



# **West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy**

## **Phase Two Revision**

**Documentation of the Consultation Event  
held on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2007**

## Table of contents

1	Introduction .....	3
2	“Where we are now?” .....	5
3	Study on Infrastructure Implications of the Preferred Option .....	6
4	The Emerging Draft Preferred Option – Draft Policies .....	7
5	Centres Presentation .....	8
6	Transport Presentation .....	9
7	Waste Presentation .....	10
8	Housing Presentation .....	11
9	Cross Cutting Themes Presentation .....	14
10	Sustainability Appraisal & Habitats Regulation Assessment .....	15
11	Housing Discussion Group .....	16
12	Employment/Centres Discussion Group .....	20
13	Waste Management Discussion Group .....	25
14	Transport Discussion Group .....	27
15	List of Participants .....	30

# 1 Introduction

The West Midlands Regional Assembly (WMRA), as the Regional Planning Body for the West Midlands, is currently working on the development of a Preferred Option for the RSS Phase 2 Revision. It is intended that the Preferred Option Draft Submission will be submitted to the WMRA Regional Planning Partnership (RPP) on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2007 for agreement, before it is submitted to the Secretary of State in December 2007.

In shaping the Preferred Option for the RSS Phase 2 Revision, WMRA is continuing to work in partnership with regional partners and communities. As part of the process of developing the Preferred Option, the WMRA held a Consultation Event on the 26<sup>th</sup> July to which all RSS Reference Groups and other stakeholder representative groups were invited.

The purpose of this event was to present the draft emerging policies, and allow the RSS Reference Groups and other stakeholder representative groups the opportunity to make an input into shaping the development of the Preferred Option.

WMRA would like to thank all participants for their contributions to the event. This report aims to summarise the discussion at the event. It is one of a suite of documents and pieces of information that will be used to inform the development of the Preferred Option.

Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the report including all figures and tables. However, WMRA cannot accept any responsibility for misrepresentations, omissions, errors or inaccuracies. The views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the WMRA.

## Format of the event

### Panel: Paul Watson (Chair), Rose Poulter and Dave Thew

9:30am	Registration and Refreshments on arrival
10.00am	Welcome (Paul Watson Panel Chair)
10.05am	'Where we are now' (David Thew)
10.20am	Study on Infrastructure Implications of the Preferred Option (Mott Macdonalds)

### Presentations & Questions

10.30am	Employment Land (Ian McLeod)
10:50am	Centres (Martin Eade)
11.10am	Transport and Accessibility (Danny Lamb)
11.30am	Waste (Bruce Braithwaite)
11:50pm	Housing (Ada Wells)
12:20pm	Cross Cutting Themes (Chris Blakeley)
12.40pm	Sustainability Appraisal & Habitat Regulation Assessment (URSUS)

### End of morning sessions

1.00 – 2.00pm Lunch

### Discussion Groups

2.00 – 3.15pm

**Housing** (Ada Wells to lead with Ron Hilton to Chair and Emma Kiteley to scribe)

**Employment/Centres** (Ian McLeod/Martin Eade with David Thew to Chair and Amanda Turner to scribe)

**Waste Management** (Bruce Braithwaite to lead with Adrian Cooper to Chair and Vicki Popplewell to scribe)

**Transport** (Danny Lamb to lead with Rose Poulter to Chair and Stefan Preuss to scribe)

3.15pm **Close of the event**

## **2 “Where we are now?”**

At the beginning of the workshop a presentation provided an overview of the process of Phase 2 Revision and the purpose and structure of the workshop event. A copy of this presentation is available on the WMRA website;  
<http://www.wmra.gov.uk/page.asp?id=345>

### 3 Study on Infrastructure Implications of the Preferred Option

David Bishop from Mott MacDonald gave a presentation on the Infrastructure Implications of the Preferred Option for Phase 2 of the RSS revision. A copy of the presentation is available on the WMRA website;

<http://www.wmra.gov.uk/page.asp?id=345>

The presentation was followed by a short questions and answers session which is summarised below.

Paul Watson referred to an email received from Kenswick & Wichenford Parish Council and the request that their comments be noted at the RSS event. The Parish Council wished to reiterate their response to the RSS Spatial Options, which suggested that Option 1 should be the only option to be considered in view of current infrastructure constraints. However, in light of the recent floods, the Parish Council stress that in their view housing proposals under Option 1 would have significant implications upon the area's infrastructure capacity.

- **Question Denise Craig (Federation of Small Businesses)**  
You stated that there were no anticipated "Showstoppers". What is a Showstopper?
- **Answer David Thew (WMRA)**  
A Showstopper is something that cannot be overcome and will have a significant impact on our ability to deliver revisions to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The study indicates that so long as we get appropriate planning and resources in place we should be able to deliver. This is not to say that there are not risks.
- **Question Peter Langley (West Midlands CPRE)**  
Financial resources are a key issue to the delivery of the Regional Spatial Strategy. As part of the study will Mott MacDonald cost the infrastructure requirements? If not, who will do this since this will be critical evidence for the Examination in Public.
- **Answer David Thew (WMRA)**  
The second stage of the study being prepared by GVA Grimleys will focus on this. The South East Region Implementation Plan provides a model "shopping list" for the sort of things we are moving towards in this Region.

## 4 Phase 2 Revision – The Emerging Draft Preferred Option – Draft Policies

The Consultation Event contained general presentations, giving an insight to the Emerging Draft Preferred Option from each of the policy areas. Copies of the presentations are available on the WMRA website.

Each presentation was followed by a brief question and answer session which are summarised below. More detailed discussion and related matters took place during the afternoon ‘Discussion Groups’ which are summarised below.

Employment Land Presentation - Ian MacLeod (Birmingham City Council)

- **Question Robin Richmond (Leamington Society)**  
Will the protection of Employment Land be to the detriment of land that is available for housing?
- **Answer Ian MacLeod (BCC)**  
It is a question of balancing these requirements – we will need to ensure that the requirements for both housing and employment land are satisfied, whilst also ensuring that we protect a good quality employment land supply. However, in doing so, we have to recognise – as a consequence of the economic restructuring that we are still undergoing - the different land requirements for employment now compared to when manufacturing was pre-eminent.
- **Question John Acres (Redrow Homes)**  
To what extent are you looking at working from home in order to reduce travel to work requirements?
- **Answer Ian MacLeod**  
We are including this as one of the potential models to help reduce travel to work requirements.
- **Question Mark Sullivan (West Midlands CPRE)**  
In your presentation you referred to two Regional Logistics Sites for which there will be a requirement for direct rail access. It is questionable how much rail access to current logistic sites are used – will not therefore the Regional Logistic Sites just create more heavy road traffic?
- **Answer Ian MacLeod**  
The Regional Logistics Study recognised that is a key growth factor for the Logistics industry and that there is scope for this within the Region. If we fail to provide for this then it will not be sustainable. The rail link at Hams Hall is well used and we need to provide operators that choice in order to ensure sustainable patterns of freight movement both now and in the future. At the Regional planning level we need to balance the regional imperative versus local considerations

## 5 Centres Presentation - Martin Eade (Birmingham City Council)

- **Question**  
In respect of the retail requirements will the Roger Tym Study be updated? Also are the RPB taking into account the Retail Studies being prepared by Local Authorities because sometimes these come out with different figures.
- **Answer Martin Eade (BCC)**  
The Roger Tym Study is being updated to incorporate new data. Also some of the assumptions made in that study (for example the impact of e-tailing) will be re-examined. There is a Regional Centres Group, which is a forum open to all Local Authorities and provides an opportunity for them to feed in their own Retail Studies for consideration.
- **Question David Smith (National Farmers Union)**  
Three key observations:
  - a) The emphasis on Centres – and moving everything into centres - will do nothing to help rural and farming communities;
  - b) Employers seek out of town office accommodation due to the ease of parking there (for staff and customers) in comparison to town centres;
  - c) Public transport in rural areas is non-existent.
- **Answer Martin Eade**
  - a) We need to emphasise the importance of centres policies outside of the strategic centres which will assist in ensuring the vitality of local centres;
  - b) The access to all centres figures strongly in our considerations. We need to transform centres in this respect to enable them to take as much development as possible. Whilst rural areas have some advantages, centres have a wider access to workforces and many sectors and companies like to be located close to similar businesses.
- **Answer David Thew ( WMRA)**
  - c) Both Urban Renaissance and Rural Renaissance are key to the RSS and are viewed as two sides of the same coin. We are undertaking a rural proofing of all of our policies as they develop. Phase 3 will pick up Rural services as a key theme and will address these concerns.
- **Question Ken Pollitt (Tamworth Planning Aid)**  
Policy PA13 refers to a Regional policy in respect of Casinos. In view of recent Government pronouncements on this issue is such a policy still required?
- **Answer Martin Eade**  
The policy scene is undeniably shifting. However, for the time being the Government Office for the West Midlands has advised that it would be sensible at this stage to retain this option.

## 6 Transport and Accessibility - Danny Lamb (West Midlands Regional Assembly)

- **Question Stephen Hill (Birmingham International Airport)**  
In your presentation you implied that that the car parking at Birmingham International was being identified for a Park and Ride role. This facility was originally identified as a Parkway facility. Can you reassure us that it is not intended to change the role of car parking at Birmingham International?
- **Answer Danny Lamb (WMRA)**  
Birmingham International and Warwick Parkway will continue to provide an opportunity for longer distance inter-regional travel.
- **Question Ben Smith (Architect)**  
When I was working in connection with the Frankley overspill in its early days a possible rail link at Holly Hill was identified. Is there anything in the pipeline which might bring this forward?
- **Answer Danny Lamb**  
Whilst looking at the housing numbers we will be looking at consequent transport needs. Any potential schemes identified will require appropriate evidence for progress to be made.
- **Question Mark Sullivan (West Midlands CPRE)**
  - a) Could you please clarify the relationship between the schemes contained in the RSS Policy T12, the Regional Funding Allocation and the DfT process.
  - b) You referred to the opportunities presented by changing the supporting text in the revised document. Does supporting text form part of the Strategy or is it just the policies contained therein?
- **Answer Danny Lamb**
  - a) Two years ago the Regions were asked by Government to provide advice on funding priorities in the themes of economy, housing and transport. For these purposes schemes of less than £5m were considered “local” and schemes of more than £100m were considered national. Through this process the West Midlands Region put forward a number of transport schemes of relevance to the implementation of the RES and RSS. All of these were reflected in Policy T12 due to the cost criteria previously described. It is also worth remembering that funding through Local Transport Plans does not refer solely to capital schemes but also revenue schemes to cover maintenance.
- **Answer David Thew (WMRA)**
  - b) My understanding is that the supporting text forms an integral part of the RSS and therefore has status.

## 7 Waste Presentation - Bruce Braithwaite (Staffordshire County Council)

- **Question Valerie Burton (MASA)**  
Expressed concern at the continuing rise in the amount of waste being generated and that nothing in the presentation seemed to refer to the reduction in the generation of waste. The RES refers to changing hearts and minds - where does the responsibility lie for changing waste generation patterns?
- **Answer Bruce Braithwaite(SCC)**  
We need to regard waste as a resource and concentrate on the expense of getting rid of waste and the economic potential of its reuse. The increases in the Landfill Tax will help in this regard. We are concerned not only with domestic waste but also waste from the workplace of which there is significantly more than that arising from the domestic situation.
- **Question Denise Craig (Federation of Small Businesses)**  
Waste is generated by communities, which includes small businesses. Whilst many in the community have access to free waste disposal this is not always the case for small businesses. Will this situation be reviewed?
- **Answer Bruce Braithwaite**  
An increasing number of local authority amenities permit use by small businesses overcoming this issue e.g. the Battlefield facility in Shrewsbury. We are also looking at ways that SMEs can recover value from waste creating potential business opportunities: this is especially importantly in rural communities.

## 8 Housing Presentation - Ada Wells (Staffordshire County Council)

- **Question** *Cllr Bodenham (South Shropshire DC)*  
What impact on the cost of providing affordable housing will recent Government announcements on Zero Carbon housing have? Concern that this would make housing even more expensive.
- **Answer** *Ada Wells (SCC)*  
We require urgent talks with the Housing Corporation on this issue, to assess the impact of these announcements on the volume of affordable housing that we will be able to deliver. The revision to the RSS under the Phase 2 process will include a policy on Sustainable Communities and Sustainable Construction. The Sustainable Construction Policy will set out requirements in relation to the development of carbon neutral homes. We may be able to look at lower thresholds for S106 Agreements to encourage a mix of housing type in rural housing developments.
- **Question** *Roger Stone (West Midlands Business Council and Vice Chair of Regional Planning Partnership)*  
The re-use of employment land sites for housing has the potential for stripping away the supply of employment land and premises. This is particularly the case with smaller sites that are suitable for SME development (a half of all employees work in SMEs). Are the Housing and Prosperity for All Policy Leads collaborating to ensure that whilst housing needs are satisfied employment/economic needs are not undermined?
- **Answer** *Ada Wells*  
Yes.
- **Question** *Peter Langley (West Midlands CPRE)*  
Logged a number of concerns:
  - a) CPRE disagree with the level of 19,000 new houses per annum (net) suggested to be implied by the most recent information coming out of Government. Suggested that we need a range of options overlaid by inherent risks to be brought forward.
  - b) RSS needs to demonstrate how balanced sustainable growth will be achieved;
  - c) Expressed concern re the use of targets in areas outside the MUAs (as opposed to the current maxima). These would, it was suggested, worsen overprovision in some areas (eg Warwickshire);
  - d) Phasing should be proposed at a District level.
  - e) Brownfield land targets should be identified at the strategic level in line with the existing RSS
  - f) The issue of densities is an important one. We should have a policy that discriminates MUA/Other Urban Areas/ Rural to support regional distinctiveness.
- **Answer** *Ada Wells*  
Noted.

- **Question Roland Bolton (DLP Planning)**
  - a) The PMs announcement implies that new homes need to be supplied at above trend levels. Within the Region should we therefore be supplying new homes at above or below trend?
  - b) Why are Housing Market Areas absent?
  
- **Answer Ada Wells**
  - a) No decision has yet been made in respect of the overall level of provision; however if a level of 19,000 were to be decided upon this would be higher than the current rate.
  - b) Housing Market Areas were devised as part of the Regional Housing Strategy to inform the provision of affordable/social housing. HMAs are geographically too big to be used in Draft Policy H3 (housing level and distribution) though they will be used elsewhere where appropriate.
  
- **Question Roger Tilley (Retirement Housing Group)**
  - a) Welcomed the greater recognition of the needs of older people in Draft Policy H9B. Will this be taken account of in the assessment of local need?
  - b) Policies recognising the requirements of older people need to be cross cutting. Will this happen?
  
- **Answer Ada Wells**
  - a) An assessment of local need will need to be determined at the local District level and through the LDF process.
  - b) This will be looked at.
  
- **Question Gary Woodman (Herefordshire & Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce)**

Will the AWM study on housing and the economy inform the Regional approach on home working and mixed development – or will it be considered a local issue?
  
- **Answer Ada Wells**

We will need to look for an appropriate mix of housing in development and uses. The RSS will need to provide a hook on which a policy can be applied at the local level.

- **Question** *Cllr Neil Roberts (Lichfield District Council)*  
The inclusion of windfalls is to be welcomed – within the West Midlands context their exclusion would be short-sighted and would put greenfield land unnecessarily at risk. We are therefore in conflict with Government on this issue. Can we afford to wait for the Examination in Public and risk the imposition of different numbers?
- **Answer** *Rose Poulter (West Midlands Regional Assembly)*  
Along with Government Office West Midlands we are keeping up the pressure on the Dept for Communities and Local Government and we will take a view nearer the EiP. The proportion of windfall housing built in the MUAs is currently of the order of 80% - therefore the use of windfall sites is of critical importance.  
  
*Answer Paul Watson (Deputy Chair WMRA Regional Advisors Group, Event Chair)*  
We have to assume it is part of the available supply – otherwise it will blow a hole in the RSS strategy.
- **Question** *George Goodall (Hampton in Arden Society)*  
The approach to housing provision seems to be based on predict and provide with no critical assessment of the underlying Government Household Projections. Is this the right approach to be taken? How will affordable houses be delivered?
- **Answer** *Ada Wells*  
Policy H8 will be exploring this in more detail together with Cambridge Study on Affordable Housing and, in particular, the deliverability aspects. However, Government Office for West Midlands has advised us that there is a gap in provision and that the Government is looking to shift a greater balance towards the social sector than at any time over the past 20 years.
- **Question** *Tamsin Hartley (RENEW North Staffordshire Pathfinder)*  
Welcomed the acknowledgement in the draft housing policies, which differentiated North Staffordshire from the rest of the MUA's and its housing market characteristics. In addition, it is hoped that in the latter part of the RSS period North Staffordshire would be in a position to accommodate increased growth to relieve the pressures faced elsewhere in the Region.
- **Answer** *Ada Wells*  
Noted.

## 9 Cross Cutting Themes Presentation - Chris Blakeley (West Midlands Regional Assembly)

- **Question** *Stephen Spencer (Ramblers Association)*  
There is no mention of how the strategy will contribute to encouraging a healthy lifestyle. How will this be developed?
- **Answer** *Chris Blakeley (WMRA)*  
The way that health is being handled is by ensuring better design that is walking and cycling friendly, access to green and open spaces to encourage healthy lifestyle choices to be made. The Regional Health Strategy is also aligned with the RSS.
- **Question** *Nick Williams (Black Country LA21)*  
The emphasis in the MUAs on landscape enhancement/design etc will require the availability of suitably trained workers, yet the LSC have recently removed funding for the only appropriate training course at a Black Country college.
- **Answer** *Rose Poulter (West Midlands Regional Assembly)*  
We were not aware of this and will discuss with the LSC.
- **Question** *Mike Kingham (Wildlife Trusts)*  
There is increasing evidence that climate change will pose a greater risk to wildlife. The need to enable wildlife movement is therefore that much greater. This offers the opportunity/challenge through the provision of green space to create better biodiversity. Are we moving towards a set of policies, which will contribute, to better biodiversity/movement of wildlife?
- **Answer** *Chris Blakeley*  
A qualified yes – to be dealt with within Phase 3 Revision process.

## 10 RSS Phase 2 Sustainability Appraisal & Habitats Regulation Assessment

URSUS Consulting Ltd gave a presentation on the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment for Phase 2 of the RSS revision. A copy of the presentation is available on the WMRA website;  
<http://www.wmra.gov.uk/page.asp?id=345>

The presentation was followed by a short question and answer session which is summarised below.

- **Question** *Alan Cutler (Black Country Geodiversity Partnership)*  
Is Geodiversity considered as part of the SA process?
- **Answer** *Anthony Wright (Ursus)*  
The SA Framework does briefly consider the issue however the wider awareness of the issue is poor – so if additional expertise is forthcoming this would be welcomed.

It is difficult to relate geodiversity to specific RSS sites, there is therefore potentially a need for stronger reference in Phase 3.

## Discussion Groups

Following the overview presentation, there was an opportunity for detailed discussion with Policy Leads for each of the Policy areas. The discussions at each of the groups is summarised below.

### 11 Housing Discussion Group

Comments made on 4th Draft of Housing Chapter:

Top Table: Ron Hilton (Chair)  
Ada Wells RSS Policy Lead Housing

Policy H1: Housing within the Urban Areas:

- How will the policies deliver Urban and Rural Renaissance? Housing figures appear to be low in the MUAs, also figures for demolitions have now been excluded, they were implicit and are now explicit. The numbers appear to conflict with the principles in the current RSS. AW responded that final decisions have yet to be made; the balance between development in MUAs and non-MUAs is still being worked on.
- How much Brownfield land still available across MUAs? There does not appear to be a full picture regarding land availability. Need to be accurate about this before we can decide how much growth should be accommodated in non-MUAs – AW responded that Urban Land Capacity Study was currently being refreshed but work undertaken by the Mets themselves was coming out at approximately the Option 2 level.
- What figures are being used for occupancy rate? Several different ones seem to have been referred to - AW responded that occupancy rates were declining rapidly across the WM Region and a rate of 2.1 was to be used
- Proposed 44,000 housing growth for Coventry appears high and disproportionate when considering population was forecast to increase by 50,000. Concerns particularly related to preservation of the Green Belt and exacerbating an already imbalanced socio-economic mix (3% of Coventry houses being in the top council tax band compared with 10% nationally) – AW responded the proposed housing growth in Coventry was partly to accommodate regional population growth. Occupancy rates would depend on a number of factors including the mix of house sizes and an ageing population. AW also explained that there was no relationship between the 50,000 figure and the 44,000 figure.
- Query re: Policy H1 B and discrepancy with para 6.11 - AW explained that RENEW North Staffordshire have identified priority areas for development in core urban areas, restricting more peripheral development. Suggested text insert – “A review part way through the RSS will determine how RENEW is delivering”.

- Concern was addressed regarding the density of new house building - AW responded that consideration would be given to the emerging issue of development in land that was previously gardens. RH responded that local authorities in their Development Planning Documents the need to retain the quality of development
- Issue of PPS3 changing the character of parts of the Region. What impact will release of MoD land have on RSS? Surely WM Region needs to be aware of scale of land being made available before land is identified outside of MUAs? AW responded that the RPB did not have any details of MoDs plans for land release at this time (nothing available on English Partnerships website). Possible New Policy – Policy of retaining the character of an area.

### Policy H2: Housing beyond MUAs

- What was rationale behind the introduction of a larger number of settlements (9 compared to 5 Sub-Foci) and what will be the implications on housing distribution? – AW responded that growth capacity across Foci's in existing RSS varied widely in scale but the 9 Strategic Settlements identified would all be expected to accommodate significant development. AW highlighted that the list may change.

### Policy H3: Level and Distribution of New Housing Developments

- What process has been undertaken regarding the distribution of numbers? AW responded – distribution is based on past trends, household projections and existing RSS principles
- Opportunities / issues presented by cross-border working, particularly with East Midlands needs to feature, i.e. the issue of potential developments in cross-border districts. RH responded stating that the East Midlands have raised cross-borders as an issue for them also and that both regions are working together on this.

### Policy H8: Delivering Affordable Housing

- Has consideration been given to the possibility that any reduction in thresholds on smaller sites / in small towns will have a negative effect on Windfall sites? - AW responded – no as they tend to be high value, another option is contributing to a funding pot, i.e. use of Planning Gain Supplement rather than Section 106.
- It was reported that rural districts were finding it difficult to identify potential sites for affordable housing.

General comments:

- It was noted that there was no explicit reference to the Greenbelt, especially as Government has issued a recent statement that it did not expect to see any reduction in the size of the Greenbelt. It was suggested that there was a need for a RSS Green Belt policy to be consistent with national policy – RH responded that the housing figures would need to be firmed up before the effect on Greenbelt could be estimated. AW responded that Greenbelt may need to be considered in the Sub-Regional chapter of RSS.
- Given the level of build proposed in MUAs, how can the RSS ensure greenspace and biodiversity is not compromised? AW acknowledged that this is an issue and policies in the Sustainable Communities Chapter would seek to address this.
- Concern was expressed that Option 2 was still being considered, despite the Government's clear message of the need to provide homes for all and to meet the household projections (the 2006 projections being higher than 2004). Suggestion that a more positive approach to Planning by WM Region was needed generally – particularly lifting of the imposed moratoriums across many of the Districts.
- It was suggested that there was a need to make greater reference to Eco-towns as currently only mentioned briefly and why no reference was to Urban Extensions, whilst also considering rural towns and hinterland sites. AW responded that WMRA were currently in discussions with local authorities regarding the levels of growth achievable.
- It was asked whether Low Cost Market Housing had been considered. AW responded that low cost housing was considered generally in policies H1 to H8 but recognised that there may be a need to consider issues related to caravan sites.
- There was a need to make greater use of Rural Exception Sites on edges of MUAs, which would assist in taking pressure off smaller settlements
- Defence Estates highlighted the potential need to consider house approximately 1,500 – 2,000 repatriated military personnel from Germany within the Region. RH responded that he was in discussions with Defence Estates about this issue. AW welcomed further information on this from workshop attendees
- Noted that there was little reference to Growth Points bids in draft. AW responded that New Growth Points bids had been taken into account in the housing figures.
- Vacancy rates – surely with demand being so high, RSS should lower existing vacancy rates? There is no evidence that newly built homes are quickly occupied, don't plan for empty homes.

- Why no reference to New Settlements in draft – Stratford are talking about this, so should feature in Revision? AW responded there is no reference as they are not part of current RSS.
- Phasing issues – what level will monitoring go down to? AW responded that discussions regarding this were still being had, one possibility is that phasing could be done at the Strategic Planning Authority level. AW commented on the need for frontloading of development to 2016 in the Major Urban Areas.
- Little reference made to community / leisure facilities – inevitable that many of these will be lost in drive to accommodate growth but important to development of sustainable communities and need for them to be protected by RSS. AW responded that text will be included within a Sustainable Communities Policy.
- Query as to whether Low Cost Home Ownership (LCHO) is included? – AW clarified that the PPS3 definition of affordable housing does not include LCHO.
- Infrastructure is key to delivering the housing policies within the RSS.
- Inconsistency of Government message was highlighted in that “existing plans will continue” whilst councils will be given a new role in house building.

## 12 Employment/Centres Discussion Group

Comments made:

Top Table: David Thew (Chair)  
Ian McLeod Employment  
Martin Eade RSS Policy Lead Centres

### Loss of Employment Land

- PA6B as a separate policy was generally welcomed but it could need strengthening in places.
- There was a lot of concern about the threat to employment land and premises from the increased housing growth. The loss of job opportunities in the SME sector was highlighted as a particular issue. It was also stressed that some lower quality employment land plays a very important role in local economies and this was particularly vulnerable.
- The term 'regularly review' in PA6B was queried, there is a need for clarification.
- A cross reference from paragraphs 6.27/6.29 in the housing policies is needed to PA6B.
- It was accepted that not all employment land needs to be retained, there were some cases where very low quality employment land should go to other uses.
- There should be a carefully managed process of change with regards the loss of employment land, the pace of loss and spatially where this takes place is very important. This should be reflected in policy. Core strategies and joint core strategies play an important role in managing the change.
- Employment land reviews in LDFs are very important in this process and the RSS policy seeks to encourage local planning authorities to undertake them. This is where the case for retention of sites can be set out.
- Local authorities need to be clear about which sites are important to their economy, it is these sites that should be retained. This issue should be strengthened in the RSS policy.

### Employment Land Numbers

- It was highlighted in North Warwickshire that the employment land allocation figures might be low because of the RLS site in the district. There was concern that this would stifle local economic prosperity. WMRA clarified that regionally significant sites would be excluded from the employment land figures, local needs would be provided for.
- Opportunities to promote and encourage SMEs should be promoted in the RSS.

### Mixed Uses

- Mixed uses, particularly in town locations need to be encouraged. Out of town business sites have their place but providing employment opportunities in and on the edge of centres is also important.
- A policy statement encouraging mixed uses should be included in the RSS. PPS4 when it is released may contain more guidance.
- Employment use integrated into park and ride sites should be considered.

### Logistics

- A suggestion was made to promote 10-15 hectare sub-regional logistics sites rather than large RLS in the RSS. These could be provided in the MUAs, eliminating the need for large scale development in the shire areas. There are issues over rail links though, these smaller sites would not have a critical mass to justify a rail connection.
- It was commented that the RLS policy has not gone far enough and should identify broad locations so that there is certainty for developers. WMRA clarified that broad locations are to be included.
- The wording in the policy on the number of hectares to be provided needs firming up, i.e. “between 150 and 300 hectares could be required” is too loose.
- There was a query over whether cross regional discussions regarding RLS provision had taken place (e.g. with East Midlands). This is currently being progressed by the WMRA.

### Regional Investment Sites

- It was questioned why different wording was used within parts D, F and G of the policy. D uses the word ‘should’, F uses ‘will’ and G uses ‘may’. It was agreed that a closer link between G and I should be made for clarification because G is subject to I.

- Sub-section I. It is not clear in the policy who the decision maker is when the issue of new provision is investigated. Who makes the final decision as to whether a new site is allocated? Is it the sub-regional group, the RPB or who? It was suggested that new allocations should be brought through the WMELAG group then endorsed by the RPB through the Regional Planning Partnership. Any proposals would also go through the RPB conformity process when allocated in an LDF.
- It was queried whether the policy should specifically refer to sub-regional studies when considering extra RIS provision. It was felt that this was too rigid/formal – this may imply the need for large scale very detailed studies which in some cases may not be necessary.
- Sub-section I may require some clarity in relation to the above issues.
- The point was made that the policy does not recognise rural regeneration zones. Might there be a case for an RIS in a rural regeneration zone? This was not considered to be appropriate by some other members of the discussion group.

#### Regional Economic Strategy Links

- It was stated that the RSS should be reflective of the RES and vice versa. The timetables for the production of both allow this to happen.
- Up-skilling of the population is essential. The RSS spatial policies should bring forward opportunities for up-skilling the indigenous population. For example, we should not automatically be putting low-skilled employment uses in low skilled areas, rather we should be encouraging high-skilled employment uses in these towns or villages.
- The employment land numbers that are developed should be reflective of the RES.
- The importance of manufacturing in the economy and associated spatial implications should not be forgotten in the RSS.

#### Clusters

- The cluster policy is still important and should remain. However, clusters are wider than just higher education and research and the policy should reflect this.

## CENTRES

### Definitions

- The term 'centres' should be defined/clarified throughout the policies. 'Centres' probably has a different definition for retail and offices, it is probably more relaxed for offices.
- The policies should explain as to why edge/out of centre is not acceptable. The reason is due to accessibility issues etc.

### Casinos

- It was questioned whether a casinos policy was really necessary in the RSS because of the social consequences of such a development and the fact that the Government is not going ahead with regional casinos at present.

### Network of Town and City Centres

- There was some concern about the level of growth in non-strategic centres. These centres need investment and need to be allowed to flourish. The categorisation of strategic and non-strategic centres in the policy could stifle the development of non-strategic centres.
- WMRA responded that strategic centres need to be defined to ensure that major investment of retail and offices are in areas of good accessibility. However, there is an issue over the need to balance the level of control in non-strategic centres so that strategic centres gain investment with the need to allow local centres to prosper. This is a difficult issue.
- The 10,000 square metre threshold in policy PA11B in relation to retail development needs to be clarified – it is not a maximum.
- There is some concern over the use of tiers and their purpose. There needs to be flexibility in the hierarchy of tiers – centres should be allowed to grow and move up tiers. The tiers imply rigidity when the network is constantly changing.
- The issue of European funding was raised. Would grant money just be directed toward the strategic centres, with the lower order centres losing out? It was felt by other members of the workshop that the lower order centres would still continue to benefit and that the policy would not be prohibitive for the receipt of funding.
- It was pointed out that the tiers are inconsistent with the Black Country Study which sees all 4 Black Country centres as equal.

### Out of Centre Office Development

- The physical constraint on the potential for in-centre office developments was raised. The region must not lose out from potential investment because of capacity issues in-centre. There is a need for out of centre development. Areas of investment such as Birmingham Business Park should be supported, there is a wider economic regeneration knock-on effect which should not be stifled.
- The criteria based approach is supported in PA13B but it could be expanded to take account of wider regeneration/economic benefits that the out of centre development might deliver.
- The conditioning element of the policy was discussed. The reason for this was to control B1(a) out of centre office developments. There have been issues in the past whereby outline consents for mixed B1, B2 and B8 have been granted and this has resulted in large scale B1(a) development.

## 13 Waste Management Discussion Group

Comments made Draft Waste Policies:

Top Table: Adrian Cooper (Chair)  
Bruce Braithwaite RSS Policy Lead Centres

### Waste policy: W1

The Group discussed the overall requirement that Waste should be considered as a resource and therefore the need to determine what the best end use for waste materials.

In relation to the proposed policy W1 the following points were suggested:

- It was accepted that Waste should be regarded as a resource
- The policy should be revised to acknowledge the treatment of waste in the area where it is generated.
- Discussions need to be continued with the Environment Agency to amend the Environment Agency's protocols in relation to when waste ceases to be "Waste" and with regard to the "exemptions" to the requirements for Waste Management Licences.
- The Group supported the view that polices should not be too locationally and technologically specific and that this should be left to the market to determine.
- Lessons from the experience of the South East RSS should be taken on board when determine the location for facilities to manage priority waste streams and the policy should instead be based upon particular materials.
- It was agreed that the policy should indicate a hierarchy of settlements where facilities should be located to in line with the spatial priorities of the emerging Preferred Option.
- The policy needs to identify greater incentives for recycling by making it easier for residential and businesses to recycle their waste
- It was acknowledged that the Black County should be specified as a location for the treatment of contaminated soil. However, it should not be ruled out that a third regional facility for the treatment of hazardous waste might be required.

### Waste Policy: W3 – no comments

Waste Policy: W6

- This policy relates to non-urban and land outside the towns. The most likely uses for such land are facilities for recycling, windrow composting, and the re-use of agricultural buildings. It was suggested that land in the Green Belt should be considered where there are no other suitable alternative sites available – this will be at the discretion of the LPA and the applicant will need to demonstrate that there are no alternative sites available.
- It was suggested that the RSS polices should provide more guidance on what might be considered to be a use suitable for open land and that the justification for this would need to be provided in the supporting text.
- The wording within this policy will need to be checked to ensure that the policy is appropriately interpreted. Need to differentiate between facilities that should be promoted on open land and those within Green Belt.
- It was requested that the final bullet point under Policy W6 includes a reference to Geodiversity.

Waste Policy: W12

- Whilst the policy needs to acknowledge that the geology has to be suitable for landfill it should also be conserving the geological value of the site for the future.

## 14 Transport Discussion Group

Comments made:

Top Table: Rose Poulter (Chair)  
Danny Lamb Transport

### Strategic Park and Ride

- The question was asked how much detail RSS policy on Strategic Park and Ride (SPR) should contain. Some participants argued that it would be beneficial for the RSS to specify the purpose of SPR facilities (e.g. to cater for commuters, shoppers, tourists or other users) and make recommendations as regards opening hours (e.g. 7 days a week, including early mornings and late evenings to facilitate use of SPR for various purposes). Participants were informed that the main purpose of SPR is to address longer distance commuting. It was the intention to focus on defining criteria for the location of SPR, while issues such as controlling the use of SPR and opening hours were down to the operation level.
- It was suggested that the RSS should not only specify locations for SPR but also mention any constraints/conditions that would come with the creation of SPR in those locations (e.g. as regards Worcester Parkway mention capacity constraints on existing single line track and obstacle created by River Severn).
- SPR policy should contribute to the overall RTS objective of reducing journeys by private car. SPR should be 'transport hubs' which are not just targeted at commuters but allow interconnection between services/modes of transport. SPR should also make sufficient provision for bicycle access.
- The question was asked why the revision focused on SPR and did not include local Park and Ride. It was explained that the existing RTS already includes a policy on local Park and Ride which will remain in place.
- In developing policy on SPR, in particular as regards the identification of new locations, consideration needed to be given to possible effects on existing rail services and stations (e.g. to avoid that rail services are reduced at existing stations).
- It was argued that the creation of SPR at some of the existing railway stations may require the use of greenfield land.
- New rail franchises should be taken into account in designating locations/setting criteria for SPR.
- Various possible locations for SPR were suggested by participants, including Burton upon Trent and Rugby (due to their proposed/existing role as sub-regional foci). On the other hand, it was argued that in the case of Burton upon Trent SPR may encourage out-commuting into the Major Urban Areas which should be avoided.

- It was pointed out that SPR can be a useful measure to facilitate a shift from using the private car to using public transport. However, SPR can also have an impact on the trunk road network in the area (e.g. Birmingham International/NEC).

### Car parking standards

- Different views were expressed in relation to car parking standards. Participants were informed that many local authorities and businesses seem to be opposed to car parking standards in the RSS, while central government wants the RSS to set such standards. One of the reasons for having car parking standards in the RSS is to avoid unnecessary competition between shopping areas.
- Small businesses are afraid that they would be adversely affected by car parking standards and argued that tighter standards should be set for new developments to protect existing businesses.

### Airports

- Several participants felt that the aim of achieving a 25% minimum modal share by public transport at Birmingham International Airport was too modest. The RSS should set a more stretching target (50 % modal share was suggested) and also indicate by when the target is to be achieved. On the other hand, business interests argued that the RSS should not set targets which place airports in the West Midlands at a competitive disadvantage. Participants were informed that the target that is currently proposed stems from the Air Transport White Paper.
- In relation to the production of Masterplans the question was asked why Cosford and Wolverhampton Business Airport would only be referred to in the supporting text and not in policy. Participants were informed that this was because those two airports fall below a threshold set by government. However, officers would like to see Masterplans for all airports and therefore reference would be made in the supporting text.
- A representative of Coventry airport argued that expansion of the airport should not be restricted to facilitate regeneration and job creation alongside housing growth.

### Demand management

- Some participants argued that RSS policy on demand management should be more specific/detailed, e.g. provide more detail about the purpose and benefit of demand management (such as reducing private car journeys, improving public transport, cycling and walking on the road network).

### Policy T12 – Priorities for Investment

- There was broad support for the proposal to revise Policy T12 as part of Phase 2.
- Several participants argued that it was essential to specify the infrastructure that is required to support the level of growth arising from the proposals for housing, employment, transport etc. coming out of Phase 2. These infrastructure requirements should be specified in the RSS, potentially in Policy T12.
- The Highways Agency is currently modelling the potential effects of growth arising from the Phase 2 Revision on the trunk road network. This work is expected to show 'hotspots'/areas where improvements would be required to cope with growth (e.g. access onto motorways). This work should inform the priorities set in Policy T12.
- It was argued that schemes should not be treated in isolation (which, in the view of some, T12 may suggest) but that some schemes were interdependent. Therefore a 'package approach' should be adopted.

### Cross-cutting/other issues

- It is important to build some degree of flexibility into the RSS so that the strategy can be adapted to changing circumstances such as potential changes in patterns of behaviour in the light climate change. Participants were reassured that this would be achieved through the monitoring and review process.
- The question was asked whether the transport chapter was still up-to-date or whether the whole chapter needed to be revised, in particular as regards the way in which it addresses the challenges arising from climate change. Potential contradictions between Government policy on airports and the national and regional desire to address climate change were pointed out.
- It was queried what the RSS revision will say about freight and logistics uses on smaller sites. Participants were informed that the existing freight policy in the RTS is not being revised and that the Regional Freight Strategy exists as a sister document to the RSS. It may be appropriate to add reference to the Regional Freight Strategy into the revised RSS.

## 15 List of Participants<sup>1</sup>

Jonathan	Abbott	David Lock Associates
John	Acres	Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd
Elizabeth	Allison	Sutton Coldfield Civic Society
Lucy	Allwood	English Partnerships
Paul	Ansell	Lichfield DC
Richard	Bailey	Drivers Jonas
Kate	Bailey	Worcester City Council
Fred	Barnfield	Friends of West Brom Library
Heather	Barrett	Worcester Civic Society
C	Bateman	Lickey End Parish Council
Anna	Bave	First City Limited
Adrian	Becker	Worcester City Council
Adrian	Bedford-Smith	Chartered Architect & Chartered Town Planner
Lynne	Beighton	LTB Consultancy Ltd
Mike	Best	Turley Associates
Claude	Bodenham	
Roland G	Bolton	DLP Planning Ltd
Davina	Bowe	on behalf of Taylor Woodrow Developments & BAE Systems
Jo	Bozdoganli	Sandwell MBC
J	Bradley	
Bruce	Braithwaite	Staffordshire CC
Arthur	Brown	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
Tim	Brown	Dudley MBC
John	Buckley	Worcestershire County Council
Paul	Bullock	Trine Ltd
Valerie	Burton	West Midlands Amenity Societies Association
Mike	Bushell	Black Country Chamber and Business Link
John	Cairns	Worcestershire County Council
Leonard	Cardwell	Atkins
Mark	Chant	Northamptonshire County Council - Planning Policy
Alexandra	Chidgey	Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Gary	Clarke	Zenith Development Partnership
Sharon	Clayton	Lawley and Overdale Parish Council
Stephen	Clee	
John	Coleman	William Davis Ltd
Brian	Coleman	
Gill	Collin	Wychavon District Council
Paul	Collings	South Staffordshire Council

Sarah	Conlan	Crest Strategic Projects Limited
Jane	Cook	North Staffordshire Chamber
Roger	Cook	
Jack	Cookson	
Adrian	Cooper	Shropshire CC
A H	Crookes	Lichfield Civic Society
Jim	Currin	Churches Together in England
Alan	Cutler	The Black Country Geodiversity Partnership
Alwyn E	Davies	The Cobbins
Brian	Davies	Rugby Inter Faith Forum
Rachel	Davis	
Gerry	Dawson	Urban Living Birmingham Sandwell Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder
John	De Kanter	InStaffs (UK) Limited
David	Deanshaw	Balsall Common Village Residents Association
Nick	Diment	CBRE CB Richard Ellis Limited/on behalf of The Crown Estate
Mike	Dittman	North Warwickshire Borough Council
Brian	Dobinson	
Jean	Dowty	Wychavon District Council
Nick	Duckworth	Hallam Land Management Ltd
Mike	Dunphy	Bromsgrove District Council
Alan	Dutton	
Les	Dyble	Staffordshire Police
Mr	E.T & Mr R Price	
Graham	Edwards	Birmingham & North Solihull Regeneration Zone
Karen	Elliott	West Coast Energy Ltd
Trevor	Errington	Coventry City Council
Bob	Evans	The Pritchard Group
Liz	Eyre	Worcestershire County Council
Patricia	Fairclough	Shropshire Association of Local Councils
Kelly	Ford	Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council
Ken	Forrest	West Midlands Planning Aid
Julia	Foster	David Lock Associates
Richard	Foxon	Strutt & Parker
Peter	Frampton	Framptons
David	Francis	South Shropshire District Council
Paul	Fullwood	Passenger Focus
Ros	Gallagher	Keele University
Simon	Geraghty	Worcester City Council
Clive	Gibbins	Lichfield District Council
George R	Goodall	Hampton-in-Arden Society

J A	Gosling	Ludlow Civic Society
Richard	Gough	Gough Planning Services on behalf of Revelan Group
Nigel	Gough	Bigwood Chartered Surveyors
Susan	Green	Deeley Homes
Philip	Gretton	Worcestershire County Council
Colin	Griffiths	Satnam Investments Ltd
Sue	Griffiths-Jones	Royal Town Planning Institute, West Midlands Region
Gillian	Griggs	GVA Grimley LLP on Behalf of Kilbride Properties Limited
Sarah	Hamilton-Foyn	Gloucestershire County Council
Nigel	Hancock	Owen Williams (part of Amey plc)
Neil	Hansen	Highways Agency
Nick	Hardy	GVA Grimley
Paul	Harris	Clent Parish Council
K	Hartley	Turley Associates: on behalf of Scottish Windows Investment Partnership
Tamsin	Hartley	Audit Commission - Housing Markets Team
K	Hartley	Turley Associates: on behalf of Pro Logis Development
Barbara	Hayes	Churches Industrial Group Birmingham
Chris	Haynes	Birmingham City Council
Stuart	Haywood	Droitwich Spa Town Council
Susan	Healy	
Andrew	Heasley	Audrey House
Christine	Hemmings	Central Shires British Waterways
Bill	Heslegrave	Forestry Commission
John	Hobbs	Worcestershire County Council
Mike	Hodder	Council for British Archaeology, West Midlands
Doug	Hodkinson	Warwickshire Association of Local Councils
Robert	Holdcroft	
Sam	Holder	Advantage West Midlands
James	Hollyman	Harris Lamb Limited
Ben	Holmes	
Simon	Holt	Npower Renewables Ltd
Darren	Hood	HLL Humberts Leisure
Daniel	Horgan	
David	Howatson	Government Office for the West Midlands
Ken	Humpheys	Burntwood Town Council
Steve	Hunt	Gleeson Strategic Land
Ruth	Hytch	Cannock Chase AONB Unit
Joanna	Illingworth	Kenilworth Society

Mark	Jackson	Donaldsons LLP on behalf of Multi Development
Victoria	Johnson	British Waterways
Carol	Johnson	West Midlands Rural Affairs Forum
Alisdair	Jones	Stoneleigh Planning - on behalf George Wimpy Ltd
Philip	Jones	Worcestershire Industrial Mission
Laurence	Jones	Saint - Gobain
G	Jones	Development and Regeneration
Mark	Jones	Applestone Premier Homes Ltd
Garry	Jones	Tamworth Council for Voluntary Service
Matthew	Jones	Drivers Jonas on Behalf of The Birmingham Alliance
Jo	Jones	
David	Joseph	Bloor Homes
Derek	Keatley	Phillips Planning Services
Steven	Keeley	Centro
David	Keene	David Lock Associates on Behalf of Rugby Radio Station Limited Partnership
Stephen	Kelly	Freight Transport Association
Eric	Kelsall	University Secretary's Office
Richard	Kenny	Birmingham Strategic Partnership
Carmel	Kerr	West Midlands Regional Assembly
David	Keyse	Gallagher Estates Ltd
Richard	King	Lichfield DC
Mike	Kinghan	West Midlands Wildlife Trusts
Jon	Kirby	GVA Grimley LLP
John	Knight	Church Aston Parish Council
Alison	Knight	Sandwell MBC
Mike	Lambden	National Express Ltd
Glen	Langham	NAI Fuller Peiser
Peter	Langley	CPRE West Midlands
Liz	Larkin	National Housing Federation
Don	Lawley	
Peter	Lea	Balsall Parish Council
Mark	Limbrick	Defense Estates Operations North
Steve	Loh	Birmingham City Council
N H	Lorentzen	
Tony	Lovett	Staffordshire County Council
Peter	Luff	
Robin	Lunn	
Sue	Manns	Arup
Chris	May	Pegasus Planning Group
Nathan	McLoughlin	CGMS Consulting: on behalf of CgMs Client Group

Anna	Miller	Tamworth Brough Council
Michael	Minihane	
Alison	Mitchell	Newcastle-under-Lyme BC
Steve	Mitchell	Veolia ES Birmingham Limited
Tim	Morris	Oswestry Borough Council
Andy	Mortimer	Shropshire County Council - Sustainability Group
T	Munslow	
Simon	Murphy	
Carol	Muston	RPS
Tim	Myers	
Pam	Neal	Warwickshire CC
Robert	Newton	Planning Division
David	Nicholas	DJN Consulting Ltd
Douglas	Norris	
Chris	Orphanou	Coventry Airport
Ed	Osborn	Bentley Homes
Daniel	Osborne	Drivers Jonas
AD	Owen	Rubery Owen Holdings Ltd
Mike	Parker	Wyre Forest District Council
Amanda	Patterson	The Environment Agency
Judith	Pearce	Wychavon DC
Alan John	Perkins	Grimaud
Emma	Pierce-Jenkins	Telford & Wrekin Council
Christopher	Pincher	Tamworth Conservative Association
Juliette	Porter	
Wendy	Powell	Accord Housing Association
S	Price	South Shropshire District Council
Tony	Price	South Staffordshire Housing Association
	Price	
Helen	Pugh	South Shropshire Housing Association
Brian	Rance	University of Central England
Michael	Rees	Boyer Planning
Amanda	Reid	Homezone Housing Limited
Graham	Rhodes	University of Central England
GR	Richards	FSB Coventry Branch
Robin	Richmond	The Leamington Society
Catriona	Riddell	South East England Regional Assembly
Linda	Ridgley	Warwickshire Rural Community Council
James	Roberts	Tamworth BC
Neil	Roberts	Lichfield DC

Rex	Roberts, OBE	
Charles	Robinson	CDS Development Services Ltd
Peter S	Roe	Hallow Parish Council / Whittington Parish Council
Miranda	Rogers	Stansgate Planning Consultants
Mark	Rose	David Lovejoy Ltd/on behalf of Ciel Properties Ltd
Joanne	Russell	Home Builders Federation
Mark	Sackett	RPS Planning
Stuart	Sage	Turley Associates
Claire	Sansom	Staffordshire Moorlands LSP
Mike	Scott	North Shropshire DC
E	Sheldon	Worcestershire County Council
John	Shephard	J & J DESIGN, Town Planning & Building Design Consultants
Colin	Silver	
Dave	Simpson	Solihull MBC
Antoinette	Smallman	Learning and Skills Council
D H	Smith	National Farmers Union
Amanda	Smith	English Heritage (West Midlands Region)
Mike	Smith	Regeneration Strategy - Walsall MBC
Stephen	Spencer	Ramblers Association Staffs area
Jonathon	Stackhouse	Metropolitan Estates
Colin	Staves	Stratford on Avon District Council
Bob	Stevens	
Roger	Stone	
Tim	Sunter	Brierley Hill Regeneration Partnership
Paul	Sutton	South Shropshire Housing Association
Geoffrey	Symes	Kenilworth Town Council
Sue	Taft	Brandwood West Neighbourhood Forum
Kate	Tait	Persimmon plc
Peter	Talbot	Howkins & Harrison LLP
Trevor	Tarran	Bridgnorth DC
Peter	Tetley	
Ian	Thompson	Stafford Borough Council
Michael	Thompson	Arup
Roger	Tilley	Tanner & Tilley Chartered Town Planners & Development Consultants
Samantha	Turner	North West Regional Assembly
Ray	Vanstone	Tamworth BC
Ian	Waddle	Ian Waddell and Associates
Mark	Waite	Countryside Properties
Azim	Walimia	George Wimpey Strategic Land

Deborah	Walsh	RICS
Kate	Warburton	The National Trust
Alan	Watts	Walsall Housing Group
Katie	Webb	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
Maurice	Wedd	
Heather	Wersocki	
Simon	West	Forestry Commission
Neil	Westwick	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners/on behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd
Peter	Wheelen	Wolverhampton Airport Action Group
A G	White	Central Technology Belt Birmingham & Worcester
Nicholas	Wilding	
Nick	Williams	Dudley MBC - Biodiversity Working Group
Paul	Williams	National Housing Federation
Mark	Williets	Advantage West Midlands
John	Willis	Allesley & Coundon Wedge Conservation Society
Gary	Woodham	Chamber of Commerce Herefordshire & Worcestershire
Jane	Worsey	Higham & Co
Ian	York	Terence O'Rourke
Nick	Young	Natural England
Peter	Young	Lichfield City Council

<sup>1</sup> All RSS Reference Groups and other stakeholder representative groups were invited to the event and this list contains those who confirmed their attendance/attended the event. Every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the list. However, WMRA cannot accept any responsibility for omissions, errors or inaccuracies