflect area covered by planning application boundary
Table i, Site 208	2.24 Ha	2.24 <u>1.56</u> Ha	Site area amended to reflect SHLAA
Table i, Site 211	255 capacity, 10.25 Ha	255 <u>205</u> capacity, 10.25 <u>10.74</u> Ha	Site area amended to take further account of landscape considerations and impact on the settlement of Mappleborough Green
Table i, Site 212	23.40 Ha	23.40 <u>60.13</u> Ha	Calculation error
Table i, Site 217	0.35 Ha	0.35 <u>0.07</u> Ha	Site area amended to reflect SHLAA

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
Table i, Site 218	0.19 Ha	0.19 <u>0.91</u> Ha	Typo error
Table i, Total	2913 dwellings	2913 <u>2863</u> dwellings	Total altered to reflect capacity change identified above
	Borough of Redditch Commitments to Meet the Strategic Housing Requirement At 1.4.2013 Large Site Completions = 130 Large Site Commitments = 2783 Small Site Completions = 63 Small Site Commitments = 69 TOTAL dwellings = 3045	Borough of Redditch Commitments to Meet the Strategic Housing Requirement At 1.4.2013 Large Site Completions = 130 Large Site Commitments = 2783 <u>2733</u> Small Site Completions = 63 Small Site Commitments = 69 TOTAL dwellings = 3045<u>2995</u>	Calculation altered to reflect capacity change identified above
	Outstanding Strategic Housing Target at 1.4.2013 6400 dwelling target minus 3045 commitments = 3355 below strategic target	Outstanding Strategic Housing Target at 1.4.2013 6400 dwelling target minus 3045 <u>2995</u> commitments = 3355 <u>3405</u> below strategic target	Calculation altered to reflect capacity change identified above
Appendix 3: Schedule of Employment Sites			
Table i, IN20	1.32	1.32 <u>1.21</u>	Site area aligned to GIS area

Strikethrough – deleted text
 Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
			calculations
Table i, IN58	1.10	1.10 <u>1.04</u>	Site area aligned to GIS area calculations
Table i, IN82	7.78	7.78 <u>4.21</u>	Site area amended to take further account of landscape considerations and impact on the settlement of Mappleborough Green
Table i, IN84	0.19	0.19 <u>0.22</u>	Site area aligned to GIS area calculations
Table i, Sub Total	26.70 Ha	26.70 <u>22.99</u> Ha	Recalculation based on changes above
Table ii	Winyates Green Triangle (SoADC) 4.50	Winyates Green Triangle (SoADC) (<u>gross</u>) 12.00 <u>4.50</u>	Amendment made in line with Policy 23 changes
Table ii, Sub Total	Sub Total 27.29 Ha	Sub Total (<u>gross</u>) 27.29 <u>34.79</u> Ha	Amendment made in line with Policy 23 changes
Table iii, Total	55.711 Ha	55.711<u>59.501</u> Ha	Recalculation of altered sub totals above
Appendix 4: Infrastructure Implications of Local Plan No.4 Policies			
Policy 12, Existing provision	288 formally designated open spaces within the Borough.	288 <u>300</u> formally designated open spaces within the Borough.	Altered in line with amendments to losses and gains of

Strikethrough – deleted text

Underline – new or amended text

Policy/ paragraph/ table/ map reference in Proposed Submission version of BORLP4	Existing wording	Proposed wording/ correction	Reason for change
			open space
Appendix 5: Local Plan No.3 Saved Policies that will be replaced by Local Plan No.4			
B(BE).13	Policy 40 High Quality and Safer Communities	Policy 40 High Quality <u>Design</u> and Safer Communities	Typo
B(BE).14	Policy 40 High Quality and Safer Communities	Policy 40 High Quality <u>Design</u> and Safer Communities	Typo
B(BE).20	Policy 40 High Quality and Safer Communities	Policy 40 High Quality <u>Design</u> and Safer Communities	Typo
B(RA).2	Policy 10 Agricultural Workers Dwellings and Policy 9 Open Countryside	Policy 10 Agricultural <u>Rural</u> Workers Dwellings and Policy 9 Open Countryside	Change made as suggested by South Worcestershire Councils to align with NPPF terminology