

MARCH 2014

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) & (vi) Report

Summary of the main issues raised at
Proposed Submission stage
(30 Sept. to 11 Nov. 2013)



Contents

1. Introduction
2. Publication under Regulation 19 of the 2012 Regulations
3. The Representations
4. Bromsgrove Cross Boundary

Appendices

- 1 Consultation letter and Regulation 19 Statement of Representations Procedure
- 2 Public Notice - Statement of Representations Procedure
- 3 Consultation Poster
- 4 List of Representors

Abbreviations	
ADR	Area of Development Restraint
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
BAAG	Bentley Area Action Group
BCC	Birmingham City Council
BDC	Bromsgrove District Council
BDP	Bromsgrove District Plan
BORLP4	Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
GB	Green Belt
GBSLEP	Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership
HA	Highways Authority
HGDS	Housing Growth Development Study
LA	Local Authority
LWS	Local Wildlife Site
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Policy Guidance
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
RBC	Redditch Borough Council
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SOADC	Stratford on Avon District Council
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
STW	Severn Trent Water Ltd
WCC	Worcestershire County Council
WDC	Wychavon District Council
WFDC	Wyre Forest District Council
WGT	Winyates Green Triangle
WMRSS	West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy
WYG	White Young Green

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Redditch Borough Council (RBC) submitted the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (BORLP4) to the Secretary of State for independent examination on 12th March 2014.
- 1.2 The BORLP4 has been prepared in accordance with the Authority's Statement of Community Involvement, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (SI 767/2012). Stages prior to the commencement of the 2012 Regulations were prepared in accordance with appropriate legislation at that time.
- 1.3 This Statement sets out details of the BORLP4 publication and has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 22(1)(c)(v) & (vi) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It details how the proposed Submission process was undertaken, how many representations were received and the main issues that were raised. Where no issues were raised regarding a certain policy, this has also been indicated.
- 1.4 The Redditch Borough Council Statement of Consultation sets out the Requirements under Regulation 22(1)(c)(i to iv), which is published alongside this Statement.

2. Publication under Regulation 19 of the 2012 Regulations

2.1 The Proposed Submission version of BORLP4 was approved by Full Council at a meeting on 9th September 2013 for publication. A six week Representation Period was held between 30th September and 11th November 2013. The BORLP4 Representation Period ran concurrently with the BDP Representation Period due to the inclusion of a cross boundary policy, which impacts on both Plans.

2.2 Consultation Involvement and Engagement

Notification of the Representation Period was sent to 1277 bodies and individuals on the Council's database by post or email. This correspondence set out how copies of the relevant documentation, submission forms and guidance notes could be accessed, how to submit representations, and deadlines for submission. A copy of the letter text and Regulation 19 Statement of Representations Procedure Notice sent to consultees is provided at Appendix 1.

2.3 Statutory Notice

A notice was placed in the Redditch Advertiser on 2nd October 2013, setting out the Statement of Representation Procedure (Appendix 2). The contents of the Notice were also displayed on the Council's website www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan

2.4 Drop-in Events

The Statutory Notice also highlighted when Planning Officers were available to provide guidance on how to complete the Representation Forms at the Town Hall during the following dates/times:

- Monday to Friday (30th Sept -11th Nov): 10am to 4pm (Main Reception)
- Tuesday (8th Oct, 22nd Oct, and 5th Nov): 4pm to 8pm (Committee Rooms)
- Saturday (12th Oct, 17th Oct and 31st Oct): 9.00am to 11.30am (Committee Rooms)

Officers were also available at BDC Council House and/or Customer Service Centre during the following dates/times:

- Monday to Friday (30th Sept -11th Nov): 9am to 5pm (Main Reception)
- Tuesday (1st Oct, Conference Room): 4pm to 8pm and
- Thursday (17th Oct and 31st Oct, Committee Room): 4pm to 8pm
- Saturday (5th Oct, 19th Oct, and 2nd Nov): 9.00am to 11.30am (Customer Service Centre/Dolphin Centre)

2.5 Document Availability

The Proposed Submission version of BORLP4, Draft Policies Map and Inset Maps, supporting documentation, together with Representation Forms and Guidance Notes for their completion, were made available for inspection during the Representation Period at the following locations:

- Main Reception, Redditch Town Hall
- Former Planning Reception, Redditch Town Hall
- Redditch Library
- Mobile Library
- Woodrow Library
- Redditch One Stop Shops

Additionally, all documents were placed on the RBC web site www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan

2.6 Posters

A4 posters were placed on all Council noticeboards during the Representation Period. A copy of the poster can be seen at Appendix 3.

3. The Representations


3.1 The Number of Representations received:

1345¹ bodies or individuals made representations on BORLP4 (Appendix 4). Additional representations were received relating to the cross boundary element of the Plan which has been prepared in conjunction with BDC. These representations have been analysed separately. Of the 1346 BORLP4 Representors, 1235 requested that their Part A information was linked to Action Group representations, 111 made separate representations or individual comments. Some representors did not use the representation forms and these representors tended not to indicate whether they considered the Proposed Submission Document to be legally compliant, sound, or if they wished to attend the Examination Hearings.

3.2 The Representors:

Although it is difficult to categorise the responses, the following breakdown gives a general indication of the profile of the Representors.

- 1235 Representors requested to be linked to Action Group representations
 - 950 – Keep Our Green Campaign
 - 94 – Mappleborough Green Residents Association
 - 191 – Webheath Action Group
- 62 Representors were individuals
- 1 Representor was a community/ social group (Redditch Golf Club)
- 14 Representors were developers, landowners and businesses
- 9 Representors were Parish Councils, Ward Councillors, MPs
- 17 Representors were interest groups/ organisations/ Statutory agencies
- 7 Representors were other Councils/ Council departments




- 34 or 2.5% of Representors indicated that they wished to participate at the Hearing Sessions of the Examination

¹ The database contains 1353 Representor entries, which includes 8 deleted records which arose through duplication

3.3 Legal Compliance

Of the 387² individual Representations:

- 79 Representations stated that they found the Plan to be legally compliant
- 71 Representations stated that they did not find the Plan to be legally compliant
- 238 Representations did not state whether they considered the Plan to be legally compliant or not




² The database contains 396 Representation entries, which includes 9 deleted records which arose through duplication

3.4 Tests of Soundness

Of the 387 individual Representations:


- 52 Representations stated that they considered the Plan sound
- 207 Representations stated that they considered the Plan unsound
- 128 Representations did not state whether they considered the Plan sound or not



3.5 Breakdown of the Tests of Soundness

Of the 207 individual Representations that considered the Plan unsound:

- 179 found the Plan content to be **not** Justified
- 132 found the Plan content to be **not** Effective
- 74 found the Plan content to be **not** Consistent with national policy
- 112 found the Plan content to be **not** Positively prepared



3.6 Late Representations

The Council received four Representations after the close of the Representation Period. They are detailed below alongside the reasons for accepting them.

Part A Rep No.	Name	Reason
R0918	Miss T Gooding	Rep sent to MP on 11 November and forwarded to RBC on 12 November
R1189	Mappleborough Green Parish Council (MGPC)	MGPC is a break-away Parish Council from Studley Parish Council. RBC was unaware of this split and MGPC was not on the consultees database. To rectify this, MGPC were offered an extension to the six week period (until 4 December 2013) in which to formulate a response.
R1216	Gleeson	Submission discussed with agent prior to close of consultation. Client approval needed before submission could be made
R1347	Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) – Land, Air & Water Quality Team	WRS missed the close of consultation, however it was considered imperative that their views were taken into account

3.6 The Main Issues raised in the Representations

The summaries below indicate the main issues raised in the Representations. These do not attempt to cover all the issues raised, or the detailed comments made. Full copies of all Representations are available to view separately, or on the Council's web site at: www.redditchbc.gov.uk/examination

Legal Compliance

Duty to Cooperate

- Need to demonstrate cooperation with SOADC
- Proposed 'Memorandum of Understanding' between RBC and SOADC does not demonstrate cooperation
- Ineffective joint working between RBC and SOADC
- Need to demonstrate cooperation with WDC
- Need to demonstrate cooperation with BCC
- Need to demonstrate cooperation with GBSLEP
- Welcome commitment to addressing Birmingham's objectively assessed needs through plan review if necessary
- Has consulted WFDC at each stage of the plans preparation and have actively sought to engage under the Duty to Cooperate
- Site allocations have no strategic impact on Wyre Forest, are well related to settlements
- RBC and WFDC have a shared interest in regeneration of our areas through North Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration Service
- Centro request status as a 'prescribed body'
- Plan contains no other strategic issues which need detailed cooperation

Community Involvement

- Failure to consult with local Parish Councils
- Not taking account of concerns about impact of employment on Mappleborough Green
- No consultation undertaken with Winyates Green residents
- No consultation undertaken with Matchborough residents
- No consultation undertaken with Mappleborough Green residents
- Mappleborough Green Community should have been identified as community stakeholders in the SCI
- No consultation undertaken with Studley residents in the vicinity of the land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital
- Complexity of tests of soundness and effect on the consultation process
- Purdah process affecting the ability of residents to ask questions at Council meetings
- No leaflet was sent to all residents

- Publicity of the plan was inadequate
- Residents need more time to make responses
- Lack of choice about proposed development locations during consultations
- Some drop in sessions were too focussed on Redditch growth consultation and not enough advertisement of Local Plan No.4
- Little or no account has been taken of the responses by BAAG and others
- Not enough information on the website about Local Plan consultation
- The consultation calendar on the Councils Website did not advertise the Plan consultation – this is misleading
- Questions whether this represents a truly open and transparent way of operating, or fair way of treating constituents

Acts and Regulations

- The Localism Act is intended to give people more power over planned development in their neighbourhood

Soundness

Overall strategy of the Plan

- Plan's strategy to discourage people travelling out of Redditch is inconsistent with the GBSLEP vision. Should be encouraging links with region.

Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

- Should include wording that where a proposal meets policies such as 27 or 9, it will not be rejected because it is Green Belt, Countryside or other designation.

Local Portrait

- Action agreed to replace wording hasn't been taken forward
- Missing important information on the overlap between safety/security and efforts to promote sustainable transport choices
- Suggest more accurate wording for regeneration work at Woodrow and Winyates District Centres

Local Challenges

- Action agreed to replace wording hasn't been taken forward
- Negative wording about perception of crime

Vision

- Support for the Vision

Objectives

- Support for the Objectives
- Failure to meet all Plan objectives
- Objective 1 doesn't take account of development of Winyates Green

- Objective 11, no flood risk account of Winyates Green

Sustainable Places to Live which Meet our Needs

Policy 2 Settlement Hierarchy

- Support for a logical framework
- Support Redditch as the sustainable settlement and that the vast majority of growth will take place on greenfield urban extensions adjacent to development boundaries
- Omission of A435 corridor as a strategic site reference in the policy
- Ambiguous definition of “locally identified affordable housing and other development needs”
- More clarity needed over intent for market housing

Policy 3 Development Strategy

- Support having sufficient homes, to meet needs in the best locations including strategic sites
- Support delivery early in the plan period to ensure robust housing supply
- Approach is proactive in achieving levels of growth required to meet NPPF requirements
- Support early delivery of Strategic Sites
- Importance of infrastructure delivery is recognised and should be planned with equitable contributions
- Query definition and references to infrastructure so that is made clearer who pays
- Query ‘brownfield first’ reference
- Inflexible policy, unable to deal with rapid market changes
- Omission of A435 Corridor as a strategic site which requires reference in the policy
- Omission of Brockhill West as a Strategic Site

Policy 4 Housing Provision

- Support for the housing requirement
- Query policy wording. Change ‘around’ to ‘minimum’
- Do not refer to a ‘minimum’ number of houses as this implies more land will be identified
- Justification of housing requirement
- Housing requirement based on unsound evidence
- Housing requirement is too low
- There are enough houses in Redditch
- There is significant potential for housing provision in Redditch above the level identified in the SHLAA and HGDS
- Review of SHLAA sites indicates that sites can become available over time

- Government indicated developers are sitting on brownfield sites to build 1.5 million homes so do not build on greenfield sites
- Development closer to town and infrastructure provides the best opportunity to extend existing infrastructure and is sustainable and cost effective
- Concerns regarding the reference to housing opportunities in SOAD along the A435 corridor
- SOADC Plan identifies Mappleborough Green as a Local Service Village to provide dwellings towards its own housing requirement
- Reference to limited capacity in Stratford of Avon District demonstrates that there is capacity for new housing other than sites 1 and 2
- Reference to land in SOADC should be removed
- Growth levels impacting on policing requirements
- Requirement to comply with Lifetime Homes standard will affect affordable housing delivery
- Redditch's empty homes can fill the housing waiting list rather than building 3200 homes
- There is a duty to cooperate with Bromsgrove to deliver the full objectively assessed housing need

Policy 5 Effective and Efficient Use of Land

- Query appropriateness of a blanket density requirement
- Density should be considered on a site by site basis
- 30-50 dph density should be set as aspirational targets not minimum densities
- Remediation requirements on contaminated land/PDL should apply to all development
- Policy could provide better protection against risk of pollution to controlled waters
- Contradicts NPPF Policy 17 regarding encouragement of brownfield land provided it is not of high environmental value
- Brownfield sites could accommodate 1650 to 1750 dwellings and 5Ha of employment, but have disappeared from the Plan
- Use previously developed land to promote economic growth and safeguard protected land
- Housing mix should be negotiated to take account of local needs and utilise house builders knowledge

Policy 6 Affordable Housing

- Shortfall of affordable housing provision
- A mix of affordable housing tenures is not specified so meet isn't being met
- Should have 40% target in line with the latest SHMA evidence
- A higher level of affordable housing (40%) could be achieved in some locations using a geographical split i.e. in the rural south

- Wording of “up to 30%” is concerning as developers will minimise level of affordable housing
- 30% as affordable doesn’t take account of other development costs arising from other Local Plan policies, so a lower affordable housing requirement is appropriate
- No justification for revised financial contribution levels
- Failure to address strategic housing issue in Birmingham
- Take account of site specific viability

Policy 7 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- Winyates Green used as temporary site therefore shouldn’t be developed

Policy 8 Green Belt

- Consider policy wording change
- Exceptional circumstances are concluded to exist to justify the removal of Brockhill West for residential development
- Proposals which comply with other criteria in the Plan such as development in rural areas, also pass this policy
- Policy states appropriate development in its national definition and adds nothing local. It is negatively drafted, requiring very special circumstances justification without making a link to Policy 9 or 27

Policy 9 Open Countryside

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 10 Agricultural Workers Dwellings

- No significant issue were identified

Creating and Sustaining a Green Environment

Policy 11 Green Infrastructure

- Support for policy intentions
- Support for designation of LWS – Ravensbank Drive bridle track (Drivers Road)
- Concept statements for Strategic Site have had no scrutiny but would have development plan policy status

Policy 12 Open Space Provision

- Support for policy intentions
- Query relevance of SPD in relation to policy
- Not reflective of evidence base in the Playing Pitch Strategy
- Have a separate policy covering built sport provision

Policy 13 Primarily Open Space

- Support for policy intentions

Policy 14 Protection of Incidental Open Space

- Support for policy intentions

Policy 15 Climate Change

- Support for policy intentions
- Query duplication of criteria (iii) and (iv)
- Criteria (iii) is unnecessary as it is addressed in criteria (iv) and (v)

Policy 16 Natural Environment

- Supports and welcomes policy
- Greater protection required for ancient woodlands to align with the NPPF

Policy 17 Flood Risk Management

- Support reference to assessment and mitigation against downstream flood risk

Policy 18 Sustainable Water Management

- Criteria i to iii should be applied to sites of all sizes (including those under 1 hectare) in all cases
- The responsibility and cost of maintenance of water channels is not sufficiently addressed
- Replace reference to Circular 3/99 with reference to NPPG on 'Water supply, wastewater and water quality'

Policy 19 Sustainable Travel and Accessibility

- Policy fails to mention specific AQMAs in Studley and Henley in Arden
- Re-open the rail route to Evesham
- Disagree with Council stance and suggest s.257 orders would allow redesign, redirection or extinguishment of routes to promote greater safety and usage
- Encourage new development to front onto existing routes where these fall below acceptable standards

Policy 20 Transport Requirements for New Development

- Would be better to encourage development to be situated in proximity to a well served bus route rather than be located 250m of local services
- Excessive charges not commensurate with the costs that could be reasonably incurred at Brockhill East, seeks reasonable charging regime

Policy 21 Alexandra Hospital Public Transport Interchange

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 22 Road Hierarchy

- Should have taken into account report from WCC Highways earlier in the plan process

Creating a Borough where Businesses can Thrive

Policy 23 Employment Land Provision

- Support locations for employment land
- Flexibility required in Redditch Eastern Gateway references to its employment uses
- Use vacant and unused employment premises for housing
- Moons Moat industrial estate still has plenty of empty units and land that can be built on. There is no need for new units when existing units are still empty
- Designation of 15ha to meet waste facility needs is imprecise, based on crude assumptions and is speculative

Policy 24 Development within Primarily Employment Areas

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 25 Development outside of Primarily Employment Areas

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 26 Office Development

- Support recognition of IN67 for office uses. Welcome no cap on scale of office uses within the site
- Delete references to IN69/Policy 47 Land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital as it's not appropriate for office development

Policy 27 Rural Economic Development

- If criteria passed in policy 27 dealing with a specific proposal are met by a proposal, it doesn't clarify if it passes the plan generally.
- Insert new second paragraph recognising that uses connected to farming and the food chain are best located in rural areas
- Remove reference to 'small scale' as it is confusing if applied generically
- Define small scale in the glossary (definition provided)
- Not realistic or positive to ask a rural use to pass a test to judge its type and scale against rurality itself
- Inserting 'reasonably' before 'accessible via sustainable transport'
- In paragraph 3 omit "in some circumstances" which adds/clarifies nothing

Policy 28 Supporting Education, Training and Skills

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 29 Broadband and Telecommunications

- No significant issue were identified

Improving the vitality and viability of Redditch Town Centre and District Centres

Policy 30 Town Centre and Retail Hierarchy

- Support policy thrust to improve retail offer in appropriate locations
- Include proposed new District Centre at Brockhill East in Tier 2 of the hierarchy
- Include reference to Brockhill West District Centre

Policy 31 Regeneration for the Town Centre

- Support policy thrust to improve retail offer in appropriate locations
- Include priority project of “Improved signage and promotion of Historic and Heritage sites”
- No mention of or plans for a town centre Heritage Centre/museum

Policy 32 Protection of the Retail Core

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 33 Use of Upper Floors

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 34 District Centre Redevelopment

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 35 Health of District Centres

- No significant issue were identified

Protecting and Enhancing Redditch's Historic Environment

Policy 36 Historic Environment

- Amend wording to ensure policy covers all non-designated heritage assets

Policy 37 Historic Buildings and Structures

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 38 Conservation Areas

- Supportive of policy but more publicity needed of the Schedule of Locally Listed Heritage Assets
- Not enough focus in the Schedule on history of the building and its significance

Creating Safe and Attractive Places to Live and Work

Policy 39 Built Environment

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 40 High Quality Design and Safer Communities

- Inappropriate imposition of Secure by Design principles

- Query relevance of SPDs in relation to policy
- Inadequate reference to permeability and activity/defensible space as is in the SPD
- Risk of crime to public art should be included
- Window coverings impeding natural surveillance should be discouraged

Policy 41 Shopfronts and Shopfront Security

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 42 Advertisements

- Make it clear that permission will not be given where landowner consent hasn't been obtained
- Action agreed to replace wording hasn't been taken forward

Promoting Redditch's Community Well-being

Policy 43 Leisure, Tourism and Abbey Stadium

- Lack of evidence regarding built sporting provision

Policy 44 Health Facilities

- No significant issue were identified

Policy 45 Cemeteries

- Support for the requirements of this policy

Strategic Sites

Policy 46 Brockhill East

- Support principle of selection as a Strategic Site
- Query whether delivery rates for Brockhill East are realistic
- Amend criterion (v) to recognise the land provision and delivery of the first school on site with community use contribution
- Qualify criterion (xvi) as the site comes forward in phases, each making a proportionate contribution to the Weights Lane link road
- Criterion (xvii) should allow development on a phased basis where each proposal assessed both the impact of the proposal and cumulative impact
- Criterion (xiv) should include the Red Ditch as a principal receiving watercourse
- Reference to Green Infrastructure Concept Statement concerning as it hasn't been scrutinised
- Green Belt review conducted concluding that four main areas could be removed from the Green Belt to accommodate allocation requirements
- No justification for impact assessment of the Brockhill East District Centre
- Refer to potential for relocation of Holyoakes Fields First School as full provision of a first school isn't justified by the Brockhill East development alone

- Indicative vision map is open to interpretation and not reflective of evidence base
- Evidence of White Young Green were flawed in respect of their comparative assessment of development locations on the periphery of Redditch
- The WMRSS panel concluded that options east of the A441, favoured by WYG, at Bordesley would have significant Green Belt harm and there were better options including existing ADRs and land adjacent

Policy 47 Land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital

- Support inclusion as Strategic Site
- Support for the site subject to retention of tree belt between Green Lane
- Objection to development of this site
 - Traffic impacts
 - Landscape sensitivity
 - Flooding
 - More suited wholly to residential uses because Policy 44 already safeguards land for health related uses
 - More suited wholly to residential uses because of low take-up and no change in market conditions
 - More suited wholly to residential uses because its unattractive to the market
 - More suited wholly to residential uses because the use is better suited to the Town Centre
 - Remove reference to development being appropriate in years 6-10
 - No consultation undertaken with Studley residents in the vicinity of the land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital
 - Coalescence of Redditch and Studley

Policy 48 Webheath Strategic Site

- General support for the site
- Other local plan policies cover aspects of this policy or other legislation making the policy onerous
- Provides a sustainable location to meet future needs and can be delivered without significant technical constraints
- Objection to development of this site
 - Landscape and biodiversity impacts
 - Impact on character
 - Impact on the historic environment
 - Visual impact
 - Traffic implications
 - Inadequate roads / highway infrastructure
 - Not taking account of transport evidence before the Plan was approved for Pre-submission consultation

- No evidence to suggest that the 'Choose How you Move' project will reduce car travel
- Public transport is almost non-existent
- Evidence base for transport (prepared by Halcrow) is not robust and credible, therefore the sustainability of the site is in doubt
- Dispute the allocation of Webheath when a planning application on the site has been refused (May 2013) on transport grounds
- Consultation with WCC Highways started too late
- Accessibility concerns for large scale development based on the Halcrow 2010 Transport Accessibility Study
- Already dangerous roads
- Sewerage infrastructure
- STW indicate that Webheath site is least preferable site due to sewage infrastructure – comments which have been ignored by RBC
- A disused sewage works on the Webheath site is not referred to in any evidence. This should constitute a constraint to development in the same way as Area 8
- Flooding and water drainage issues / effects on the Bow Brook corridor and downstream
- Flooding impacts on Feckenham
- Flooding and pollution danger to Norgrove Fishery
- SFRA work is inadequate, mitigation doesn't consider its consequences
- Costs associated with the consequences of flooding to existing properties
- Use of balancing ponds would be ineffective and pose a greater threat of contamination
- Should be protection in case of failure of pumped sewage
- SHLAA (2011 and 2012) state that development potential on the ADR was unclear at that time due to outstanding SFRA and drainage issues
- Concerns regarding infrastructure delivery and funding
- Inadequacy of social provision including education and health facilities, and emergency services
- Hospital is on the other side and town and is likely to be downgraded
- Limited local services
- Reiterate need for infrastructure provision/ upgrades prior to development
- No CIL in place to support delivery of infrastructure
- SA analysis is flawed including Table 1 in the SA
- Errors in the evidence used to justify the SA scores

- Views of residents not taken in to account properly in respect of SA scores and travel data
- Distance from employment and other amenities
- Webheath is remote from the Town Centre
- Querying deliverability of the site within the plan period on the basis that detailed assessment have not yet being carried out
- No alternative sites have been proposed if the site cannot be delivered
- Other sites would be more suitable for development
- No detailed analysis of the Webheath ADR
- Inconsistent site appraisal of the site compared to the others
- RBC has not demonstrated a fair and equal assessment of all development options
- RBC has not demonstrated that all other development options/ alternatives have been considered
- WYG 1 Report 07/08 does not support the Webheath ADR – development of the ADR should only be considered as part of a future Plan review
- WYG 2 Report (2009) failed to identify any significant benefits of developing the ADR
- WYG 2 Report (2009) recommended that Brockhill and Bordesley Park were sequentially preferable sites to Webheath
- WYG 2 Report (2009) should not have been completely dismissed from the evidence base as the RSS Panel merely disagreed with the methodology only
- In accordance with WYG 2 Report (2009), RBC should be considering alternative sites ahead of Webheath ADR
- Identified potential of the ADR for development in the WMRSS Panel Report does not provide a mechanism to remove ADR designation in favour of development
- Land ownership issues
- Significant remodelling of the site will be required to accommodate the allocated number of houses
- The HGDS makes incorrect and misleading statements about the assessment and suitability of Webheath ADR for development
- Site should be safeguarded until after 2026
- Visual Map is misleading
- Indicative density of the ADR will be contrary to Policy 5 in terms of its scale and character
- The site is the least accessible contrary to Policy 15 (i)

- Policy 67 of draft Core Strategy (2011) stated that the ADR was not to be brought forward for development. No further evidence has been provided to justify a u-turn on this position
- Not compliant with NPPF, paras 7, 14, 30, 85, 95, 97 and 182
- BORLP3, Policy B(RA).3 – Areas of Development Restraint not reviewed appropriately as part of the BORLP4 process
- BORLP3 Inspector did not consider detailed matters relating to the ADR therefore it has not been reviewed appropriately
- HGDS (2013) makes incorrect and misleading statements about the assessment/ suitability of the ADR for development
- Objections from residents makes the Plan untenable
- Question if the site can be classified as strategic
- Impact on Crowle considering its 25 dwellings allocation in the South Worcestershire Development Plan

Policy 49 Woodrow Strategic Site

- General support for the site

Monitoring and Implementation

- No significant issue were identified

Appendix 1: RCBD1 Redditch Cross Boundary Development

See Bromsgrove Cross Boundary section of this document.

Appendix 2: Schedule of Housing Sites

- Support for development of Broadacres Farm (part of A435 Corridor)
 - Complements character of Mappleborough Green
 - Suggests land at the rear can also be incorporated
- Objection to development of Site 158 – South of scout hut, Oakenshaw Road
 - Currently used as Open Space
 - Site contains footpaths, football facilities and other amenities
- Objection to development of site 211 – A435 (former ADR)
 - Site 211 – Site address is unclear and misleading
 - Include employment site IN82 for housing
- Include employment site IN69 for housing

Appendix 3: Schedule of Employment Sites

- IN69 Not appropriate for employment and housing is more appropriate
- IN82
 - Employment allocation interrupts the potential strategic site delivery of the A435 corridor

- Employment sites available elsewhere e.g. Redditch Eastern Gateway

Appendix 4: Infrastructure Implications of Local Plan No.4 Policies

- No significant issue were identified

Appendix 5: Local Plan No.3 Saved Policies that will be replaced by Local Plan No.4

- No significant issue were identified

Appendix 6: Saved Supplementary Planning Documents

- No significant issue were identified

Appendix 7: Glossary and Abbreviations

- No significant issue were identified

Key Diagram

- Support in respect of the Brockhill East Strategic Site
- Identify A435 as a strategic site
- Omission of Brockhill West as a Strategic Site

Policies Map

- Omission of the A435 corridor on the policies map as a strategic site
- Brockhill East Strategic Site shouldn't contain Open Space over land within the site, causing masterplanning problems. Some is already developed
- Omission of Brockhill West as a Strategic Site

Omission Sites

- Failure to take account of greenfield and brownfield sites within the urban area
- A435 Corridor omission as a strategic site
- Town Centre allocations should precede the delivery of large greenfield sites through the Local Plan
- Omission of area of traditional residential development at Dagtail End with amendments to Green Belt boundary required to allow building replacement and limited infill
- Omission of sustainable on-farm slaughter facility near Astwood Bank as an extension to farming practice
- There are defensible Green Belt boundaries at Brockhill West and Brockhill North to allow for allocated and safeguarded land for potential future development
- An evidence base portfolio is submitted to provide a scenario where an initial allocation of land within Redditch at Brockhill West can occur prior to decisions on allocations in adjoining Bromsgrove
- Opportunities in Area 12, in the Studley area to either increase housing provision or set aside land for longer term development

Allocation of the A435 (former ADR) Corridor for Development

- Support allocation of land, and request it be designated as a strategic site for housing
- Support Broadacres Farm site subject to low densities and appropriate site boundaries
- Objection to development of this site
 - IN82 will exacerbate the environmental impacts of pollution and noise on residents
 - IN82 will remove new town tree plantations designed to screen existing employment
 - Employment should be segregated from housing
 - Employment development would not be conducive with the adjacent semi-rural residential area
 - Objection to employment/ retail designations
 - Re-use vacant commercial / industrial premises in the surrounding areas
 - Allocation of only 4.5ha of employment land at WGT in RBC Plan when compared to the 12ha identified in the Eastern gateway Study indicates that RBC could be underestimating the WGT capacity, therefore the employment site at the southern section of the A435 ADR may be an over provision
 - Far Moor Lane is a leafy credit to Redditch and will be spoilt with the development
 - Far Moor Lane is already over used by traffic other than residents and the road surface is full of pot holes
 - Increased traffic impact on the A435, Far Moor Lane, Claybrook Drive, M42 j.3
 - 200 cars on an already busy road has environmental and highway safety impacts
 - Query validity of traffic assessment
 - 'Dog Island' will become dangerous for pedestrians accessing the adjacent school
 - Safety risks as a consequence of increased traffic
 - Loss of visual and physical separation of Redditch and Mappleborough Green. Area provides a buffer between Mappleborough Green and Redditch, coalescence of settlements
 - Removal of woodland buffer will impact on the character and appearance of the linear green corridor
 - Removal of woodland buffer will impact on the environmental and quality of life benefits of local residents
 - The land/trees here provide a buffer for the noise and pollution from the busy road

- Horrified that the buffer zone of green between the A435 and Far Moor Lane is to be obliterated by development.
- Wildlife (including badgers) and ancient hedgerow effects
- Urban edge of Redditch will not be visually contained
- Housing and employment development will have significant impact on the established character of the area and on the distinct identity of Mappleborough Green
- Limited scope for development along A435 corridor within Stratford District
- A factory here would be an eyesore, disruptive, noisy and polluting
- A factory here would have an impact of the value of existing properties
- Questions whether residents will be compensated for losses in property values or additional insurance premiums.
- Noise pollution
- Air pollution
- Impact on neighbouring AQMAs
- Impact on Ipsley Alders SSSI and Drovers Road LWS
- Concern over preservation of tress and hedgerows
- Questions why we need to concrete over large areas of green land and decimate the biodiversity of the countryside
- Loss of greenfield land
- Was assured by searches that the area was green belt
- Impact on biodiversity and Green Infrastructure
- Concerns about whether the environmental impact on streams and brooks has been fully evaluated
- Visual impact of development
- Identified as high landscape value in the White Consultants Landscape Assessment For Villages
- WYG Study (2009) found that the gap between Mappleborough Green and Redditch would be eroded with the developments
- No landscape assessments have been considered in the allocation of the sites
- A number of recommendations put forward as a result of a landscape review of the sites
- Proposed development area is cramped, in an area which is already heavily populated
- Impact on existing schools and distance from proposed development
- Insufficient infrastructure to accompany development
- Drainage
- Development will have an impact on the flood plain and increase flood risk to existing houses

- Oversight that no Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out on what is a very moist area with marches in close proximity
- Flooding
- The status of the ADR changed from one Plan draft to the next , leading to a different conclusion and without any consultation with individuals or groups in this area
- Already enough houses here
- Do not want affordable housing in this location
- Questions whether this is a case of people securing land for development through not legal means
- No commitment from SOADC to make provision for RBC development needs in this location
- Lack of joint working with Stratford Council
- Inconsistent with SOADC strategy to minimise development along A435 corridor
- Development briefs / detailed policies should be prepared for the sites and include land within Stratford District
- Site no.'s 211 north and south (excluding Broadacres Farm) should be retained to keep the two settlements separate
- WYG1 & WYG2 state disadvantages of developing the site for any significant number of dwellings
- WYG report identified all parcels of undeveloped land to west of A435 at Mappleborough Green as being high or high/medium sensitivity to residential development
- Insufficient evidence to support allocation
- A435 Review: *“the boundary of Warwickshire is somewhat arbitrary and should not be a barrier to development”* has not been clarified by LAs
- The WMRSS panel Report (Sept 2009), in para 8.84 states that it was reluctantly concluded that it would be inappropriate to recommend development within the Studley area. Any development in Stratford District west of the A435 accessed via the A435 ADR would have such modest capacity that it would not be significant in strategic terms – In other words, the land along the A435 corridor should not be used for development
- Evidence exists refusing access to Stratford District when they wished to build on this site

Infrastructure

- Needs a separate policy on infrastructure
- Transport infrastructure evidence hasn't fed into the decision making at appropriate times

Meeting the housing needs of Birmingham

- Need for a clear policy hook which would allow the housing needs of Birmingham to be considered once they are identified

- Failure to address Birmingham's strategic housing growth issues

Democratic process

- Decisions made in Council meetings are part of an undemocratic process
- Elected Members have failed to represent the views of residents
- Questions raised at RBC Exec and Full Council meetings were deferred to PINS by the planners

Miscellaneous Comments

- Lack of focus towards Neighbourhood Planning
- Paragraph numbering required
- Poor choice of colour scheme

EVIDENCE BASE

- Need for Plan viability testing
- Lack of transport evidence and lack of regard to it
- Findings / recommendations from WCC Highways report should have been incorporated into the plan

Sustainability Appraisal

- SA does not take account of the Webheath Neighbourhood Action Group analysis
- Not taken account of reports from STW stating their preference for Bordesley site rather than Webheath
- SA doesn't cover all areas
- Flawed analysis / inconsistent approach to analysis of sites in the study and SA

SHMA

- Justification of housing requirement
- Shortfall of affordable housing provision
- Consider the housing requirement figure is too low
- The housing requirement of 6,400 dwellings is a midway point between the lower and upper ranges in the SHMA
- Updated SHMA Monitoring Report (June 2013) suggests a housing requirement figure of 6,235 and 9,724 dwellings after a 3% vacancy rate has being applied
- Housing requirement of 6,400 dwellings may impede economic growth and prosperity
- An increase in the older population warrants forward planning to avoid a shortage with regards to the elderly population

SHLAA

- The SHLAA is flawed evidence

- A senior planner was asked by BDC to review the SHLAA but no such report was prepared
- Sporting facilities such as golf courses should be relocated to GB land where the openness of the GB will not be affected in order for open space land to be allocated for development
- GB land should be a late option in a proper sequential approach to the identification of land for development
- Open space should be allocated for development ahead of Green Belt

Five Year Housing Land Supply

- Lack of five year supply
- Appropriate buffer
- No discount applied for lapsed sites
- Dealing with shortfall in provision (Liverpool vs. Sedgefield methods)
- Query whether delivery rates for Brockhill East are realistic

Affordable Housing Viability Assessment

- Query current validity of Assessment
- Query reliability of cost assumptions
- Lack of clarity in notional site analysis

SPDs

- Unclear what SPDs will contain

A Review of the A435 Corridor and Adjoining Lands

- Support Broadacres Farm being recommended for residential development
- Tree loss unacceptable as all trees are valuable, report doesn't acknowledge this

Worcestershire County Council Transport Infrastructure

- Query interpretation of highways evidence
- Member presentations by County HA undermined the validity of selected sites
- Presentation made it clear that there were still many areas that had not been considered
- HA had not finished assessment of major concerns about M42 J1 and J3. These concerns could undermine the ability of the Plan to be delivered
- Concerns about the ability of the A38 to expand its capacity at J1 to ease current flow issues without the anticipated increase from housing at Redditch
- Assessment has not considered the impact from a further large volume of housing yet to be located in Bromsgrove
- Concerns over the viability of the selected sites regarding bus routes and public transport

- HA had not been asked to make up comparative information of other major sites in Redditch by Redditch officers
- Officers stated that Bordesley had been ruled out as not sustainable with highways and public transport, the concerns about motorway links were not detailed
- Current site selections are not sustainable for travel to work within Redditch. The industrial areas are on the opposite side of the town and would require 2/3 bus changes

Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- An overarching strategic infrastructure assessment will provide West Mercia policies evidence but isn't yet completed
- Support for definition of infrastructure and alignment with West Mercia police's definition
- Needs reference to West Mercia Police's equipment and staff set-up costs
- Details provided for Western Power Distributions planning requirements


4. **CROSS BOUNDARY - BROMSGROVE**

- 4.1 Through BORLP4, RBC is unable to identify sufficient land within its administrative boundary to meet its objectively assessed housing need. Resolution of this issue has been achieved jointly with Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) through the proposed allocation of Bromsgrove District land adjacent to the Redditch Borough boundary. Policy RCBD1 – Redditch Cross Boundary Development, forms part of the Bromsgrove District Plan and is included for information in BORLP4 at Appendix 1.
- 4.2 For the purpose of this reporting process and subsequent Examination, Representations relating specifically to Policy RBCD1 were given separate Representor and Representation numbers prefixed 'XB' and are detailed in Appendix 4 of this document.
- 4.3 The summary of Representations has been compiled jointly by RBC and BDC and reflects a comprehensive list of all the issues received during the Representation Period, and is set out below.
- 4.4 **The Number of Cross Boundary Representations received:**
68 bodies or individuals made representations (Appendix 4), which included 2 Representors who requested that their Part A forms were also linked to BAGG in addition to their individual comments. Some Representors did not use the representation forms and these Representors tended not to indicate whether they considered the Proposed Submission Document to be legally compliant, sound, or if they wished to attend the Examination Hearings. Of the 68 cross boundary Representors, 19 also made representations about the reset of the BDP and 26 also made representations about the remainder of BORLP4.

4.5 The Cross Boundary Representatives:

Although it is difficult to categorise the responses, the following breakdown gives a general indication of the profile of the Representatives.


- 2 Representatives requested to be linked to BAAG representations
- 38 Representatives were individuals
- 2 Representatives were Action Groups
- 11 Representatives were developers, landowners and businesses
- 5 Representatives were Parish Councils, Ward Councillors, MPs
- 7 Representatives were interest groups/ organisations/ Statutory agencies
- 3 Representatives were other Councils/ Council departments
- 22 or 32.4% of Representatives indicated that they wished to participate at the Hearing Sessions of the Examination



4.6 Legal Compliance - Cross Boundary

Of the 139 individual Representations:


- 13 Representations stated that they found the Plan to be legally compliant
- 14 Representations stated that they did not find the Plan to be legally compliant
- 112 Representations did not state whether they considered the Plan to be legally compliant or not



4.7 Tests of Soundness - Cross Boundary

Of the 139 individual Representations:


- 9 Representations stated that they considered the Plan sound
- 83 Representations stated that they considered the Plan unsound
- 47 Representations did not state whether they considered the Plan sound or not



4.8 Breakdown of the Tests of Soundness - Cross Boundary

Of the 83 individual Representations that considered the Plan unsound:

- 62 found the Plan content to be **not** Justified
- 44 found the Plan content to be **not** Effective
- 31 found the Plan content to be **not** Consistent with national policy
- 39 found the Plan content to be **not** Positively prepared



4.9 The Main Issues raised in the Bromsgrove Cross Boundary Representations

Appendix 1: RCBD1 Redditch Cross Boundary Development

- Key issues should be considered prior to allocations such as transport strategies, GI Strategy and Management Plan, Sewer Capacity, drainage impacts, impact on protected species, archaeology and health provision.
- Provision of these sites for Redditch questioned when Bromsgrove cannot meet its own housing need.
- Concern about what stage the school gets implemented in Site 1, if phased later pupils may be forced to travel considerable distances
- Should not discourage 'rat-running', it should be prevented
- Democratic process flawed
- No consultation with Studley Parish Council
- Evidence base omission of West Midlands Local Transport Plan
- Redditch Eastern Gateway Economic Impact Study (June 2013) - factually incorrect. P.50 states access from Far Moor Lane not lane off A435
- Difficult to consider the responses made by the Councils to the previous representations
- There is no mutual benefit to Bromsgrove District
- Pressure from Birmingham may mean further loss of Green Belt contributing to further unacceptable loss of Green Belt
- Duty to Cooperate has been used unreasonably to require over 50% of the Redditch housing requirement in Bromsgrove
- No methodology for the scoring of sustainability appraisal was published
- No independent review of the SA scoring or responses to objections
- Implied that an evidenced argument could impact on the Council's proposals, but planners abdicate responsibility to the Planning Inspector rather than address issues
- Inconsistent to allocate these Green Belt sites considering what is said in Bromsgrove's housing options document about Green Belt.
- Inconsistent with Green Belt criteria in the NPPF
- Redditch Green Belt Study (Jan 2013) doesn't consider Site 1
- Jobs need to balance the people, rather than becoming a dormitory housing area.
- WCC Transport consultants have a conflict of interest
- RBC Exec papers not available in time for deputations or questions to be put forward
- Reassurance sought of appropriate flood mitigation downstream of Redditch
- Brockhill East should be allocated for 700 not 600 dwellings
- Policy should identify safeguarded land for beyond the plan period
- The words 'up to' should be deleted in relation to the 40% affordable housing target

HOUSING GROWTH DEVELOPMENT STUDY

- Flawed analysis / inconsistent approach to analysis of sites in the study and SA

- Highways evidence/information insufficient for analysis of sites
- Highways information received at a later stage undermines the chosen sites
- Concerns about motorway links have not been considered
- Analysis has not taken into account the impact of other new housing proposals in Bromsgrove
- Support concept that Redditch needs cannot be fully met and acknowledge need for cross boundary development
- Deliverability of the sites
- Land ownership issues
- Study makes incorrect and misleading statements about the assessment and suitability of Webheath ADR for development
- Planning Statement to support policy RCBD1 does not include funding commitments to the school
- Consultation with WCC Highways started too late
- No CIL in place to support delivery of infrastructure
- View of residents not taken in to account properly
- Concerns regarding infrastructure delivery and funding
- Bromsgrove policy has not been applied (Bromsgrove town sitting in a bowl and maintaining that it should not spill over that bowl), but under duty to cooperate it is supposed to be a two way negotiation.
- Redditch SHLAA should be reconsidered to identify additional land and increase densities
- Objection to Area 5 not being proposed for development
 - Heritage issues should be challenged
 - Question whether the case for re-opening the investigation into Site 5 being used for housing being re-opened as promised
 - Mitigation could be provided
- Support for development at Brockhill (Site 2)
 - There is scope for housing on the site
- Objection to development at Brockhill (Site 2)
 - No reassurance for open space to be adopted given previous history at Brockhill
- Objection to development at Foxlydiate (Site 1)
 - Pollution issues
 - Flooding / water drainage issues and effects on the Bow Brook corridor
 - Site is not deliverable in 5 year period because of sewage issues
 - Costly site to develop
 - The Bow Brook Study should be taken into consideration
 - Impact on the aquifer / water quality issues
 - Sewerage disposal will require pumping
 - Costs associated with the consequences of flooding to existing properties
 - There are refuse sites on the land
 - The masterplan does not provide enough detail / not adequate to determine delivery
 - Other sites for development are more appropriate

- No alternative sites have been proposed if the site cannot be delivered
- Requires major road infrastructure to provide access to the site
- Access to the site would require link to the PRN which would be contrary to Policy 19 (v)
- The Transport and Highways evidence to support the site does not provide factual evidence and relies on assumptions. No detail on engineering works necessary
- Highway safety issues
- Impact on the country lane network
- Significant impact on the historic environment
- Biodiversity impacts
- No response from officers about the impact of Site 1 on The Saltway
- People with reduced incomes need good access to employment
- There will be disruption to residents until 2030
- Loss of green belt
- Capacity at nearby schools is not known
- No evidence of topography and historic geography of the site
- RBC has not demonstrated that all other development options/ alternatives have been considered
- Water Source Protection Zones within the site
- Severn Trent comments ignored with respect to sewage
- Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 7, 95 and 197
- A recent planning application was refused in May 2013 for development on Webheath ADR on transport grounds
- 2,800 dwellings is not deliverable or viable in the period to 2030
- Reduce capacity and allocate land at Bordesley or Brockhill West
- Site 1 should be expanded further

BORDESLEY

- Bordesley is a better option than Webheath and Foxlydiate/Support for Bordesley (Area 8):
 - Flood risk and zones and flood defences worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
 - Difficult foul drainage and wastewater drainage being unsustainable at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
 - Surface water run-off significant and unsafe on Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
 - Cheaper for water/ sewage treatment
 - Source protection zones at Foxlydiate
 - Impact on climate change
 - Highways distance to motorways and access to major routes better at Bordesley rather than Webheath/Foxlydiate
 - Distance to hospital and impact of joint service review worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
 - Distance to recycling facilities and waste disposal site worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
 - Distance from Redditch town centre/railway station worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley

- Accessibility better to schools, local shops, leisure facilities at Bordesley rather than Webheath/Foxlydiate
- Public transport better at Bordesley rather than Webheath/Foxlydiate
- Rail link from Alvechurch to Redditch is being upgraded
- Distance to employment sites better at Bordesley rather than Webheath/Foxlydiate
- Lack of local employment
- Visual sensitivity greater at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
- Size of development greater than 3km at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
- Green belt impact worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
- Green belt gap to Alvechurch still remains at Bordesley, but would be lost with merging of Webheath and Foxlydiate
- Damage to wildlife habitats
- Green Infrastructure impacts worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
- School infrastructure provision worse at Webheath/Foxlydiate rather than Bordesley
- Provision of bypass can be delivered with Bordesley
- Electricity providers preference is for sites east of the River Arrow
- Foxlydiate site has the best agricultural land
- If 40% are affordable, distance to Redditch is a key issue favouring Bordesley
- Bordesley would not put so much pressure on the A38 and Slideslow roundabout
- Bordesley has existing highway capacity unlike Webheath/Foxlydiate
- Has direct access to M42
- Not taken account of reports from Severn Trent Water stating their preference for Bordesley site rather than Webheath and Foxlydiate.
- There are several sites considered in the Broad Area Appraisal that should have been considered in the Focussed Area Appraisal.
- There is scope for development within Areas 5 and 6.
- Public transport is required on all sites so it isn't a determining factor in site selection. Bespoke service is required on all sites.
- Criteria used is too limited and lacking imagination
- Redditch golf courses should be relocated in Bromsgrove Green Belt so that housing is closer to Redditch Town Centre
- Development Study May 2013 by Bentley Paucefoot Parish Council [BAAG?] clearly shows that Bordesley is a better option than Foxlydiate

CONSULTATION

- Consultation responses from the LPA on the Housing Growth Development Study did not adequately address concerns raised by residents
- No leaflets sent to all residents

- Lack of choice about proposed development locations during consultations. Bromsgrove officers admitted that they had chosen not to consult on more than two options. By not consulting on a range the process is contrary to Bromsgrove's SCI
- Advertising is poor
- Drop in sessions were poorly advertised, had to ask for events to be held where development is proposed
- Planners are biased and subject to Council influence
- Too much consultation material and not enough time to respond
- Not everyone is able to view documents online and not enough printed copies were available

CROSS BOUNDARY - OTHER

REDDITCH EASTERN GATEWAY (Winyates Green Triangle/ Gorcott)

- Objection to development of this site
 - Impact on Ipsley Alders SSSI and Drovers Road LWS
 - Impact on biodiversity
 - Noise pollution
 - Visual impact from A435
 - Industrial development is out of character with the area
 - Re-use empty factory units
 - Compromises the integrity of the Green Belt
 - Coalescence of settlements
 - Impact of increased traffic on A435 and wider road network
 - Query validity of traffic assessment
 - Evidence indicates that access from Far Moor Lane is the only viable option
 - Initial highways infrastructure costs are likely to render this site undeliverable
 - Conclusions of RSS Panel Report have been ignored (development should not take place in this location)
 - Conclusions of WYG1 and WYG2 Reports have been ignored (development should not take place in this location)
 - Impact on nearby listed buildings
 - Evidence base is clear that development at Winyates Green Triangle is unviable
 - Redditch Eastern Gateway Economic Impact Study contains factual errors
 - Evidence documents added after the close of consultation in May 2013, rendering this process unjustified

Appendix 1

Consultation letter and Regulation 19 Statement of Representations Procedure

Redditch Borough Council

Town Hall,
Walter Stranz Square,
Redditch,
Worcestershire B98 8AH

tel: (01527) 64252
fax: (01527) 65216
minicom: 595528



Date as postmark

Dear Sir/Madam,

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4 Proposed Submission document: Representation
Period 30th September – 11th November 2013

Due to changes to the planning system through the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Redditch Borough Council is currently preparing a Local Plan, which will be known as the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4. The Local Plan will be the main planning document for the Borough up to 2030 to deliver the goals and aspirations of Redditch Borough's community. Once Local Plan No.4 is adopted it will replace the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

Redditch Borough Council has published its Proposed Submission version of Local Plan No.4 and is about to enter a six-week Representation Period. Full details of how to participate during the Representation Period can be found in the Statement of Representations Procedure notice which accompanies this letter.

This Representation Period aligns with the Bromsgrove District Plan Proposed Submission Representation Period with respect to Redditch-related housing development located in Bromsgrove District. The Redditch Cross Boundary Development policy appears in the Bromsgrove District Plan as Policy RCBD1 and in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 as Appendix 1. *If you wish to make representations relating to this specific matter, you can respond to either Council, as these particular representations will be dealt with jointly. Please avoid sending copies to both Councils as duplicates will be deleted.* The format of your representation should follow the same guidelines and use the same response form as described in the Statement of Representations Procedure notice described above.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'E Baker'.

Emma Baker
Acting Development Plans Manager
Redditch Borough Council



www.redditchbc.gov.uk

**Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
Regulation 19: Publication of a local plan**

**Statement of Representations Procedure
Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (Proposed Submission 2013)**

Subject matter and area covered:

Redditch Borough Council has published its Proposed Submission version of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (BORLP4) for formal representations prior to its submission to the Government for independent examination.

The BORLP4 Proposed Submission document outlines the strategic planning policy framework for guiding development in the Borough up to 2030. It comprises a long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives, a spatial strategy, core policies, strategic and non-strategic site allocations, and a monitoring and implementation framework. The Plan also includes a copy of the Redditch Cross Boundary Development policy (Appendix 1), which appears in the Bromsgrove District Plan as Policy RCBD1.

Period for Representations:

Representations in relation to the 'legal compliance' and 'soundness' of the BORLP4 Proposed Submission document can be made over a six-week period, starting on Monday 30th September 2013. **Representations must arrive no later than 5.00pm on Monday 11th November 2013.**

Representations should be made using the prescribed form, available at the locations listed overleaf.

By post: Development Plans Team
Redditch Borough Council
Walter Stranz Square
Redditch
Worcs B98 8AH

Electronically: devplans@redditchbc.gov.uk

Planning officers will be available to assist in procedures to complete Representation Forms at Redditch Town Hall during the following times/dates:

Monday to Friday 10am to 4pm (Main Reception)
Tuesday (8th Oct, 22nd Oct and 5th Nov) 4pm to 8pm (Committee Rooms)
Saturday (12th Oct, 26th Oct and 9th Nov) 9am to 11.30am (Committee Rooms)

Officers will also be available at the Bromsgrove Council House, Burcot Lane, Bromsgrove on:
Tuesday (1st Oct) 4pm to 8pm (Conference Room)
Thursday (17th Oct and 31st Oct) 4pm to 8pm (Committee Room)
Saturday (5th Oct, 19th Oct and 2nd Nov) 9am to 11.30am (Customer Service Centre, Dolphin Centre)

Notification request:

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address for any of the following:

- (i) that the BORLP4 has been submitted for independent examination
- (ii) the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the BORLP4
- (iii) the adoption of the BORLP4

If you wish to contact Bromsgrove District Council regarding the cross boundary growth policy, submission of representations or to submit a Notification Request, you should visit the website: www.bromsgrove.gov.uk/bdp for further details. Please note that the Representation deadline is the same for both Councils.

Statement of Fact

The BORLP4 Proposed Submission document, the Representation Form and Guidance Notes, together with the Sustainability Appraisal Report, Statement of Consultation and relevant supporting background documents are available to view, download and comment on from Monday 30th September 2013 at: www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan. Paper copies of all the documents are available for inspection at:

Redditch Borough Council
Walter Stranz Square
Redditch
Worcs B98 8AH

Opening Hours:
Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.00pm


A paper copy of the BORLP4 Proposed Submission document is also available for inspection during normal opening hours at:

Redditch Borough Council One Stop Shops (Batchley, Winyates and Woodrow)
Redditch Library (Town Centre)
Woodrow Library
Mobile Library

Paper copies of the Representation Form and accompanying Guidance Notes are also available at all of the above locations during the six-week representation period.

Appendix 2 Public Notice - Statement of Representations Procedure

http://edition.pagesuite-professional.co.uk//launch.aspx?eid=5543a442-dbd7-451a-9cf1-8bcc23fad390



HP Date: 24.9.13 Op: am eSend: 299278
Revise: 24.9.13 3: LES
Size: 140x85 dam AH: sharon Pub: redditch advertiser

PLEASE CHECK SIZE IS CORRECT

1031379 redditch pn x85

10:04 Wed, 25 Sep 2013

**Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)
Regulations 2012
Regulation 19: Publication of a local plan
Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (Proposed Submission 2013)**

Redditch Borough Council has published its Proposed Submission version of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (BORLP4) for formal representations prior to its submission to the Government for independent examination.

The BORLP4 Proposed Submission document outlines the strategic planning policy framework for guiding development in the Borough up to 2030. It comprises a long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives, a spatial strategy, core policies, strategic and non-strategic site allocations, and a monitoring and implementation framework. The Plan also includes a copy of the Redditch Cross Boundary Development policy (Appendix 1), which appears in the Bromsgrove District Plan as Policy RCBD1.

Representations in relation to the 'legal compliance' and 'soundness' of the BORLP4 Proposed Submission document can be made over a six-week period, starting on Monday 30th September 2013. **Representations must arrive no later than 5.00pm on Monday 11th November 2013 at:**

By post: Development Plans Team, Redditch Borough Council, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, Worcs B98 8AH

Electronically: devplans@redditchbc.gov.uk

The BORLP4 Proposed Submission document, together with the Sustainability Appraisal Report, Statement of Consultation and relevant supporting background documents are available to view, download and comment on at: www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan. Additional information, representation forms and guidance notes are also available at the above website.

Paper copies of all the documents are available for inspection at:

Redditch Borough Council **Opening Hours:**
Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, Worcs B98 8AH Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.00pm

A paper copy of the BORLP4 Proposed Submission document is also available for inspection during normal opening hours at:

Redditch Borough Council One Stop Shops (Batchley, Winyates and Woodrow)
Redditch Library (Town Centre), Woodrow Library, Mobile Library

Planning officers will be available to assist in procedures to complete Representation Forms at Redditch Town Hall during the following Surgery sessions:

Monday to Friday 10am to 4pm (ask at Main Reception)

Tuesday (8th Oct, 22nd Oct and 5th Nov) 4pm to 8pm (Committee Rooms)

Saturday (12th Oct, 26th Oct and 9th Nov) 9am to 11.30am (Committee Rooms)

Officers will also be available at the Bromsgrove Council House, Burcot Lane, Bromsgrove on:

Tuesday (1st Oct) 4pm to 8pm (Conference Room)

Thursday (17th Oct and 31st Oct) 4pm to 8pm (Committee Room)

Saturday (5th Oct, 19th Oct and 2nd Nov) 9am to 11.30am
(Customer Service Centre, Dolphin Centre)

**E. Baker Acting Development Plans Manager
Redditch Borough Council
(2 Oct 2013)**

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL



making
a
difference

www.redditchbc.gov.uk

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (Proposed Submission document)

Representation Period

Redditch Borough Council has published its Proposed Submission version of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 for formal representations prior to its submission to the Government for independent examination.

This is your opportunity to make representations on the legal compliance and soundness of the Plan.

All information is available to view online at:
www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan

You can submit representation forms to us at:
Redditch Borough Council
Development Plans
Town Hall, Walter Stranz Square, Redditch, Worcs. B98 8AH

or via email at:
devplans@redditchbc.gov.uk

The Representation Period will run from 30 September to
11 November 2013



**Please let us have your representations no later than 5pm
on Monday 11 November 2013**

www.redditchbc.gov.uk/localplan

Appendix 4

List of Representors

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0001	MCCOLL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0002	TILBROOK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0003	TILBROOK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0004	JUKES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0005	FENTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0006	ABBOTTS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0007	ORMONDE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0008	EDWARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0009	TAYLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0010	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0011	BENNETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0012	SHARP	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0013	ETHERIDGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0014	CUTTING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0015	CUTTING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0016	CUTTING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0017	ALLBUTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0018	STRAWBRIDGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0019	BIRKETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0020	FISHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0021	QUILLIAM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0022	GROGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0023	ROWSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0024	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0025	GORTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0026	EVANS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0027	CLARKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0028	FLORANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0029	HOWARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0030	GRIFFIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0031	HEATH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0032	FARQUHARSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0033	WALKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0034	POOLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0035	POOLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0036	HICKMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0037	BRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0038	BRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0039	BINNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0040	BINNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0041	MASON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0042	MOORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0043	WAKELYN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0044	SCREEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0045	INGLIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0046	PEACH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0047	MOORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0048	EVANS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0049	EVANS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0050	SUTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0051	BUTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0052	EDWARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0053	TURNER-TYMM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0054	CAULWELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0055	RAWLINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0056	CAULWELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0057	PROUSE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0058	FARLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0059	FARLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0060	BARRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0061	HOPKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0062	PEARE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0063	GERAGHTY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0064	DEAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0065	RICHARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0066	DAVIES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0067	ELMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0068	KEATING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0069	JOHNSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0070	BYNG	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0071	BYNG	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0072	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0073	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0074	FINCHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0075	BARSTOW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0076	MORGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0077	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0078	YARDLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0079	TEAGO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0080	MORRISSEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0081	SUTOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0082	LOVETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0083	HOPE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0084	HOPE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0085	MCSWEENEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0086	SULLIVAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0087	TROTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0088	TROTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0089	LINLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0090	COOPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0091	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0092	BONSEN / KIMBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0093	GHOSE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0094	COOPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0095	DIXON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0096	PEMBERTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0097	MARKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0098	HARTLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0099	COOPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0100	GHOSE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0101	HILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0102	CLARKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0103	HORNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0104	STOKES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0105	VILLACRESES TONATO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0106	HYDE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0107	WEAVER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0108	HAYES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0109	FISHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0110	ALYSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0111	SCHULTE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0112	HOPKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0113	TALBOT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0114	EL-BARBARY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0115	CHIANESE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0116	WILKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0117	ROOK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0118	ROOK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0119	LEES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0120	JOWETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0121	LOCKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0122	JOWETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0123	SAVERY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0124	GRIFFIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0125	PARSONS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0126	FARQUHAR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0127	FARQUHAR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0128	GIBBS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0129	HART	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0130	HART	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0131	BISHOP	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0132	WILSHIRE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0133	WILSHIRE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0134	BOND	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0135	ASTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0136	LIPSCOMBE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0137	PROSSER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0138	MOSS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0139	PROSSER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0140	MOSS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0141	FYLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0142	HILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0143	SOLOMON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0144	FUTCHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0145	BROOM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0146	ZYDEK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0147	CURTIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0148	LAWLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0149	HOMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0150	LIPSCOMBE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0151	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0152	PIPE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0153	PIPE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0154	BAYLIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0155	FARMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0156	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0157	ALDRIDGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0158	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0159	PHILLIPS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0160	WRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0161	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0162	SIEKIERIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0163	ARKELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0164	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0165	FINDLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0166	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0167	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0168	MARSHALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0169	NOLAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0170	NOLAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0171	HAYES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0172	HADLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0173	HUMPHRIES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0174	RAVENHILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0175	LAXTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0176	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0177	GARLAND	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0178	SAHOTA	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0179	CRANER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0180	MOLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0181	VENMORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0182	BAYLISS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0183	FISKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0184	FISKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0185	FISHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0186	FISHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0187	HODGKINSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0188	HODGKINSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0189	SILVER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0190	SILVER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0191	HARRIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0192	HARRIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0193	HARDGRAVES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0194	WRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0195	MARIES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0196	WATTS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0197	BANE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0198	JENKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0199	HEAPS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0200	HEAPS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0201	LEWIS-VILLACRESES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0202	LYTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0203	MCARDLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0204	SAHOTA	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0205	SAHOTA	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0206	HILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0207	SPEAR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0208	JENKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0209	OLDFIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0210	WARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0211	GRUBB	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0212	BOLUS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0213	EDMONDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0214	ROWSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0215	ROWSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0216	COOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0217	PENDRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0218	COOK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0219	ALLEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0220	GARNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0221	JENKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0222	ALLBUTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0223	BAGBY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0224	YATES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0225	SANDERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0226	WARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0227	INGLIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0228	PEACH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0229	BEECH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0230	BEECH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0231	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0232	HUNT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0233	COOPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0234	BELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0235	GRANT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0236	EWINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0237	EWINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0238	EWINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0239	EWINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0240	BLIGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0241	BLIGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0242	BLIGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0243	POWLETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0244	MCALEAVEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0245	NEALE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0246	BRYANT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0247	SHARPLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0248	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0249	BONIFACE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0250	ROADKNIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0251	KIMBLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0252	COLLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0253	KITE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0254	KITE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0255	GRIFFITHS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0256	COLLIER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0257	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0258	COLLIER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0259	JORDAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0260	GOLDING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0261	BLAKEMORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0262	LIPSCOMBE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0263	COLLYER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0264	FLATTERY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0265	CATER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0266	PUGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0267	BARBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0268	MANTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0269	MANTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0270	WOOD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0271	MUTCHELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0272	SABIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0273	FARRELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0274	PERKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0275	PERKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0276	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0277	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0278	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0279	WHITE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0280	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0281	ADDIS-MULLINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0282	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0283	ESPLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0284	ESPLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0285	SAUNT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0286	SAUNT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0287	CROOKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0288	PANNELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0289	PANNELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0290	HILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0291	HILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0292	ROADKNIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0293	TOMALIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0294	BLAKEMORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0295	CATCH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0296	WEYHAM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0297	WEYHAM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0298	WALKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0299	HELAL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0300	WILFORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0301	WILFORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0302	BURTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0303	SOUTHALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0304	MULLINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0305	BISHOP	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0306	MURRAY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0307	SHAKLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0308	SHAKLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0309	JORDAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0310	SHAW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0311	SHAW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0312	FRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0313	FRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0314	LINES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0315	SHUCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0316	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0317	BENNETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0318	MASON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0319	MASON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0320	PRETTY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0321	PRETTY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0322	MILLARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0323	GARDNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0324	LEWINGTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0325	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0326	GORTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0327	HOLLOWAY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0328	DAVENPORT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0329	PATE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0330	FERMHOUGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0331	GROGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0332	HARRISON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0333	ELCOER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0334	MILLER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0335	RUSSELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0336	BATES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0337	GRUBB	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0338	HARDING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0339	UNDERWOOD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0340	WATTS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0341	BURTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0342	FARMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0343	RAVENHILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0344	SHAKLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0345	MEIR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0346	ADAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0347	JARRETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0348	BREYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0349	HUGES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0350	SEAL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0351	SEAL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0352	WESTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0353	CORRIGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0354	BAKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0355	BAKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0356	THOMSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0357	BAUMBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0358	THOMPSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0359	GOWLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0360	GOWLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0361	SHIM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0362	SABIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0363	CRUMPTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0364	CRUMPTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0365	GOULDING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0366	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0367	BERNARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0368	LINSCOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0369	TAYLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0370	MELLORS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0371	BOWEN-PETERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0372	HOLLIER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0373	GARNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0374	BERNARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0375	MASON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0376	HARBONE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0377	CURNOCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0378	LORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0379	LORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0380	SUTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0381	HARDGRAVE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0382	TICER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0383	FACKRELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0384	BLACKWELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0385	BARLOW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0386	MILLER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0387	STYLER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0388	WOODROW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0389	EDWARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0390	CAIRNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0391	BARBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0392	COOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0393	ORDIDGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0394	BARBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0395	BRUNNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0396	TUDOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0397	BROWN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0398	PRITCHARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0399	MORRIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0400	GREEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0401	GREEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0402	TROTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0403	BAILEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0404	HEMBURY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0405	HEMBURY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0406	HAINES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0407	CAIRNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0408	CAIRNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0409	CAIRNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0410	COOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0411	TODD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0412	OSBORNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0413	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0414	HALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0415	ALLEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0416	TEASDALE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0417	POWELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0418	POWELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0419	NELSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0420	ARNOLD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0421	WILKINSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0422	TATTERSALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0423	FRENCH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0424	HARRIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0425	MURPHY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0426	SMYTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0427	SMYTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0428	COLLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0429	HICKEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0430	HICKEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0431	COOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0432	PATERSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0433	PATERSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0434	WELCH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0435	DALTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0436	DALTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0437	CORRIGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0438	TROWPOLLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0439	PRETTY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0440	TRINDALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0441	TINDALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0442	ALLBUTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0443	SEDDON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0444	SEDDON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0445	ALLCOCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0446	CROWLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0447	WHITEHOUSE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0448	HIGGINSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0449	FOREMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0450	GARRETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0451	WILCOX	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0452	FLATTERY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0453	PUGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0454	PARKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0455	CLARKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0456	MASON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0457	GRENNAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0458	VENMORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0459	COOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0460	HALFORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0461	LILLY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0462	PALMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0463	DUGGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0464	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0465	CHARLESWORTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0466	HEWITT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0467	HEWITT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0468	FREER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0469	ATKINSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0470	YARNOLD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0471	YARNOLD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0472	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0473	WALLACE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0474	WALLACE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0475	MARSHALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0476	REEVES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0477	BAKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0478	MOORES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0479	BURTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0480	SULLIVAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0481	SULLIVAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0482	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0483	CHANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0484	PERKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0485	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0486	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0487	TURNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0488	HUGHES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0489	PITT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0490	RUSSELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0491	TRICKLEBANK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0492	RUSSELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0493	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0494	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0495	KNIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0496	RIDER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0497	RIDER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0498	FREEMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0499	GREGSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0500	STAPLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0501	CARMEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0502	CARMEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0503	POWIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0504	POWIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0505	NEWTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0506	NEWTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0507	NEWTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0508	CURTIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0509	CURTIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0510	CURTIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0511	ASPINAL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0512	SAUNDERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0513	SAUNDERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0514	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0515	SOUTHALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0516	GARDNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0517	GIBSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0518	HEWITT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0519	LEA	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0520	CARTWRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0521	TAYLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0522	FOSS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0523	FOSS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0524	HEATON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0525	BARNETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0526	MEIR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0527	ALLEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0528	HYDE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0529	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0530	DAVIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0531	CLARK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0532	HORSNALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0533	MACPHERSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0534	LEES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0535	BAYLISS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0536	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0537	LAWLESS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0538	MCNERLIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0539	GALLIVAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0540	WRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0541	NEWMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0542	TWIGG	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0543	COLEMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0544	STOAKES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0545	ELLCOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0546	BROWN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0547	BELSEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0548	EDWARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0549	SUTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0550	COX	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0551	GEORGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0552	BLIGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0553	LENNON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0554	STANFIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0555	SUTOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0556	HARTLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0557	WILSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0558	CHAUDHRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0559	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0560	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0561	OLIVER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0562	BEESLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0563	SKIRROW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0564	SADLER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0565	DAVIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0566	HURLSTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0567	CLIFTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0568	ANDREWS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0569	ANDREWS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0570	BROWN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0571	HORNCastle	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0572	PETERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0573	EDWARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0574	HORSNALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0575	LAWLESS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0576	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0577	HOWARTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0578	LAXTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0579	CRAWLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0580	BAYLISS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0581	HOLLIER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0582	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0583	DREW	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0584	LEONARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0585	WALPOLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0586	JOHNSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0587	JOHNSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0588	HENDRIE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0589	BYFIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0590	ROLFE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0591	ROLFE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0592	LEONARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0593	WALPOLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0594	BERRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0595	SHIM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0596	HOMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0597	DERRICK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0598	HILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0599	UNSWORTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0600	KESSTERTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0601	TICER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0602	DAVIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0603	GUNNELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0604	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0605	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0606	PEACE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0607	BRADFORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0608	SMULLEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0609	RADFORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0610	WHITE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0611	SUTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0612	HEATON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0613	HIGGINSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0614	COLLINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0615	DANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0616	DANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0617	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0618	WILLIAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0619	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0620	CHAMBERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0621	HEMMING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0622	BOND	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0623	GALE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0624	PANNELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0625	STANLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0626	STANLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0627	PANNELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0628	JEFFCOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0629	JEFFCOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0630	FELTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0631	PARSONS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0632	LOCKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0633	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0634	RING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0635	RING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0636	MCNERLIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0637	ASHDON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0638	BERRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0639	BERRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0640	ROUSE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0641	SMART	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0642	RUDGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0643	CROMPTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0644	CROMPTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0645	FENTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0646	FENTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0647	LEA	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0648	GALLOWAY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0649	GALLOWAY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0650	LEECH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0651	MANN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0652	SCRIVENER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0653	MOXON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0654	MOXON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0655	COOPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0656	FORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0657	FORD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0658	BARRETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0659	SHARPLES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0660	TRICKLEBANK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0661	CATER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0662	DODDATO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0663	DODDATO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0664	HAWTIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0665	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0666	COOPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0667	FRENCH EDKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0668	EDKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0669	HUNT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0670	HUNT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0671	LYNCH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0672	SOUTEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0673	DAVIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0674	DAVIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0675	LINDQUIST	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0676	WOODWARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0677	CHANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0678	LEE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0679	LYNHAM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0680	GREEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0681	HARVEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0682	PARKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0683	ARKELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0684	HINE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0685	HINE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0686	NEALE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0687	BARRETT-POWELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0688	JAYE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0689	BROWN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0690	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0691	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0692	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0693	MCGANN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0694	MCCANN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0695	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0696	GARDNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0697	GARDNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0698	TURNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0699	TAYLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0700	SEATON-SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0701	BELSEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0702	BELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0703	DELANEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0704	POULTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0705	POULTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0706	HADLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0707	HURLSTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0708	PANTING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0709	PANTING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0710	KEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0711	WARDMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0712	SEDGEBEAR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0713	HAWKESWOOD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0714	TIMMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0715	MURPHY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0716	TIMMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0717	LOVELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0718	LOVELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0719	LOVELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0720	CLIFTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0721	EVANS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0722	OLDFIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0723	MANN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0724	LEECH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0725	HEMMING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0726	MILES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0727	TURNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0728	TRINDER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0729	SEATON-SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0730	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0731	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0732	WILKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0733	HOLLINSWORTH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0734	KNIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0735	WOODWARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0736	GRUBB	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0737	MACPHERSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0738	MERRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0739	LIPPETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0740	JUKES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0741	MERRY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0742	BINNS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0743	LYNCH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0744	HALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0745	HALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0746	HOBSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0747	HOBSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0748	PENSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0749	HERLIHY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0750	REMFY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0751	TAMBURRO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0752	TIMMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0753	TIMMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0754	HASELDEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0755	HASELDEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0756	HASELDEN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0757	BARNETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0758	CAPPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0759	WINCHESTER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0760	WINCHESTER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0761	POOLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0762	LOVELL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0763	ROLLISSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0764	BOYLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0765	BOYLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0766	SUMMERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0767	SUMMERS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0768	MURRAY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0769	GRUBB	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0770	COX	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0771	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0772	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0773	ETTERLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0774	LIPSCOMBE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0775	WALKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0776	HOBBS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0777	BARBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0778	GILBERT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0779	GILBERT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0780	TAYLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0781	DUGGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0782	COLLINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0783	CUMMINGS-MAJOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0784	BAKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0785	HARRIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0786	HARRIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0787	WARDMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0788	STANLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0789	DYER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0790	OSBORNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0791	SMITH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0792	PEACOCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0793	PEACOCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0794	COLLIER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0795	BAUMBER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0796	HUGHES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0797	PENDLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0798	PENDLE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0799	BARTLAM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0800	ELLIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0801	OLDFIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0802	BROWN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0803	SIMMONS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0804	RUDGE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0805	HARPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0806	HARPER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0807	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0808	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0809	MORRISON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0810	MORRISON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0811	PALMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0812	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0813	GAMESON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0814	WRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0815	WRIGHT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0816	ELLIOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0817	ELLIOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0818	BARTLAM	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0819	HURVED	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0820	BEADSMORE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0821	MYNOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0822	MYNOTT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0823	LACEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0824	JACKSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0825	JACKSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0826	PAUL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0827	MAZLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0828	WELSH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0829	WELSH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0830	WELSH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0831	ROOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0832	CHANEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0833	MARSH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0834	MARSH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0835	BISHOP	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0836	HEWITT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0837	HEWITT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0838	BOUGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0839	NOLAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0840	NOLAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0841	WALKER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0842	STREET	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0843	DYER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0844	TWIGG	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0845	LAWLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0846	NEWTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0847	BILMAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0848	KEEP	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0849	TAMBURRO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0850	TAMBURRO	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0851	ADAMS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0852	McCOLL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0853	MURRAY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0854	ROURKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0855	RICHARDSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0856	ROURKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0857	PAYNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0858	CONNOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0859	WARNER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0860	HINDE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0861	TOMALIN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0862	BELSEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0863	RICHARDSON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0864	DYER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0865	CLARKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0866	MASON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0867	HOOKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0868	HOOKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0869	CROWLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0870	WARREN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0871	SHAABAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0872	COLLYER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0873	TAYLOR	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0874	ALLCOCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0875	ALLCOCK	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0876	ROOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0877	CARTER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0878	HOBBS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0879	HOBBS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0880	WOOD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0881	FIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0882	FIELD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0883	MILLARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0884	MILLARD	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0885	EDWARDS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0886	BOURNE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0887	STREET	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0888	YATES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0889	CARTER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0890	ROLPH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0891	WALTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0892	TWILTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0893	LEA	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0894	SUMMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0895	PIPE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0896	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0897	COCKS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0898	RILEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0899	MYTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0900	MYTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0901	HENDRIE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0902	HENDRIE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0903	BAYLIS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0904	ELMER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0905	MILLS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0906	RILEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0907	PIPE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0908	WALTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0909	KEOGH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0910	PRICE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0911	CLAYTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0912	ELSTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0913	PICKERSGILL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0914	SUTTON	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0915	HASTINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0916	HASTINGS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0917	PHILLIPS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0918	GOODING	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0919	BARRETT	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0920	ROOKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0921	ADKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0922	ADKINS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0923	PURVES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0924	WILLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0925	WILLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0926	MORGAN	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0927	GRIFFITHS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0928	CLARKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0929	CLARKE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0930	LAWLESS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0931	STEVENS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0932	STEVENS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0933	ROSSALL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0934	JONES	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0935	COLLIER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0936	VALLANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0937	VALLANCE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0938	HINDE	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0939	SIMMONS	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0940	NABEEL	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0941	HADLEY	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0942	FUTCHER	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0943	ROLPH	KEEP OUR GREEN CAMPAIGN
R0944		WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0945	OLIVER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0946	MARVIN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0947	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0948	PHILLPOTTS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0949	PHILLPOTTS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0950	BEESELY	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0951	MCKINNON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0952	CLIFTON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0953	PORTEOUS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0954	BRISTOW	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0955	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0956	GILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0957	GILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0958	MORRIS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0959	DEWHURST	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0960	DEWHURST	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0961	ALLSOPP	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0962	BOYD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0963	HOWELL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0964	CLARK	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0965	HAGUE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R0966	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0967	GREEN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0968	GREEN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0969	GREEN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0970	COLEMAN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0971	BAYLISS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0972	DAVIS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0973	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0974	HUGHES	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0975	MOUNT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0976	NOLAN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0977	JOHNSON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0978	HAIGH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0979	HAIGH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0980	HAIGH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0981	LAYTON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0982	CAPLE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0983	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0984	HANDS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0985	CHAMBERS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0986	LEATHERBARROW	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0987	HATFIELD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0988	HATFIELD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0989	ROWELL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0990	JUWAH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0991	MILLWARD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0992	CLIFFORD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0993	CARTWRIGHT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0994	CARTWRIGHT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0995	NEWTON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0996	WALKER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0997	COGAN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0998	SWORDS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R0999	ELLCOTT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1000	ALLEN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1001	WATERS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1002	HAYWARD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1003	PERKS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1004	SANDERS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1005	READING	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1006	READING	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1007	PERKS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1008	GOVIER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1009	POWLESON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1010	BENNETT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1011	COOPER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1012	COOPER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1013	BROWNING	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1014	BEARD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1015	BADGER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1016	LEEMING	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1017	BURNARD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1018	NASH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1019	JARVIS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1020	HAWKINS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1021	BONHAM	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1022	BONHAM	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1023	ALLUM	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1024	OSBORNE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1025	OSBORNE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1026	HILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1027	HILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1028	HILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1029	BIRD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1030	HART	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1031	DAVIS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1032	WOOD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1033	WOOD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1034	PROSSER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1035	ALLEN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1036	BRADSHAW	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1037	MACWILLIAM	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1038	MACWILLIAM	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1039	PULSFORD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1040	HORTON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1041	SHOWELL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1042	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1043	BARTLEY	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1044	CASSIDY	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1045	PALMER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1046	BARRATT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1047	NEWTON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1048	WILKES	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1049	CLARK	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1050	WILKES	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1051	WILLIAMS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1052	PERRINS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1053	BRIDLE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1054	BRIDLE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1055	CARN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1056	NASH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1057	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1058	GREEN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1059	WEBBER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1060	WILLIAMS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1061	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1062	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1063	HOLLIER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1064	BARNFIELD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1065	MEREDITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1066	BRISCOE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1067	SMITH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1068	COOMBS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1069	COOMBS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1070	STEER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1071	MASEFIELD	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1072	BONSEN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1073	SMITH	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1074	WILKINSON-GUY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1075	SLATER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1076	MERRIS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1077	LOCKE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1078	LOCKE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1079	COX	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1080	COX	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1081	GREEN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1082	CREMIN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1083	CREMIN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1084	HUGHES	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1085	BENNETT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1086	COOK	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1087	GREEN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1088	BENNETT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1089	COOK	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1090	NIVEN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1091	WILES	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1092	FITCHETT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1093	WEBB	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1094	HALL	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1095	MANSFIELD	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1096	PRESS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1097	ALLCOCK	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1098	BROADLEY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1099	BOWEN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1100	DANIELS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1101	PRESS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1102	HUGHES	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1103	COTTERRELL	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1104	CLARNE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1105	TEMPLE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1106	MULLINS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1107	STARR	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1108	COLLINS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1109	CLARKE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1110	MCMANUS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1111	NICKLIN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1112	BERRY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1113	GOVIER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1114	MCMANUS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1115	GOVIER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1116	ELLIOTT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1117	HUGHES	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1118	COOPER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1119	OSBORNE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1120	ELLIOTT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1121	PERRINS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1122	TOWERS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1123	OSBORNE	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1124	MASEFIELD	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1125	MATTHEWS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1126	LOMAS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1127	LOMAS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1128	MATTHEWS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1129	OSBORN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1130	JACOBS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1131	BURROWS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1132	HUNTING	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1133	PATEL	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1134	WEAVER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1135	WEAVER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1136	WEAVER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1137	WHEELER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1138	WOODWARD	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1139	WOODWARD	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1140	ROBINSON	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1141	BERRY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1142	FIELD	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1143	BICKNELL	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1144	SANDELL	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1145	ROBINSON	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1146	COOK	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1147	PADDA	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1148	BRIDGEWATER	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1149	APSLEY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1150	LOLLEY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1151	CONLON	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1152	EDWARDS	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1153	OSAKI	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1154	REICHOW	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1155	REICHOW	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1156	JARMY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1157	JARMY	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1158	LEGGITT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1159	HAYLOCK	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1160	HAYLOCK	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1161	LEGGITT	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1162	BROWN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1163	BOWEN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1164	HUGHES	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN RESIDENTS ASSOC.
R1165	LEGGITT	
R1166	HAYLOCK	
R1167	HAYLOCK	
R1168	LEGGITT	
R1169	BROWN	
R1170	JARMY	
R1171	BOWEN	
R1172	GREEN	HOME BUILDERS FEDERATION
R1173	GAILEY	STUDLEY PARISH COUNCIL
R1174	BEAMAN	STUDLEY PARISH & STRATFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL
R1175		SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
R1176	CARLIN	
R1177	JOHNSON	
R1178	WILSON	
R1179	CARLIN	
R1180	GREGSON	
R1181	RAYBONE	
R1182	HATTERSLEY	
R1183	ROSE	

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1184		HOMES AND COMMUNITIES AGENCY
R1185	BERRY	SPORT ENGLAND
R1186	BLOOMFIELD	WORCESTERSHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST
R1187		STOFORD LTD AND GORCOTT TRUST
R1188		WEST MERCIA POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER
R1189	REGAN	MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN PARISH COUNCIL
R1190		BENTLEY AREA ACTION GROUP
R1191	OLDFIELD	
R1192	DANIELS	
R1193	WEST	
R1194	TUDOR-COULSON	
R1195	BARSTOW	
R1196	BRUNNER	
R1197	DAVIES	CENTRO
R1198	JARRETT	
R1199	STYLER	
R1200	STYLER	
R1201	FLOWERS	
R1202	MAHER	
R1203	CRUSE	
R1204	KERRIDGE	SAMBOURNE WARD COUNCILLOR (SOADC)
R1205	CHANDLER	
R1206	STAPLES	
R1207	DELANEY	
R1208	WRIGHT	WARD COUNCILLOR (SOADC)
R1209	KENDRICK	CPRE (REDDITCH GROUP)
R1210	SOMERS	GLADMAN DEVELOPMENTS
R1211	NASH	STRATFORD-ON-AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL
R1212	DELETED RECORD	
R1213	DELETED RECORD	
R1214	ROWLEY	
R1215	JEWELL	
R1216	CHAMBERLIN	GLEESON STRATEGIC LAND
R1217	CARTER	
R1218	DELETED RECORD	
R1219	STRATTON	
R1220	BARBER	
R1221	MORGAN	
R1222	HAIGH	
R1223	BUSH	
R1224	BAILIHT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1225	BARRETT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1226	BARRETT	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1227	BATTY	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1228	BLACKBURN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1229	BOX	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1230	CARLESS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1231	CARLESS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1232	CARPENTER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1233	CHARMLEY	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1234	CLULOW	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1235	COOKE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1236	COOKE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1237	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1238	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1239	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1240	EVANS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1241	FISH	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1242	FORMAN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1243	GEORGE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1244	GIBSON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1245	GIBSON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1246	HATTON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1247	HILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1248	HILL	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1249	HODSON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1250	HUMPHREYS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1251	LENNOX	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1252	LONG	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1253	LUNN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1254	MCCORMACK	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1255	MCCORMACK	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1256	MCCORMACK	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1257	MCQUAID	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1258	MCQUAID	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1259	MCQUAID	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1260	MCQUAID	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1261	MCQUAID	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1262	MIKNENAS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1263	MIKNENAS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1264	MILLS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1265	OSTROUMOFF	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1266	OSTROUMOFF	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1267	PAPPER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1268	PORTER	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1269	RAMSAY	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1270	REYNOLDS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1271	RODD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1272	ROOD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1273	ROOD	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1274	ROSE	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1275	SIMS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1276	SIMS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1277	SIMS	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1278	SINCLAIR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1279	STEWART	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1280	TAYLOR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1281	WAKEMAN	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1282	WALDRON	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1283	BATCHELOR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1284	BATCHELOR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1285	BATCHELOR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1286	BATCHELOR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1287	DELETED RECORD	
R1288	SINCLAIR	WEBHEATH ACTION GROUP
R1289	STEVENS	
R1290	STEVENS	
R1291	CLARKE	NETWORK RAIL
R1292	CRAMPTON	
R1293	LUFF	
R1294	HUGHES	
R1295	COOMBES	REDDITCH LOCAL HISTORY SOCIETY
R1296		REDDITCH GOLF CLUB
R1297	DELETED RECORD	
R1298	CURNOCK	
R1299	TORKILDSEN	ENGLISH HERITAGE WEST MIDLANDS
R1300	MATTHEWS	
R1301	BEST	
R1302	YARWOOD	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GYPSY LIAISON GROUPS
R1303	TAYLOR	HIGHWAYS AGENCY
R1304	BRADNICK	SALEWAY PARISH COUNCIL
R1305	NAZIR	BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL
R1306	MCKELVIE	
R1307	COOK	
R1308		PERSIMMON HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS
R1309	EMMS	
R1310		MILLER STRATEGIC LAND, PERMISSION HOMES SOUTH MIDLANDS AND SOUTHERN & REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTS
R1311	EASTWOOD	CROWLE PARISH COUNCIL

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
R1312	FROST	
R1313	HARBONE	
R1314	GILL	
R1315	MORRIS	
R1316	HOPKINS	
R1317	DELETED RECORD	
R1318	SPENCE	
R1319		SAINSBURYS SUPERMARKETS LTD
R1320	HOPKINS	
R1321	KING	
R1322	HILL	A.F HILL AND SON
R1323	MOBERLEY	
R1324	DELETED RECORD	
R1325	MORTIMER	
R1326	PORTEOUS	
R1327	PHILLPOTTS	
R1328	HOROVITZ	WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
R1329	BRADBURY	
R1330	HERON	
R1331	TOMLINSON	HEYFORD DEVELOPMENTS LTD
R1332		CAPITAL AND REGIONAL PLC
R1333	CROW	BARTON WILLMORE
R1334	DUNN	WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL
R1335	COOPER	REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL
R1336	TYAS	ENVIRONMENT AGENCY
R1337	SIMPSON	
R1338		WEST MIDLAND HARP PLANNING CONSORTIUM
R1339	DAVIES	
R1340	HUTCHINGS	
R1341	ATKINSON	MARINE MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION
R1342	COOKE	
R1343	MATTHEWS	
R1344	JUDD	
R1345	ADAMSON	
R1346		WESTERN POWER DISTRIBUTION
R1347	COX	WORCESTERSHIRE REGULATORY SERVICES
R1348	DELETED RECORD	
R1349	WARBY	
R1350	BEDFORD-SMITH	
R1351	MILWARD	WOODLAND TRUST
R1352	STEVENS	
R1353		BROMSGROVE DISTRICT HOUSING TRUST

The following Respondents made representations to the cross boundary element of the Plan relation to Redditch's housing requirement being met in Bromsgrove District (Policy RCBD.1 – Redditch Cross Boundary Development)

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
XB001	Tomlinson	Heyford Developments
XB002	Tyas	Environment Agency
XB003	Somers	Gladman Developments
XB004	Taylor	Highways Agency
XB005	Fleming	Natural England
XB006		Gallagher Estates
XB007		Gallagher Estates
XB008		Café Quote
XB009		West Midland HARP Consortium
XB010		Bentley Area Action Group
XB011	Whitworth	
XB012	Porteous	
XB013	Whittaker	
XB014		Miller Strategic land Southern and Regional Developments and Persimmon Homes South Midlands
XB015		Persimmon Homes South Midlands (Brockhill East)
XB016	King	CPRE
XB017		Telstar Limited
XB018	Campbell	Mr S and Mrs R Campbell
XB019	Morgan	West Mercia Police and Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service
XB020		Webheath Action Group
XB021	Duggan	South Worcestershire Development Plan
XB022	Boss	
XB023	Rose	
XB024	Bradnick	Saleway Parish Council
XB025	Mortimer	
XB026	Stevens	BAAG
XB027	Stevens	BAAG
XB028	Matthews	
XB029	Adamson	
XB030	Coffey	Severn Trent Water Ltd
XB031	Taylor	Highways Agency
XB032	Spence	
XB033	Moss	
XB034	Harrop	
XB035	Hampshire	
XB036	Frost	

Respondent Number	Surname	Company/Organisation
XB037	Every	
XB038	Cotterill	
XB040	Stuart	
XB041	Manley	
XB042	Griffiths	
XB043	Griffiths	
XB044	Bourne	
XB045	Bourne	
XB046	Crawford	Crowle Parish Council
XB047	Hopkins	
XB048	Moberley	
XB049	Bush	
XB050	Haigh	
XB051	Morgan	
XB052	Barber	
XB053	Stevens	
XB054	Boss	
XB055	Keevil	
XB056	Horovitz	WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
XB057	Heron	
XB058	Keatley	
XB059	Rowley	
XB060	Jewell	
XB061	Stratton	
XB062	Carter	
XB063	Warby	
XB064	Bedford-Smith	
XB065	Dyson	Bentley Pouncefoot Parish Council
XB066		Birmingham Property Group
XB067	Davies	South Worcestershire Councils
XB068	Green	Home Builders Federation
XB069	Hutchins	