



Mr. Ian Kemp  
49 All Saints Close  
Bromsgrove  
Worcs B61 0AX

6th September 2014

Dear Mr Kemp

I understand that you are the appointed Inspector for the Birmingham City Council Development Plan.

I have enclosed copies of my original submission to the council on this matter for your perusal and information. I understand that the BCC has taken no notice of the 5863 comments made and have stated that their plans are sound; I disagree in the strongest terms.

I have also heard that the BCC are saying that parts of their plan are allowed to be aspirational, presumably what they would like it to be. Surely this is a cop out! or a change in the rules to suit themselves and should not be permitted.

I am totally against any building on the Green Belt and in particular area C which is near where I live.

As you will see from my attached submission statements, I have several concerns, the major one being Connectivity (transport). I would request you read my comments on this section. I would agree the plans of BCC are very aspirational and are totally impossible to achieve for a number of very practical reasons.

The transport section alone is so very flawed it should be sufficient in itself to stop the building of these new houses on its own. The BCC would be adding additional traffic to already overloaded routes through Walmley Village and Kingsbury Road to Birmingham.

How can the BCC say their plans are sound? when they are clearly not? Is it one set of parameters for BCC and everybody else has to play to an ever changing set of parameters.

I trust you will look very closely at these issues outlined in my submission and should you wish to be shown my areas of concern then, I would be only too pleased to show you around.

My telephone numbers and email are given below:



Many Thanks.

Yours faithfully

Alan Finnemore

BIRMINGHAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
Pre-submission consultation  
Comments Form - Part B  
Comments on soundness

Please use a separate sheet for each section of the Plan that you wish to comment on.  
Please ensure

For a Plan to be sound, it must be: Positively Prepared This means it should seek to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements where it is reasonable to do so and where this is consistent with achieving sustainable development.  
considered reasonable alternatives.  
development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

**B1. Which part of the Plan does this comment relate to?**

**Employment TP10,TP10,TP16, GA5, GA.**

B2. What is your comment?

The site at Peddimore is not the area of Greatest Economic need. The distribution/ assessment of economic growth across Birmingham and Solihull regions has not yet been completed, it is not due until spring of this year. This information is missing and therefore not positively prepared. There are other areas in the greater Birmingham area than the Sutton Coldfield employment zone. Therefore the BCC plan at the moment is putting an employment zone in an area where it is really not needed.

Once the distribution assessment of economic growth is completed surely this will indicate where an employment centre is required.

B3. What changes (if any) do you think should be made to the Plan to address your concerns?

The site at Peddimore will increase traffic congestion and Co2 emissions. If goods and services were to be brought in by rail where would a new rail line be sited and how would it be funded?

The land at Peddimore is grade 3 agricultural land and is very productive every year.  
The potential flood risk in the Peddimore area.

The land at Pedmore should be rigorously assessed for Flood risk.

The plan in my opinion diminishes the value of local historic sites such as Peddimore Hall, and Langley Hall which are grade two listed buildings.

B4. Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public? Please tick one box  
B5. No

BIRMINGHAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
Pre-submission consultation  
Comments Form - Part B  
Comments on soundness

Please use a separate sheet for each section of the Plan that you wish to comment on.  
Please ensure

For a Plan to be sound, it must be: Positively Prepared This means it should seek to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements where it is reasonable to do so and where this is consistent with achieving sustainable development.  
considered reasonable alternatives.  
development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

**B1. Which part of the Plan does this comment relate to?**

**Connectivity (transport) TP37, GA5, GA6**

**B2. What is your comment?**

The plan has not demonstrated at all that there will be a “development of a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system, where the most sustainable mode choices also offer the most convenient means of travel”. The introduction of potentially 10000 cars and other commercial vehicles into the area of Walmley will increase pollution in the area and increase the level of stress and frustration when trying to travel to their place of work.

The plan states that the opening of Sutton Park line is desirable and a New station could be built at Walmley.

If the residents of this new area and existing residents had to travel to Heartlands Hospital for treatment then this would add to traffic congestion and C02 emissions as there is no direct sustainable transport system.

The plan states things like the use of car sharing should be considered. The use of electric vehicles and the provision of electric charging points. ( there are two in Sutton Coldfield that in my opinion have never been used).

What does the phrase ( road user hierarchy) mean? If this is bus lanes on the Tyburn Road - we used to have those but they were abandoned because they didn't work.

The Plan actually states that some 25% of the City's C02 emissions are caused by cars. How can that be good and then place a possible 10000 more car journeys through the City and Walmley.

The whole of the transport section /low emissions/environment considerations is full of very poor and contradictory suggestions like these

**B3. What changes (if any) do you think should be made to the Plan to address your concerns?**

Part of the Plan (9.4) section on "Rail" suggest expanding the the Park and ride facilities at Four Oaks railway station. My request is HOW? clearly whoever put this into the report has never travelled from Four Oaks.

The same Question would apply to all of the stations on the Cross City line.

The plan states that the opening up of the Sutton Park line should be considered to help with the congestion. Where would this be accessed? A new station where the current Post Office sorting Department is (off Upper Clifton Road)? The access to this is difficult and what about car parking. Would British rail and the Post office assist financially in this. May be a car park in Sutton Park - I dare you to try!

The plan states a New station could be built in Walmley! Presumably this would be at the top of Penns Lane so that it would be within reasonable walking distance of the near end of this development at Thimblemill Road. Try 30 mins I researched it the other day. Therefore this would require a car park with considerable capacity? WHERE?

My last suggestion would be a rapid tram system from the railway bridge at the top of Penns lane down the central reservation into the City Centre. This would meet a sustainable/ ecological etc solution!

All of the above schemes would cost money where would it come from? Only one maybe has a certain merit (the rapid tram system). It also has difficulties like the speed of building it , as an example the system out of the city along Hagley Road has been planned for years but not yet built as far as I am aware.

I am a great believer in the use of the railways/trams as the answer to providing an ecological and sustainable solution to the use of this section of green belt (area C). However the BCC must give detailed information on how in practical and monetary terms they are going to achieve this because the road transport/bus schemes will make matters considerably worse. The Plan in a nut shell is very UNSOUND. The transport issues are a very serious flaw in the whole plan.

There is however one solution to all of these horrendous solutions to make our lives better, more enjoyable, more sustainable, more ecological and that is to build these houses in another part of the CITY!! New transport ideas not required!

**B4. Do you wish to speak on this issue at the examination in public? No**

**B5.**Alan Finnemore