



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY, 3RD JULY, 2008 AT 4.30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE, BROMSGROVE

MEMBERS: Councillors Mrs. J. Dyer M.B.E. (Chairman), P. J. Whittaker (Vice-Chairman), Mrs. M. Bunker, S. R. Colella, G. N. Denaro, Mrs. R. L. Dent, R. Hollingworth, Mrs. J. D. Luck, E. J. Murray, S. R. Peters, Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP, E. C. Tibby and C. J. K. Wilson

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence and notification of substitutes
2. Declarations of Interest
3. To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Local Development Framework Working Party held on 29th May 2008 (Pages 1 - 6)
4. Additional Redditch Growth Study (Pages 7 - 14)
5. Redditch Joint Study Part 2 Brief (Pages 15 - 28)
6. Core Strategy Preferred Options (Pages 29 - 36)
7. To consider any other business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

The Council House
Burcot Lane
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B60 1AA
25th June 2008

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY

THURSDAY, 29TH MAY 2008, AT 2.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors Mrs. M. Bunker, S. R. Colella, G. N. Denaro, Mrs. R. L. Dent, Mrs. J. Dyer M.B.E., R. Hollingworth, Mrs. J. D. Luck, S. R. Peters, Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP, E. C. Tibby and P. J. Whittaker

Officers: Mr. P. Street, Mr. D. Hammond, Mr. A. Coel, Mr. M. Dunphy, Mrs. R. Williams, Ms. S. Lai and Ms. R. Cole.

1/08 **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs J. Dyer M.B.E. be elected Chairman of the Working Party for the ensuing municipal year.

2/08 **ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED that Councillor P.J. Whittaker be elected Vice-Chairman of the Working Party for the ensuing municipal year.

3/08 **APOLOGIES**

No apologies for absence were received.

4/08 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Local Development Framework Working Party held on 13th December 2007 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes be approved as a correct record.

5/08 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

6/08 **REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY PHASE 2 PREFERRED OPTION UPDATE AND PHASE 3 LAUNCH**

The Working Party considered a report which set out in detail the latest position regarding the revised Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), the consultation exercise and the process of making representations to the submitted version of the strategy.

The Strategic Planning Manager referred to an additional report which had been submitted as part of the consideration of this item. The report related specifically to the commissioning of an additional Redditch Growth Study. It was intended that the study would identify how the requirements of Redditch growth as proposed in the RSS Phase 2 revision should be split between the Districts of Bromsgrove and Stratford on Avon together with a determination of the priority of sites to be developed. This study would enable the Authorities involved to develop their respective core strategies and would provide a robust technical evidence base to be presented at the RSS Examination in Public. At a meeting on 19th May 2008 the Leaders of the respective Councils had agreed that this work was required in order to address the issue of Redditch related growth.

It was noted that the cost of the study would be approximately £50,000 and the funding of the study was to be split between this Council, Worcestershire County Council, Stratford District Council, Redditch Borough Council and the West Midlands Regional Assembly. It was likely therefore that this Council's contribution would be up to £10,000 which could be met from within existing budgetary provision. Following discussion it was

RESOLVED that the contents of the reports be noted.

7/08

CORE STRATEGY UPDATE

The Working Party considered a report on the current position regarding the preparation of the Preferred Options Core Strategy. The progress made on various studies which would assist with the provision of an evidence base to support policies within the Core Strategy was considered.

Consideration was also given to the draft Spatial Vision and it was reported that it was intended to consult on this vision at the forthcoming Town Hall meeting of the Local Strategic Partnership on 9th July 2008. It was felt that there should be a reference to the development of the Longbridge site within the vision document.

RESOLVED that the progress made on the preparation of the Preferred Options Core Strategy be noted.

RECOMMENDED that the Spatial Vision be approved for consultation subject to the inclusion of a reference to the Longbridge site.

8/08

BROMSGROVE TOWN CENTRE AREA ACTION PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

The Working Party considered an updated report on the Issues and Options document in relation to the Town Centre Area Action Plan together with the consultation process to be undertaken.

It was reported that the Issues and Options stage of the Area Action Plan process was intended to provide an opportunity for the public to express both positive and negative opinions about the Town Centre. In order to focus responses on the aspects of the Town Centre redevelopment which could be affected by the planning system, the document contained a number of significant issues and options to overcome each issue although respondents were also encouraged to suggest alternative options. The document was intended to trigger discussion around certain key areas.

There was some concern that all Members of the Council had not received a copy of the document and that the vision contained within Section 2 of the document was not the same as that agreed by full Council as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy. It was also felt that it would be helpful in future for the minutes of the Town Centre Steering Group to be submitted to this Working Party. Following discussion it was

RECOMMENDED:

- (a) that subject to the vision for the Town Centre being replaced with the vision agreed by Council as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy 2007-2010, the document be approved for consultation purposes as an "issues" paper only and circulated to all members of the Council;
- (b) that the questionnaire currently being developed to accompany the consultation document be considered at the next meeting of the Town Centre Steering Group and that the questionnaire be extended to ensure there is focus on key issues and additional options are included in respect of those key issues;
- (c) that the minutes of the Town Centre Steering Group be submitted to the Local Development Framework Working Party for information; and
- (d) that it be made clear on the Council's website that the consultation document is a draft document at present.

9/08 **RURAL EXCEPTION HOUSING SCHEMES**

The Working Party considered a report on the role of rural exception sites in delivering affordable housing and the development of the policy background in respect of these sites. It was reported that rural exception sites could provide additional housing within or adjoining villages where normally development would not be allowed e.g. within the green belt. This would need to be on the basis of meeting identified local housing needs.

Members of the Working Party expressed views on this issue in the light of their knowledge of particular circumstances within the wards which they represented. Following discussion it was

RESOLVED that officers note the feedback received and utilise it in the preparation of a revised rural exceptions policy for inclusion within the Core Strategy.

10/08 **NEW PLANNING POLICIES**

The Working Party considered issues contained in a paper produced by Members on particular issues of concern. The paper was intended to encourage discussion on possible changes to planning policies in the light of national projected population figures, including an increase in the number of elderly people requiring various categories of housing and care and the number of young people living at home but requiring an element of independent living.

Affordable Housing

The Head of Planning and Environment reminded Members that the results of the Housing Market Assessment would be available at the end of July 2008 and that these results would provide robust evidence for revision of the policy relating to the provision of affordable housing and the proportion of affordable housing to be provided within new development schemes. Officers accepted the intentions behind the proposals to ensure that the provision of affordable housing was maximised.

Categories of Care for the Elderly

The Head of Planning and Environment stated that in relation to extensions to Care Homes in the green belt, there could be conflict with national green belt policy which would mean the Council's Core Strategy would be unsound. It was acknowledged that whilst Members had the option of overturning officers' recommendations at Planning Committee in relation to applications for extensions to Care Homes, this was not a particularly satisfactory approach. It was noted that the results of the Older Persons Housing Survey would be available in December 2008 and this would assist in identifying gaps in provision. Officers undertook to seek information from other Authorities within the Council's "family group" in relation to the issue of extensions to care homes within the green belt.

It was reported that the Head of Strategic Housing had undertaken to arrange for Members to visit a Care Village and a "Care at Hand" facility together with a presentation from officers representing social services and supporting people to assist with the identification of gaps in service provision and the type of accommodation the Council may wish to encourage in order to meet the needs of older people within the District.

The 40% Rule

In relation to the possible increase in the floor area on which present policy is based, the Head of Planning and Environment undertook to report back to a future meeting with plans illustrating examples of various floor areas together with suggestions for a base date from which extensions could be calculated.

RESOLVED that the contents of the paper together with the subsequent discussions be taken into account by officers in formulating new policies and

that officers report back with the additional information referred to above as soon as possible.

The meeting closed at 5.45 p.m.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY

3rd July 2008

ADDITIONAL REDDITCH GROWTH STUDY

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Councillor Mrs J Dyer
Responsible Head of Service	Dave Hammond, Head of Planning & Environment Services
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This Report updates members on the strategic assessment of the implications for potential future growth within and adjoining Redditch Borough over the period to 2026 conducted by White Young Green Consulting (WYG).

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Members note the report.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 Members received an update at the meeting of the Local Development Working Party held on the 29th May 2008 regarding the latest position in relation to the planning implications of Redditch growth as proposed in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Phase 2 revision. Members were also informed that a further technical study building on earlier work was to be undertaken, as the earlier study did not determine a priority of sites to be developed, nor examine the spilt of development between Bromsgrove and/or Stratford. This report is to inform members of the findings of the earlier technical study. A separate report has been prepared detailing the brief for the second phase of the study.
- 3.2 The initial Spatial Options paper of the RSS stated '*the Government will expect the Region to build more homes than set out in the current RSS*'. The Government has signalled its desire to see the provision and delivery of new housing given greater priority. It is clear that the Region will be under pressure to accept higher targets. Hence, the study being based on three housing development options (4,300 dwellings, 8,200 dwellings and 13,200dwellings) for the period 2001 to 2026. While the study was taking place the Regional Assembly published its preferred options figures, allocating 6600 dwellings to Redditch of which 3300 need to be provided in Bromsgrove and or Stratford districts. Subsequently an addendum to the study was produced to take into account these revised figures.

3.3 The existing study is strategic and technical in nature and did not involve any public consultation apart from a limited exercise to identify potential sources of housing capacity within the urban area of Redditch. The purpose of the study is to give clear technical guidance to the four commissioning authorities and the Regional Planning Body on the following:

- the potential urban capacity of Redditch Town to accommodate housing and employment growth to 2026
- the level of additional peripheral growth required to meet the housing requirements set out in the WMRSS Spatial Options Consultation, and
- the implications of accommodating those peripheral growth levels in the various locations around Redditch Town in Worcestershire and Warwickshire.

3.4 Key Findings of the Study

The WMRSS Spatial Options Consultation suggested 3 possible housing growth options for Redditch for the period 2001-2026: Option 1 – 4300 dwellings; Option 2 – 8200 dwellings; and Option 3 – 13200 dwellings.

The Study found that:

3.5 Under Growth Option 1:

- there is more than sufficient potential within 3 areas on the periphery of the built up area within the Borough that have been identified for possible development post 2011 in the Redditch Local Plan (ADRs) and/or an area in Stratford-upon-Avon District to the north-east of Redditch (known as the Winyates Green Triangle), to accommodate the residual amount of housing that cannot be met on land in the urban area of Redditch (about 130 dwellings). No development in the Green Belt is required.
- The road infrastructure mitigation measures needed would be relatively limited, potentially involving some improvements to the A435(south) link, the Crabbs Cross Roundabout, and the construction of the Bordesley Bypass, which already has planning permission.

3.6 Under Growth Option 2:

- In addition to developing all of the above peripheral areas (ADRs) and the Winyates Green Triangle, meeting Option 2 would also involve the release of peripheral land in the Green Belt. The total area of Green Belt required to accommodate new dwellings (about

2080 dwellings), together with employment, retail, open space and other community facilities, would be about 145 hectares.

- the adverse strategic implications of peripheral development would be minimised to the north/north east of the town, with development concentrated around the A441 (north).
- The road infrastructure required includes the Bordesley By-pass, and improvements to the A441 (north).

3.7 Under Growth Option 3:

- more substantial Green Belt land take would be necessary than under option 2, in the order of about 390 hectares.
- As with Option 2, the adverse strategic planning implications of development would be minimised to the north/north east of the town.
- Development concentrated to the north east of the built up area would be likely to require a new link road between the A441(north) and the A435(north). The development of this road could take 5 years, leading to pressure for very high levels of housing in the latter part of the plan period to meet the Option 3 growth level.
- Further consideration should be given to meeting development on land either side of the A448 (west).
- In view of possible constraints to early development to the north east and north west consideration should also be given to land to the south east of Redditch - to the west and north of Studley - in association with a Crabbs Cross Relief Road. This however may lead to an adverse effect on the Alvechurch Highway, traffic congestion on the A435, and would lead to coalescence between Redditch and Studley.

3.8 Public Utilities Infrastructure

- The most pertinent public utility constraint is foul water disposal. Development of this infrastructure to the west of the River Arrow would be potentially more expensive and less sustainable than to the east of the river.
- The supply of gas should not influence the number or location of new dwellings. Neither should telecommunications or electricity supply unduly influence the residential growth of Redditch.

3.9 Addendum to the Study

Since the Study was originally drafted, the Regional Assembly has agreed that as part of the RSS Preferred Option, the level of growth at Redditch for the (revised) plan period of 2006-2026 should be 6600 dwellings, with 3300 dwellings to be provided within Redditch Borough and the balance to be provided in the neighbouring districts of Bromsgrove and/or Stratford-upon-Avon District. In view of this the planning consultants were requested to produce a short Addendum to their Study.

3.10 The principal findings of the Addendum are:

- The Preferred Option is more than Growth Option 1 but less than Growth Options 2 or 3, allowing for dwellings completions 2001-2006
- Committed and potential capacity within Redditch is more than sufficient to meet the 3300 dwellings target set for Redditch Borough. (Indeed potentially there could be about 1000 dwellings surplus capacity within the Borough.)
- With respect to the balance of provision of 3300 dwellings adjacent to Redditch, should the capacity of non-Green Belt land adjacent to Redditch in Stratford District be taken up, there would be a requirement for 3000 dwellings in the Green Belt in adjoining authorities. Accommodating this amount of housing growth, together with related employment and community land uses, would require about 150 hectares of Green Belt.

3.11 **Conclusions**

Constraints imposed by highway and drainage infrastructure are generally less to the north than to the south and west. Also expansion northwards including the development of the Brockhill ADR would be relatively close to the town centre and significant savings on vehicle mileage in comparison with the more peripheral locations could be achieved particularly if improved public transportation links are incorporated into any masterplan for the area. For these reasons the opinion is that development to the north of the town is more likely to result in a more sustainable pattern of development. However, even if funding can be found, it will mean that the delivery of development will be heavily concentrated in the latter half of the Strategy period.

4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 None

5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 None

6. **COUNCIL OBJECTIVES**

- 6.1 The ability of the Council to deliver its objectives is affected by the status of the Local Development Framework (LDF). All documents produced as part of the LDF have to be in general conformity with the RSS, therefore the RSS will ultimately impact on these objectives and priorities. The table below indicates potential impacts.
- 6.2 The ability to implement the Bromsgrove Sustainable Community Strategy is also highly dependant of the Local Development Framework. Many of the areas covered by the Sustainable Community Strategy cannot be delivered without formal planning polices.

Council Objective (CO)	Regeneration (CO1)	Council Priority (CP)	A thriving market town (CP1)
Impacts			
Policies in the RSS support the development of centres across the region, including those not specifically named as major urban areas or, settlements of significant development, the ability to regenerate the town are not adversely effected by policies in the RSS			
Council Objective (CO)	Improvement (CO2)	Council Priority (CP)	Customer service (CP2)
Impacts			
No impact			
Council Objective (CO)	Sense of Community and Well Being (CO3)	Council Priority (CP)	Sense of community (CP3)
Impacts			
The RSS gives a strategic framework for planning across the region. Plans at a more local level can then create planning policies that provide developments which can enhance the sense of community and well being.			
Council Objective (CO)	Environment (CO4)	Council Priority (CP)	Housing (CP4) Clean streets and recycling (CP5)
Impacts			
The RSS guides the levels and distribution of housing development across the region. The ability of Bromsgrove to satisfy all of its affordable housing needs are significantly reduced by this emerging policy of housing restraint in districts which are not Major Urban Areas or, Settlements of Significant Development.			
In the Long term the RSS could help provide more waste management facilities			

in the district.

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

7.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are:

- Inability to produce development plan documents which are judged to be sound by the planning inspectorate.

7.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

Risk Register: Planning and Environment
Key Objective Ref No: 6
Key Objective: Effective, efficient, and legally compliant Strategic planning Service

7.3 Progress on the LDF is monitored by the government through the Local Development Schemes and Annual Monitoring Reports produced by the Strategic Planning section. The progress on the Local Development Scheme is a key factor used to allocate Housing and Planning Delivery Grant. Failure to progress the LDF inline with the Local Development Scheme could have short term financial implications. Consistent failure to produce LDF documents specifically the Core Strategy could result in the GOWM taking the strategic planning function away from control of the council. In this case they would employ other planning professionals to prepare the core strategy on behalf of the GOWM and then impose it on the District Council, whilst also requesting that the district council pay the consultancy fees accrued in the process.

8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The study will be used as evidence for councils in the sub-region for their Core Strategies preparation, so the implications of the work are likely to have a wide sub regional impact on customers.

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 This study will form part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy. Consultation will be carried out with all sections of the community as the plan progresses.

10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The study was part funded by the four authorities.

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues	None
Personnel Implications	None
Governance/Performance Management	None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998	None
Policy	The policy decisions taken at a regional level directly effect the ability to generate local policies especially in relation to planning
Environmental	As stated above there will be implications to the environment over a long period of time, the exact effects are currently unknown.

12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	No
Chief Executive	No
Executive Director - Partnerships & Projects	No
Assistant Chief Executive	No
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	No
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

13. WARDS AFFECTED

All wards

14. APPENDICES

None

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

CONTACT OFFICER

Name: Sumi Lai
E Mail: s.lai@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 881314

This page is intentionally left blank

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY

3rd July 2008

REDDITCH JOINT STUDY PART 2 BRIEF

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Councillor Jill Dyer
Responsible Head of Service	Dave Hammond
Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report details the brief for the second stage of the Redditch Joint Study to be carried out to inform the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Phase 2 revision.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Members agree the brief of the Second Stage of the Redditch growth study, and consultants are commissioned to carry out the work.

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 As members will be aware the phase 2 revision of the RSS is proposing an additional 3300 dwellings to meet the needs of Redditch which will need to be accommodated in Bromsgrove and or Stratford. Currently the revision does not specify how this requirement should be split between the districts, which present a challenge for the authorities in progressing their Core Strategies. In order to move to the latter stages of Core Strategy production the District Council needs to have more clarity on the levels of development potentially required in Bromsgrove for Redditch's growth needs.
- 3.2 Government Office and the Regional Assembly have indicated that they expect robust arrangements to be put in place to determine the split in the housing and employment land targets between the authorities' areas to provide greater certainty in the preparation of Core Strategies.
- 3.3 To support the preparation of the RSS Worcestershire County Council, Redditch Borough, and Bromsgrove and Stratford District Councils commissioned consultants White Young Green to undertake a 'Joint Study into the Future Growth of Redditch Town to 2026'. This study was completed in December 2007 and forms a key part of the evidence base for the RSS.
- 3.4 The existing joint study is strategic in nature and provides an independent view on (i) the potential capacity of Redditch Town to accommodate additional growth; and (ii) taking account of that capacity, to give a view on the scale of and likely implications of growth in the surrounding districts of

Bromsgrove and Stratford that will be required to meet Redditch Borough-related growth needs. Having considered areas of search the study provides sufficient evidence for a view to be formed on the broad balance of development required between Redditch Borough and the surrounding two districts of Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon; the key infrastructure issues such levels of growth are likely to give rise to and which will need to be addressed; and the key policy implications that will need to be addressed such as the impact the levels of growth will potentially have on the Green Belt and its purposes. A further report has been prepared outlining in more detail the findings of the joint study.

- 3.5 However, there is a general agreement between the authorities concerned that the Joint Study is insufficiently detailed to allow district level splits of Redditch Borough-related growth to be identified. At a meeting on the 19th of March attended by the Leaders and senior officers of all the Local Authorities four options of how to progress were outlined, it was agreed option 2 additional work would need to be done augment the broad study findings.
- 3.6 A brief has been prepared by officers at the commissioning authorities (see appendix A) and it is proposed upon members approval White Young Green are commissioned to undertake the further work, the role of Warwickshire County council has yet to be finalised.
- 3.7 This additional work will investigate the following elements
 - a) Whether Redditch Borough can accommodate more than its 3300 dwelling designation within its boundary and the optimum split of the remaining designation between Stratford and Bromsgrove districts, together with a phasing programme based on two scenarios firstly the Preferred Option figures for housing and employment land together with a second scenario of a 30% increase on these figures;
 - b) Provide detailed information on the likely impacts of development (including different scales of development) on the priority of sites to be developed. This will relate to the areas of search considered within the existing Joint Study (or parts of them), in terms of the natural environment, including sensitive sites and opportunities for protection and enhancement (i.e. a more robust and detailed SWOT type analysis). This should include reference to the Worcestershire/Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessments and the application of a sensitivity analysis.
 - c) The suitability or otherwise of the areas of search (or parts of them) in relation to the existing Redditch Town form, in particular accessibility to essential Town Centre facilities and transport nodes. An accessibility profile for areas of search (or parts of them) would need to be established to allow comparisons;

- d) The key infrastructure issues to be faced, particularly with regard to the two concerns identified within the Joint Study regarding new transportation and foul water infrastructure. This would need to address the issue of which areas of search (or parts of them) are most likely to be deliverable, or are preferable for development given the scale of infrastructure needs and likely costs. This should examine the scale of development and associated infrastructure required in various areas to justify unlocking them. In terms of transportation this would involve more detailed analysis throughout the sub-region of trip rates, the implications of growth on the proposals for the Studley by-pass, the Bordesley by-pass and future rail plans particularly along the cross city line between Redditch and the conurbation.
 - e) The implications of development in the areas of search (or parts of them) in respect of one another in terms of specific impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt and in helping to deliver the aims of the RSS (e.g. urban renaissance of the MUAs and local regeneration), including for example an appraisal of the proposed development on the strategic function of the Green Belt;
 - f) Thorough/rigorous consideration of the capacity of the Areas of Development Constraint and White Land (Winyates Green Triangle) within and adjacent to Redditch;
 - g) Detailed scrutiny of the capacity of the urban area, both the Town Centre and more widely in terms of the adopted open space standards in Redditch;
 - h) Sustainability Appraisal to consider likely sustainability impacts of the scale of development required and the implications, for example in terms of infrastructure needed.
- 3.8 It is anticipated that work would commence on the stage 2 study by the end of July with a report being available for public consultation by 7 October. This timing means that the Stage 2 study would be available at the same time that the Government Office Study of Housing Options for the RSS, being undertaken by Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners (NLP), is published for public comment. The findings of the stage 2 study would also be available for public consultation as part of the Preferred Options consultation in respect of each of the three District Authorities Core Strategies, which are due to commence by the end of October 2008.
- 3.9 The final study, together with the feedback from public consultation would be available to inform the Local Authorities response to the WMRSS Preferred Option and the NLP study by 8 December.

4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 It was estimated that the costs for carrying out such a study was likely to be in the region of £50,000 and contributors would be Worcestershire County Council, Stratford District Council, Redditch Borough Council, Bromsgrove District Council and the West Midlands Regional Assembly. At the meeting on the 19th May both the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive agreed to part fund this work to the sum of £10,000.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 The RSS is the responsibility of the West Midlands Regional Assembly and is being prepared under the regulations of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; the district council also has an obligation under the act to prepare a Local Development Documents in line with the Local Development Scheme. The ability to prepare these documents is influence by progress on the RSS.

6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

6.1 The ability of the Council to deliver its objectives is affected by the status of the Local Development Framework (LDF). All documents produced as part of the LDF have to be in general conformity with the RSS, therefore the RSS will ultimately impact on these objectives and priorities. The table below indicates potential impacts.

6.2 The ability to implement the Bromsgrove Sustainable Community Strategy is also highly dependant of the Local Development Framework. Many of the areas covered by the Sustainable Community Strategy cannot be delivered without formal planning polices.

Council Objective (CO)	Regeneration (CO1)	Council Priority (CP)	A thriving market town (CP1)
Impacts			
Policies in the RSS support the development of centres across the region, including those not specifically named as major urban areas or, settlements of significant development, the ability to regenerate the town are not adversely effected by policies in the RSS			
Council Objective (CO)	Improvement (CO2)	Council Priority (CP)	Customer service (CP2)
Impacts			
No impact			
Council Objective (CO)	Sense of Community and Well Being (CO3)	Council Priority (CP)	Sense of community (CP3)
Impacts			

The RSS gives a strategic framework for planning across the region. Plans at a more local level can then create planning policies that provide developments which can enhance the sense of community and well being.

Council Objective (CO)	Environment (CO4)	Council Priority (CP)	Housing (CP4) Clean streets and recycling (CP5)
Impacts			
<p>The RSS guides the levels and distribution of housing development across the region. The ability of Bromsgrove to satisfy all of its affordable housing needs are significantly reduced by this emerging policy of housing restraint in districts which are not Major Urban Areas or, Settlements of Significant Development.</p> <p>In the Long term the RSS could help provide more waste management facilities in the district.</p>			

7. **RISK MANAGEMENT**

7.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are:

- Inability to produce development plan documents which are judged to be sound by the planning inspectorate.

7.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

Risk Register: Planning and Environment
 Key Objective Ref No: 6
 Key Objective: Effective, efficient, and legally compliant Strategic planning Service

7.3 Progress on the LDF is monitored by the government through the Local Development Schemes and Annual Monitoring Reports produced by the Strategic Planning section. The progress on the Local Development Scheme is a key factor used to allocate Housing and Planning Delivery Grant. Failure to progress the LDF inline with the Local Development Scheme could have short term financial implications. Consistent failure to produce LDF documents specifically the Core Strategy could result in the GOWM taking the strategic planning function away from control of the council. In this case they would employ other planning professionals to prepare the core strategy on behalf of the GOWM and then impose it on the District Council, whilst also requesting that the district council pay the consultancy fees accrued in the process.

8. **CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 Endorsing the agreement to carry out a further technical study will have no direct implications on the council's customers; however the implications of the work are likely to have a wide sub regional impact on customers as does the RSS.

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 This study will form part of the evidence base to inform the Core Strategy. Consultation will be carried out with all sections of the community as the plan progresses.

10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The proposed study is to be jointly funded by a number of different bodies thereby distributing the costs, it is also hoped that White Young Green who carried out the original work will also be able to complete the part 2 study thereby reducing the time and cost implications of a further procurement exercise.

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues	None
Personnel Implications	None
Governance/Performance Management	None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998	None
Policy	The policy decisions taken at a regional level directly effect the ability to generate local policies especially in relation to planning
Environmental	As stated above their will be implications to the environment over a long period of time, the exact effects are currently unknown.

12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	No
Chief Executive	No
Executive Director - Partnerships & Projects	No
Assistant Chief Executive	No
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	No

Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	No
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

13. WARDS AFFECTED

All wards

14. APPENDICES

Appendix A - Redditch Joint Study Part 2 Brief

15. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

CONTACT OFFICER

Name: Mike Dunphy
E Mail: m.dunphy@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 881325

This page is intentionally left blank

PROJECT BRIEF
2nd STAGE JOINT STUDY INTO THE FUTURE GROWTH IMPLICATIONS
OF REDDITCH TOWN TO 2026

PREAMBLE

1. West Midlands Regional Assembly (WMRA) as Regional Planning Body (RPB) for the West Midlands Region is currently undertaking a partial revision of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS). The current WMRSS was approved in June 2004. As part of the revision process the WMRA undertook between January and March 2007 a consultation exercise on the Spatial Options for the Region for the period 2001-2026. The consultation exercise considered, amongst other things, issues in relation to the two main drivers of the WMRSS – housing and employment. Following on from the Spatial Options consultation exercise the WMRA has prepared the Preferred Option which was submitted to the Secretary of State in December 2007.
2. Following this formal submission, the West Midlands Regional Assembly received a letter from Baroness Andrews, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State in the Department for Communities and Local Government. In her letter, dated 7th January 2008, the Minister expressed concern about the housing proposals put forward by the Assembly in light of the Government's agenda to increase house building across the country. In view of this, the Minister has asked the Government Office for the West Midlands to commission further work to look at options which could deliver higher housing numbers, this work will be considered as part of the Examination in Public.
3. Consultants Nathaniel Lichfield have been appointed to carry out this study and the aim is for the work to be completed by 7th October, 2008, in order for stakeholders to take it into account when submitting final representations on the Phase 2 revision which now closes on the 8th December.
4. In developing the Preferred Option a difficult and sensitive issue arose which related to the implications of future growth within Redditch Borough, given the projected high level of future 'local' housing need and the perceived limited capacity of the Borough and Redditch Town in particular to accommodate further growth to 2026.
5. The RSS revision proposes that some of Redditch's growth (3300 dwellings and 32 ha of employment land) should be accommodated in the adjoining districts of Stratford-on-Avon and/or Bromsgrove and that this growth should be located adjacent to Redditch's boundary.
6. The WMRSS does not identify how these requirements should be split between Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon Districts, which presents a challenge for the authorities in progressing their respective core strategies.

7. A joint study, funded by Worcestershire County Council, the adjoining districts and the Regional Assembly, was completed in December 2007 by White Young Green, an independent firm of consultants who undertook a land use planning study to provide an improved evidence base to inform the preparation of the Preferred Option for the Region. This evidence base comprised both an assessment of the potential urban capacity of Redditch Town to 2026 and an assessment of the implications of the possible options/directions of growth for the Town, including site constraints and opportunities. It did not however determine a priority of sites to be developed nor examine the split of development between Bromsgrove and Stratford-on-Avon Districts. This work needs to be done to enable each district to develop appropriate policies within their respective core strategies.

STATUS AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

8. This stage 2 work will build on the work already undertaken by White Young Green. It is being commissioned by Worcestershire County Council, **Warwickshire County Council***, Bromsgrove District Council, Redditch Borough Council, Stratford-on-Avon District Council and the Regional Assembly. It will give clear technical and detailed guidance to the three authorities on:
 - (a) the split of growth, including housing and employment land, both within Redditch Borough and then between Stratford-on-Avon and/or Bromsgrove (in other words the 3300 RSS target for Redditch Borough needs to be evaluated)
 - (b) the priority of sites to be developed shown on an Ordnance Survey base
 - (c) the implications of accommodating these peripheral growth levels on infrastructure requirements in each District
 - (d) the implications of an increase in housing figures as a result of Nathaniel Lichfield's work
 - (e) the implications of the designation of Redditch as an SSD in terms of potential growth requirements and impact on two adjoining districts.
9. The Study will not incorporate any form of public consultation but will require technical consultation with the five/**six*** commissioning authorities and relevant outside organisations. Public consultation will be undertaken by the on the back of the RSS consultation period. There will also be local consultation as the three District Authorities will include the outcome of the study alongside planned consultation on their respective Core Strategy – Preferred Options consultations. The Study will be dealing with sensitive issues and information and will be confidential between the commissioning authorities and the consultants until such

time that the authorities consider it appropriate to place its findings in the public domain.)

PLANNING AND STUDY CONTEXT

10. As mentioned above the Study is to provide technical evidence to inform the Local Development Frameworks of the three Local Planning Authorities. The Study must also be considered within the context of the current RSS revision process, the implications of the work being undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield to increase the housing figures across the Region, the implications of the designation of Redditch as a Settlement of Significant Development (SSD) and the implications, especially for the strategic function of the Green Belt due to the potential peripheral expansion of the conurbation southwards.
11. Additionally the Study should take into account all relevant current national policy guidance, including that which may have been issued subsequent to the original adoption of the WMRSS in June 2004.
12. The Study will be confined to the administrative areas of Redditch Borough, Stratford-on-Avon and Bromsgrove Districts

STUDY REQUIREMENTS

13. Investigate whether Redditch Borough can accommodate more than its 3300 dwelling designation within its boundary and the optimum split of the remaining designation between Stratford-on-Avon and Bromsgrove districts, together with a phasing programme based on two scenarios firstly the Preferred Option figures for housing and employment land together with a second scenario of a 30% increase on these figures;
14. Detailed information on the likely impacts of development (including different scales of development) on the priority of sites to be developed. This will relate to the areas of search considered within the existing Joint Study (or parts of them), in terms of the natural environment, including sensitive sites and opportunities for protection and enhancement (i.e. a more robust and detailed SWOT type analysis). This should include reference to the Worcestershire/Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessments and the application of a sensitivity analysis.
15. The suitability or otherwise of the areas of search (or parts of them) in relation to the existing Redditch Town form, in particular accessibility to essential Town Centre facilities and transport nodes. An accessibility profile for areas of search (or parts of them) would need to be established to allow comparisons;
16. The key infrastructure issues to be faced, particularly with regard to the two concerns identified within the Joint Study regarding new transportation and foul water infrastructure. This would need to address the issue of which areas of search (or parts of them) are most likely to be

deliverable, or are preferable for development given the scale of infrastructure needs and likely costs. This should examine the scale of development and associated infrastructure required in various areas to justify unlocking them. In terms of transportation this would involve more detailed analysis throughout the sub-region of trip rates, the implications of growth on the proposals for the Studley By-pass, the Bordesley By-pass and future rail plans particularly along the cross city line between Redditch and the conurbation.

17. The implications of development in the areas of search (or parts of them) in respect of one another in terms of specific impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt and in helping to deliver the aims of the RSS (e.g. urban renaissance of the MUAs and local regeneration), including for example an appraisal of the proposed development on the strategic function of the Green Belt;
18. Thorough/rigorous consideration of the capacity of the Areas of Development Constraint and White Land (Winyates Green Triangle) within and adjacent to Redditch;
19. Detailed scrutiny of the capacity of the urban area, both the Town Centre and more widely in terms of the adopted open space standards in Redditch;
20. Sustainability Appraisal to consider likely sustainability impacts of the scale of development required and the implications, for example in terms of infrastructure needed

LEAD AUTHORITY

21. Redditch Borough Council will act as lead authority for the Study and will be the contact point for the appointed consultants. The project will be subject to confidential reports to an inter-authority panel of senior officers in the first instance.

WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

22. The three authorities commissioning the Study require an independent view on the potential future capacity and growth implications for Redditch Town. However, the County Councils as strategic planning authority and the three District Councils as local planning authorities, clearly have between them substantial expertise and knowledge in relation to the strategic and local planning issues within Worcestershire and Warwickshire. The authorities also hold significant detailed information at both a strategic and local level. Whilst an independent outcome is required it is essential that this expertise, knowledge and information is fed into the process in order to assist the consultants in reaching informed and accurate conclusions. To this end it is proposed that the consultants should work closely with officers of the authorities in the assembly of base information.

23. In addition the consultants will be required to involve, (as appropriate), other organisations directly in order to gain relevant technical information to inform the study, such as the Highways Agency; Severn Trent water, Network Rail.

TIMESCALE

24. The project is to commence mid July 2008 and be completed by the 7th October 2008. As part of the process specific milestones will be identified within the contract and the initial “draft” findings will be required by 31 August 2008
25. Public and stakeholder consultation on the issues and options associated with the future growth of Redditch Borough into the surrounding district areas is to be carried out alongside the consultation on the findings by Nathaniel Lichfield’s work after submission on 7th October 2008. There will also be consultation on the back of the three Core Strategies (Preferred Options stage).

OUTPUTS/REQUIREMENTS OF THE CONSULTANTS

26. Attendance at an initial joint briefing meeting in mid July 2008 with officer representatives of the three authorities and County Councils to consider the detailed approach to undertaking the work. To include issues such as the following:
 - working arrangements/roles;
 - inputs from the local authorities
 - timescales/clarification of outputs, etc.
 - to establish the detailed project plan.
27. Submission of a report to the authorities by 1 August 2008 following the initial joint meeting detailing the discussions at the meeting and agreed outputs/approach to the work (i.e. the project plan).
28. Attendance as required at a regular progress meeting with officer representatives of the five/six* authorities.
29. Submission and presentation of a written final report to officer representatives of the five/six* authorities **at least two weeks before** the agreed end date of the project, i.e. no later than 23 September 2008.
30. Submission of a written clear and logical final report to the five/six* authorities covering all the aspects set out in the section “Project Requirements” (unless subsequently jointly agreed to be amended) by the specified end date of the project. It is envisaged that six copies of the final report in paper version and on CD’s will be required.
31. All mapped information to be prepared and provided by the consultants.

32. Both the draft and final reports to be provided in paper and electronic format, including key diagrams.

* The role of Warwickshire County Council is still to be clarified.

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING PARTY

3rd July 2008

CORE STRATEGY

Responsible Portfolio Holder	Councillor Mrs J Dyer
Responsible Head of Service	Dave Hammond, Head of Planning & Environment Services
Non Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Members on the proposed structure and content of the Preferred Options Core Strategy.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That Members note progress and the proposed format of the Core Strategy Preferred Options.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 A key part of the new Local Development Framework (LDF) planning system is the requirement on the Council to produce a Core Strategy.

3.2 The Core Strategy is a strategic level document that provides the framework for subsequent Development Plan Documents. It will contain a spatial vision, strategic objectives for the area, together with core policies and a monitoring and implementation framework.

3.3 Members will recall at the meeting of the LDFWP on the 29th May 2008 the Spatial Vision for the core strategy was approved, subject to the inclusion of reference to Longbridge, for public consultation purposes.

3.4 Bromsgrove's strategic planning framework has to be in line with National policy, in general conformity with the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS), whilst taking into account the emerging phased revisions of RSS. Emerging updates to national planning policy statements will set new challenges for Bromsgrove to 2026. Conformity will be assessed at Examination in Public under the tests of soundness.

Strategic Objectives

3.5 A set of Strategic Objectives have now been defined which aim to deliver the spatial vision for Bromsgrove by 2026. They build upon national and regional planning policy objectives and address key local issues. The objectives provide the basis for the preferred spatial strategy for the District which together with the core policies aim to secure delivery;

- SO1 - Deliver the required level of housing in line with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy
- SO2 - Provide a range of housing types and tenures with a particular focus on affordable housing to meet the needs of the local population
- SO3 - Regenerate Bromsgrove Town Centre to create a thriving market town
- SO4 – Provide sufficient opportunities for employment growth, particularly in knowledge based industries and high tech manufacturing whilst supporting rural diversification
- SO5 - Focus new development in the most sustainable locations in the district
- SO6 - Create a more integrated, sustainable and reliable public transport network across the district
- SO7- Promote high quality design of new developments
- SO8 - Protect and enhance the unique character and appearance of the historic built and natural environment throughout the district
- SO9- To protect and improve the countryside and the diversity of wildlife and habitats
- SO10 - Enhance the vitality and viability of local centres across the district
- SO11 - Encourage energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy in the District
- SO12 - Encourage recycling including waste, rainwater and building materials
- SO13- Conserve water supplies
- SO14- Respond to increased risks of flooding
- SO15 - Provide excellent and accessible health, education, culture and leisure facilities to meet the needs of Bromsgrove’s population
- SO16 - Promote active and healthy lifestyles and strive for excellence in education and culture

Sustainable Community Strategy

3.6 One of the current tests of soundness, No. 5, states that the Core Strategy must demonstrate that “ It has had regard to the authority’s community strategy”.

3.7 The work of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in identifying key issues for the district in the Sustainable Community Strategy has helped to inform the spatial objectives in the Core Strategy. The responses to the issues and options consultations have also had a significant impact on the process. The implementation of the Core Strategy will put an emphasis on the delivery of the spatial objectives which will in turn help to deliver many of the Local Area Agreements within the Sustainable Community Strategy.

3.8 To provide a level of coherence and consistency it is proposed that the topic headings will build on the key issues identified within the Sustainable Community Strategy. The issues of ‘meeting the needs of children and young people’ and ‘stronger communities’ have been combined under the heading of ‘meeting the needs of the community’. Whilst the issue of ‘communities that are safe and feel safe’ will form part of the topic entitled ‘a better environment for today and tomorrow’. Each topic will focus on several key areas and a small number of

broad strategic policies will enable the delivery of the vision for Bromsgrove in 2026. Due to their spatial nature there will inevitably be some overlap between the policy areas.

Proposed Structure

3.9 The headings with suggested core policies are therefore as follows;

A. A Better Environment for Today and Tomorrow

1. Climate Change
2. Distribution of Housing
3. Rural Regeneration
4. Promoting High Quality Design
5. Protecting Natural and Man Made Assets
6. Responding to Natural Forces

B. Economic Success that is Shared by All

7. Distribution of New Employment Development
8. Retail and Town Centre Regeneration

C. Improving Health and Well Being

9. Sustainable Transport
10. Open Space and Recreation
11. Biodiversity and Geodiversity

D. Meeting the Needs of the Community

12. Size Type and Tenure of Housing
13. Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople
14. The Scale of New Housing
15. Affordable Housing
16. Sustainable Communities

Sample Policy

3.10 The example policy below provides an illustration of what a Core Strategy policy may contain. The guidance states that whilst policies should essentially be a strategic level policy, they must also be locally distinctive, hence in this case the reference to the proposed new railway station at Bromsgrove.

3.11 CP9 Sustainable Transport

The Local Development Framework will deliver an improvement in accessibility by encouraging more sustainable means of travel. Public transport needs to be a convenient and efficient alternative to the private car in order to encourage more people to use it. Encouraging more rail travel, for instance, is an effective way of reducing car journeys. The availability of car parking and cycling facilities at railway stations is important to encourage more people to switch from car to rail for at least part of their journey. Cyclepaths, footpaths, and bus connections to

stations can make an effective contribution to enabling people to move through and around the District.

New developments will be assessed against the following criteria so as to ensure that there is a reduction in the need to travel and, where travel is necessary, an increase in the use of sustainable transport modes;

- a) Developments which generate significant travel demands must include transport assessments and should be located adjacent to existing or proposed public transport links;*
- b) Developments which generate significant commercial movements should be located close to suitable rail freight facilities or roads designed and managed as traffic distributors;*
- c) To support increased public transport usage only essential car parking will be allowed at new developments close to public transport interchanges;*
- d) All new developments should be accessible by sustainable modes of transport including walking and cycling;*
- e) All major developments should incorporate proposals to increase the scope for walking and cycling.*

Furthermore, Bromsgrove District Council will work towards reducing the need to travel by car and deliver a sustainable transport network by working with Worcestershire County Council Transport Department and rail industry partners to secure a new and improved Bromsgrove Railway Station with adequate car parking and cycle facilities at the station and bus connections to Bromsgrove Town Centre.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A budget currently exists for progressing the Core Strategy and there are no direct implications of receiving this update.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The Plan once adopted will become part of the Statutory Development Plan for the District required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and prepared in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

6. COUNCIL OBJECTIVES

Council Objective (CO)	Regeneration (CO1)	Council Priority (CP)	A thriving market town (CP1) Housing (CP2)
Impacts			
The Core Strategy identifies the long term spatial vision for the district this includes key areas such as the regeneration of the town centre. Policies within the core strategy will direct where and when new housing should be built across the district up to 2026, it will also look at affordable housing and be supplemented by an Affordable Housing SPD which will look to maximise affordable housing provision across the district.			
Council Objective (CO)	Customer service (CP2)	Council Priority (CP)	Customer service (CP3)
Impacts			
The issues and options process has involved detailed consultation with the general public and the completed core strategy will be a publicly available document that identifies the spatial vision for the district.			
Council Objective (CO)	Sense of Community and Well Being (CO3)	Council Priority (CP)	Sense of community (CP4)
Impacts			
The core strategy sets out the long term spatial vision for the district and the strategic policies required in delivering that vision. The core strategy goes beyond identifying land uses and attempts to tackle social and economic issues affected by the implementation of various policies.			
Council Objective (CO)	Environment (CO4)	Council Priority (CP)	Clean Streets and recycling (CP5)
Impacts			
The Core Strategy could contain policies which encourage recycling			

7. **RISK MANAGEMENT**

7.1 The main risks associated with the details included in this report are:

- Inability to produce development plan document which is judged to be sound by the planning inspectorate and therefore resulting in non legally compliant Strategic planning service

7.2 These risks are being managed as follows:

Risk Register: Planning and Environment
Key Objective Ref No: 6

Key Objective: Effective, efficient, and legally compliant Strategic planning Service

8. CUSTOMER IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The Core Strategy is likely to have an impact on many different aspects of people’s lives including living, working, shopping, leisure and education. Public consultation has been and will be extensively undertaken throughout the process.

9. EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

9.1 An equalities impact assessment will be carried out on the final submission version of the strategy, although attempts will be made to consult with all sections of society as the plan progresses towards completion.

10. VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Whilst there are no direct value for money implications connected with this report, methods to provide value for money are continuously being explored, for instance via joint procurement for external consultancy work identified as a requirement to provide a robust evidence base for the Core Strategy.

11. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Procurement Issues	None
Personnel Implications	None
Governance/Performance Management	None
Community Safety including Section 17 of Crime and Disorder Act 1998	None
Policy	The core strategy forms an essential part of the LDF and the policies contained within the core strategy will shape future development.
Environmental	Core strategy will contain policies in relation to the environment.

12. OTHERS CONSULTED ON THE REPORT

Portfolio Holder	No
Chief Executive	No
Executive Director - Partnerships and Projects	No
Executive Director - Services	No
Assistant Chief Executive	No
Head of Service	Yes
Head of Financial Services	No
Head of Legal, Equalities & Democratic Services	No
Head of Organisational Development & HR	No
Corporate Procurement Team	No

13. WARDS AFFECTED

All wards.

14. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

CONTACT OFFICER

Name: Rosemary Williams
E Mail: r.williams@bromsgrove.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 881316

This page is intentionally left blank