## **PART B: Your Representation**

For official use only			

Please use a separate form for each representation

Name of Person / Organisation (if appropriate) making representation:			
Name:	Mrs Anne Dyson Parish Clerk		
Organisation	Bentley Pauncefoot Parish Council		
Which Proposed Main Modification to the Submission Bromsgrove District Plan/ Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 does your representation relate to? (Please indicate which Plan your response relates to as appropriate)			
Proposed Main Modification Number		MM 24	
2. Do you consider the Proposed Main Modification to be:			
A. Legally compliant?		Yes No No	
B. Sound?	Yes	□ No ✓	
3. If you consider the Proposed Main Modification to be unsound please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to? (tick all that apply)			
Not positively prepar	red ✓		
Not justified	✓		
Not effective	✓		
Not consistent with n	ational policy 🗸		

As also set out in the accompanying Guidance Notes on making representations to the Proposed Main Modifications these are the tests of soundness to which your comment(s) should relate:

Positively prepared - the Plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

Justified - the Plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on a proportionate, robust and credible evidence base;

Effective – the Plan should be deliverable over its identified time period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and

Consistent with national policy - the Plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Please use a separate sheet for each Proposed Main Modification response

4. Please give details of why you consider the Proposed Main Modification is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Proposed Main Modification please also use the box below to set out your comments.

Your representation should relate <u>only</u> to the current Proposed Main Modifications. Please be specific as to which part of a Policy, Proposal or paragraph no. you are referring to.

## Preamble:-

It is disappointing to see that our continuing concerns about bias, lack of accurate information and flawed processes are given little weight. Our response is made without prejudice to our previously expressed belief that the plan to develop a SUE at Foxlydiate is inherently unsound.

## Comment:-

This MM repeats the statement that a 'full' Green Belt Review will be carried out with no reference to the fact that, if the current plan goes ahead, a large area of Green Belt will already have disappeared by the time of the Local Plan review. This is not consistent with NPPF guidelines regarding the protection of the Green Belt.

5. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the proposed Main Modification legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Your representation should relate only to the current Proposed Main Modifications.

We suggest that reference should be made within this modification to the scale of the Green Belt in Bromsgrove District, the inroads into its extent already anticipated and the exceptional circumstances which have dictated that this is necessary.

## Declaration

I understand that all representations submitted will be made available for public inspection and will be identifiable to my name and organisation (if applicable).

2 B Dypen

Date: 11<sup>th</sup> September 2016

Signature: