

**Matter 1**

**Statement on behalf of  
West Midlands Planning & Transportation Sub-Committee**

**i) The phased revision programme**

**Will the revisions in Phase 2 result in a coherent and internally consistent RSS?**

**What is the relationship between Phase 2 and the changes made by the Phase 1 revision: do the Phase 2 revisions entail further changes to the regeneration strategy for the Black Country (including policies UR1A, B, C and D) adopted since the Phase 2 submission was made?**

**Does the Phase 2 revision provide sufficient guidance on the issues and policies that will be covered in the Phase 3, pending the completion of the Phase 3 revision?**

1. On procedural grounds we concur with the views submitted by WMRA (400) and the Black Country Consortium (441), which seek to ensure that the Phase One Revision is effectively enshrined within the Phase Two Revision so as to provide a coherent document.
2. Our fundamental point, however, is to ensure that the 'golden thread' of urban renaissance, as established in the adopted RSS, is maintained through the phased revision process.
3. In publishing the adopted RSS in 2004 the Secretary of State made it very clear that it represented a 'fundamental change of direction' and that there was no need for a further review in the short to medium term. Paragraphs 3.1, 3.2, 3.16 and 10.14 are especially pertinent in this respect.
4. In order to provide the Panel and other participants with the requisite clarity at the outset of this EiP, we have prepared a background paper entitled: Urban Renaissance in the West Midlands: Origins, Progress and Future Prospects (core document to be added to the library). We will refer to this document repeatedly through our submissions.
5. This sets out in some detail the origins of the urban renaissance strategy, progress made thus far and why it is imperative that it is maintained through the phased revision process. The phased revision process is not appropriate for a review of the fundamental RSS principles. If necessary this would be more appropriately undertaken through the future preparation of the Single Integrated Regional Strategy.

ii) **Inter-regional/national issues**

Is the RSS, as proposed to be revised, consistent with RSS for neighbouring regions, and are there strategic inter-regional issues that need to be addressed? (Local or sub-regional cross boundary issues will be considered in Matter 8).

Does the Phase 2 revision take sufficient account of impacts in neighbouring regions and in Wales, specifically to do with river systems and water supply?

6. These issues are adequately covered by representations made by WMRA and the Black Country Consortium.

iii) **Procedural soundness in relation to SA and HRA**

Have the requirements for SA and HRA been adequately met and are they properly reflected in the content of the Phase 2 revision?

In the light of the material considered at the seminar session on 18 March 2009 is there a need for changes to the Phase 2 revision or further assessment work?

7. We support the submissions made by WMRA.

Simon Rowberry, CEPOG Support Team (0121) 214 7327  
[simonrowberry@centro.org.uk](mailto:simonrowberry@centro.org.uk)

Andy Donnelly, CEPOG Support Team (0121) 214 7338  
[andrewdonnelly@centro.org.uk](mailto:andrewdonnelly@centro.org.uk)

Sarah James, CEPOG Support Team (0121) 214 7908  
[sarahjames@centro.org.uk](mailto:sarahjames@centro.org.uk)