

Cabinet – 3rd February 2016

Walsall's Local Plan – Consultation

- Site Allocation Document (SAD) Publication**
- Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) Publication; and**
- Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.**

Portfolio: Councillor Adrian Andrew,
Deputy Leader and
Portfolio Holder Economy, Infrastructure and Development

Related portfolios: All

Service: Regeneration and Development

Wards: All

Key decision: No

Forward plan: No

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report seeks approval to consult on the 'Publication' drafts of the Site Allocation Document and Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan, as well as the draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule.
- 1.2 The Black Country Core Strategy ('Core Strategy') provides a broad strategy for the Black Country, but Walsall and the other individual authorities need to allocate sites for investment, to promote improvements and to have policies to protect the environment if they are to deliver the regeneration strategy.
- 1.3 Cabinet has previously agreed to the preparation of a borough-wide Site Allocations Document (SAD), an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Walsall Town Centre, and a charging schedule to enable the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). A programme for the plans has also been agreed. This programme reflected the need for the plans to reflect relevant statutory and legal requirements and for the council to be able to demonstrate it has been following the proper processes for preparing the documents.
- 1.4 Following consultations on 'Issues and Options' in 2013, in July 2015 Cabinet agreed to consultations on 'Preferred Options' for the SAD and AAP and on a 'Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule' for CIL. These consultations provided the opportunity to publish the plans in draft so that local residents and all of those concerned with investment in and the environment of the borough could

have the best possible opportunity to participate. The 'Preferred Options' consultations took place in September-November 2015.

- 1.5 The next stage in the preparation of the plans is to consult on 'Publication' versions of the SAD and AAP and on a Draft Charging Schedule for CIL. Officers have drafted the documents taking account of the representations received in response to the previous stage of consultation, relevant changes in circumstances and in Government policy – and have sought to bring all of the relevant changes together in the context of the evidence available. The interactions are complex as the plans, and the proposals to charge CIL, seek to address a wide range of important issues for the future of the borough
- 1.6 The consultation documents and the supporting evidence are very large and complex. The 'Publication' documents, for the SAD and the AAP and the draft CIL documents are provided with this Report. However, they are lengthy and the 'Publication' Policies Maps are best understood when printed at a large scale. Therefore:
 - the copies of the 'Publication' documents have been provided with the copies of the report for Cabinet Members only; and
 - whilst copies of the Policies Maps have been provided with the documents for Cabinet Members, these are rather small in size, so full-sized copies of the Maps will be made available at the meeting.The Draft Plan Documents and the Policies Maps (viewable at their full sizes) as well as the CIL documents, are available on the Committee Information Pages on the Council's website. Paper copies of the Draft Plan Documents, Policies Maps and Draft CIL Charging Schedule have been placed in each of the Members' Group rooms. It is proposed that on the day of Cabinet there should be an exhibition in the Council House open to all members of the Council.
- 1.7 It is important to note that the 'Publication' plans and the draft charging schedule are consultation documents. They might be amended by Cabinet (and in respect of details through delegations) and they are being published for consultation that will lead to further modifications being proposed in future, before the plans are submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination Public.
- 1.8 The consultation will involve publicising the Publication versions of the SAD and AAP and the Draft CIL Charging Schedule plus (on top of previous publications) various supporting documents listed in the Background Papers for this Report. The consultation will use exhibitions, meetings, press releases and social media as well as letters and emails. The aim will be to give the fullest possible opportunities for all sections of the community to comment on and in the light of all of the documents.
- 1.9 Approval is sought for the consultation to begin early in March (Monday 7th) and to last for 8 weeks. It is important to recognise that although the decisions of Cabinet might generate media coverage, the consultation cannot start until the consultation material has been prepared and arrangements for meetings and exhibitions will need to be put in place.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet agrees to publish material for consultation on three Walsall Local Plan documents:
- i. Walsall Site Allocations Document – Publication
 - ii. Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan – Publication
 - iii. Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule
- 2.2 That Cabinet agrees the consultation on all 3 documents should begin early in March 2016 and should run for 8 weeks concurrently.
- 2.3 That the detailed form and content (not the substance) of the emerging documents and consultation material be delegated to the Executive Director for Economy and Environment. If there are any changes to the ‘Publication’ documents, Policies Maps and / or the Draft CIL Charging Schedule, which would go to the substance of the issues in question or the core of the policies such changes should be made by the Executive Director in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economy, Infrastructure and Development.
- 2.4 That Cabinet agrees that this consultation should be publicised in advance of the start in March, and that all Members of the Council and all council services concerned with the use of land and premises should be asked to participate positively in the consultation and encourage members of the community and relevant interest groups to do so.
- 2.5 That Cabinet notes that a report is to be submitted to a future meeting on the programme for ‘Local Plan’ preparation and that in future there will also be reports to Council in accordance with the process for the preparation of the SAD, AAP and CIL documents set out in paragraph 3.5 of this report.

3. Report detail

- 3.1 The Black Country Core Strategy provides an overall plan for the regeneration of the Black Country (covering Dudley, Sandwell and Wolverhampton, as well as Walsall). When it was found sound, via an examination in public, the Planning Inspectors who considered it were clear that more detailed plans would be necessary to implement the strategy. Sandwell has prepared a borough-wide Site Allocations Document and a plan for the centre of West Bromwich, Dudley has prepared several Area Action Plans (including for Brierley Hill) and is working on Site Allocations, and Wolverhampton has prepared Area Action Plans and is working on a Plan for the city centre. Dudley and Sandwell have been through the necessary processes to enable them to implement CIL, whilst Wolverhampton has decided not to introduce CIL.
- 3.2 In June 2011, Walsall’s Cabinet approved the preparation of three documents.

- a) A Site Allocation Development Plan Document (SAD) to allocate sites for development for housing, employment and other uses across the borough (except for town and district centres);
 - b) An Area Action Plan (AAP) for Walsall Town Centre, to allocate sites for development and to propose improvements to support the town centre; and
 - c) An Infrastructure Plan and a Charging Schedule, to support the introduction of a CIL regime to levy charges on certain types of development, replacing a large part of the regime of s106 obligations.
- 3.3 The process for making statutory development plans is set out under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which describes them in terms of the Local Development Framework, although the Government now prefers to call them 'Local Plans'. The process requires consultation on 'Issues and Options' leading to an explicit choice of 'Preferred Options' before the council is required to produce a 'Publication' version of its plan(s). It was decided to work towards a CIL regime (which is subject to its own processes and requirements) in parallel with the SAD and AAP so as to share evidence and consultation arrangements.
- 3.4 The Council undertook 'call for sites' exercises (to see if anyone wanted to propose sites for development) in 2011 and 2013-2014. It carried out a major consultation on 'Issues and Options' for the SAD and the AAP in April-June 2013. Large numbers of representations were received. Following this the council has had to deal with a large number of complex issues (over 1,500 sites have been considered and assessed in respect of dozens of issues) and has had to obtain and/or assemble substantial evidence. It has also had to respond to important Government proposals and to plans for surrounding areas, including Birmingham, which raised and continue to raise important issues for the planning of the borough, including the ability to provide land for industry and to plan for housing without substantial risks to the Green Belt.
- 3.5 In September 2014 Cabinet approved a report that reviewed the Local Development Scheme. This set out the proposed timetable for the SAD and AAP (with the CIL work to be progressed in parallel) as follows.

Local Development Scheme PROGRAMME SUMMARY – 2014-2016

Preparation of Site Allocation Document and Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan

Issues and Options	
<i>Issues and Options Reports Public Consultation</i>	<i>22nd April - 3rd June 2013 - 6 weeks consultation</i>
Preferred Options	
Cabinet	June/ July 2015
Preferred Options Reports Public	August - September 2015 - 6 weeks consultation

Consultation (including draft plans)	(may be extended) [The 'Preferred Options Consultation was for 8 weeks beginning in September and ending in November 2015]
Towards Publication, Examination and Adoption	
Cabinet (if no further evidence / consultation required)	January 2016 [This Cabinet meeting is in February 2016]
Publication (final draft plan) Public Consultation	February 2016 - 6 weeks consultation [This report proposes the consultation should start early in March 2016 and last for 8 weeks]
Council Approval for Submission	June 2016 [May be July 2016]
Submission to Secretary of State	July 2016
Examination (by Planning Inspector)	Autumn 2016
Adoption (by Council)	End 2016

- 3.6 It is important that the SAD and the AAP are progressed in line with the timetable, insofar as possible. At the Core Strategy examination the Black Country authorities committed themselves to a review of their strategy, to start in 2016. Without plans in place to show the strategy is deliverable, then there could be increased pressure for arguments for alternatives to regeneration and these could have consequences for industrial land and for the Green Belt. In addition, the Government's promotion of CIL has involved restrictions being placed (from April 2015) on the ability to pool s106 monies, whilst as time passes potential CIL receipts are being foregone.
- 3.7 The necessary evidence has been obtained and work done, to enable the programmed 'Publication' Consultation on the SAD and AAP, as well as a consultation on the Draft CIL Charging Schedule. The formal purpose of this consultation on the SAD and AAP is to set out Draft Plans to show the specific allocations, designations and policies that the Council is proposing. The CIL consultation is to ask about the schedule of charges the Council is proposing to operate, together with the approach that is being taken towards the infrastructure needs and provision and towards the possible types of infrastructure that might benefit from monies generated from CIL. The work must be based upon evidence, including evidence gained through the previous stages of the process and take due account of the representations received.
- 3.8 APPENDIX A to this report sets out some information on the consultations carried out at the 'Preferred Options' stage. APPENDIX B describes what are considered to be the most significant issues arising as a result of representations received, changes of circumstances, and changes in Government policy or new information. A schedule of representations received at the 'Preferred Options' stage with responses on behalf of the

Council is to be published for each document. These are included among the documents listed as Background Papers to this report.

3.9 The SAD, AAP and the CIL documents seek to address a wide range of issues. Whilst the main points arising from the last round of consultations are summarised in Appendix B to this report, the main headlines are as follows.

- i. No-one has mounted any serious challenge to the strategy for regeneration and growth set out in the plans further to the Black Country Core Strategy. Some of those making representations appear to think the plans might represent a review of the Core Strategy, or a review of its fundamental principles, but none of them has demonstrated why this should be the case (and the review of the Core Strategy is to be a separate future exercise that will end to be undertaken jointly with the other Black Country authorities). Strong support for the approaches taken in the plans has been received from a number of parties, including the Black Country Local Economic Partnership, Birmingham City Council and South Staffordshire District Council.
- ii. No-one has made any serious challenge to the council's evidence on the viability and deliverability of development. There have been assertions that urban regeneration might not be achievable and that CIL might not be affordable, and there have been attempts at arguments that higher value users might be needed or justified on some sites, or that particular sites in the Green Belt should be allocated. However, none of these has been supported by any serious evidence.
- iii. Almost all of the development sites proposed in the 'Preferred Options' are proposed to be taken forward into the 'Publication' plans. Whilst some site boundaries are to be amended, sites amalgamated and particular issues (such a potential flood risks) have been identified, none of the sites for new industrial development or for new 'bricks and mortar' housing are being removed as a result of the consultation. As far as the SAD is concerned, the biggest change is the proposed removal of the identification of an 'Area of Search' for brick clay at Highfields North in Walsall Wood. For the Walsall Town Centre AAP some detailed changes are proposed to particular sites, in most cases to clarify proposals, but also to respond to changes in the emerging plans of Walsall College.
- iv. It is notable that there have been no proposals for new / improved community facilities and no proposals relating to the sites for such facilities. A few statutory / interest bodies and some local residents have sought to argue that particular types of provision should be maintained or protected but they have not provided a basis to make specific proposals (especially in the context of the scale of the ongoing cuts to council and other public sector funding). Thus the SAD is not proposed to contain any specific proposals for new, improved or changed community sites and the AAP is proposed to refer to the importance of community facilities in 'in principle' terms rather than proposing specific allocations.

- v. Whilst the biggest issues might be relatively straightforward, as far as representations are concerned they have tended to be eclipsed by proposals for gypsy and traveller sites. This issue tended to dominate the reactions of local residents and generated by far the greatest numbers of representations, some of which have expressed very strong views. Strong views are not in themselves a determining factor but officers have given careful consideration to the representations and to the issues raised. They have also looked at the latest information on provision for gypsies and travellers and at the likely implications of recent changes in Government Policy. The results of the work are presented in the Site Assessment Matrix reproduced as APPENDIX C to this report. It is proposed that consultation on this Matrix, and an accompanying draft revised Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Methodology, is carried out in parallel with the SAD Publication Document.

In summary, officers consider that the figure for the likely need for gypsy and traveller provision can be reduced and it appears that this need can be met by the regularisation of existing sites, some small / windfall sites plus one new site. Of all of the sites that have been looked at during this process the site at Dolphin Close in Goscote is considered to be the most acceptable / least problematic. Alternative provision would need to be made if this site could not be brought forward.

Proposals for sites for travelling showpeople gave rise to far fewer expressions of concern and it is proposed to take forward most of the sites put forward at the 'Preferred Options' stage (although there is some evidence that the need for additional showpeople sites is also less than previously believed).

- vi. Work is currently ongoing in relation to the implications of the status of Cannock Chase as a 'Special Area of Conservation' (SAC) of European importance. In particular there is a question of whether neighbouring authorities will be required to contribute to its conservation by way of developer contributions. At this stage officers are unable to say how or whether this would impact on development, development contributions or CIL. The timing is such, however, that the progress of the SAD, AAP and CIL should not be stalled given that the position in relation to Cannock Chase SAC remains uncertain.

- 3.10 The 'Publication' consultation will offer the opportunity to explore the issues further. The Local Planning Regulations require that such a formal consultation on a Local Plan should last for a minimum of 6 weeks, whilst the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations require a consultation for a minimum of 4 weeks. Following the experience of the previous stages it is proposed that the consultations on the Publication plans and on the Draft CIL Charging Schedule should be for a minimum of 8 weeks. Although the Local Development Scheme intended that the consultations should start in the February, the lack of a January Cabinet date and the need to ensure sufficient

time is available for printing and checking of plans it is proposed they should begin at the start of March.

4. Council priorities

- 4.1 The Local Plan provides the statutory framework within which the Council should make decisions about the use and development of land. The borough-wide SAD and Walsall Town Centre AAP are to enable this through policies that support the Council's priorities whilst taking forward the regeneration strategy of the Core Strategy. They will give direct support for the council's priorities (as set out in the Corporate Plan 2016- 2020-') by allocating land for development including housing (including affordable housing), for industry and business, including investment in the town centre, and by protecting the environment. By doing these things within a framework for sustainable development these plans should help to improve people's access to economic and other opportunities and contribute to their health and well-being. They should also help all of those who are concerned with the future use of land and premises to plan for the future.
- 4.2 The proposed introduction of the CIL regime should provide resources to help support new, improved and better-maintained infrastructure for a variety of purposes, including open space, transport, highways and an improved environment for the public. Because CIL (unlike s106 obligations) is not tied directly to particular development it provides some flexibility to respond to changing needs and priorities.
- 4.3 Besides meeting statutory and procedural requirements, consultation on the plans should accord with the council's commitments to openness, listening and involvement. Positive plans for the future of the borough also represent tangible commitments to leadership.

5. Risk management

- 5.1 Failure to have an adopted Local Plan, based on sound evidence, could result in the borough having insufficient land to meet the need for housing, employment and other land uses that are necessary to meet the needs of residents and to support the economic and environmental well-being of the area. It could also result in development being placed in the wrong locations, leading to an inefficient use of resources, the loss of sites to meet local needs and to accommodate much-needed investment, traffic congestion, damage to the environment and other harm. Having a Local Plan in place is also essential to defend the Council's position in planning appeals and in justifying regeneration proposals and bids for resources.
- 5.2 The legal and procedural requirements for the preparation of the plans present potential risks. The Government's policy requirements mean plans have to be found 'sound', in that they should be:
- positively prepared (to meet the needs of the area);

- justified (considered against reasonable alternatives and based on evidence);
 - effective (deliverable); and
 - consistent with national policy.
- 5.3 To mitigate the risks that might impede the adoption of the plans, it is important to meet the legal and procedural requirements and to ensure that policies and proposals across all of the issues relating to and/or addressed by the plans dealt with are well-considered and properly justified. Consultation is an important part of this.
- 5.4 There is an additional risk posed by the ongoing work in relation to the Cannock Chase SAC (referred to at 3.9vi). If it were to become necessary for development in Walsall to contribute to the Cannock Chase SAC, there is potential for impact on both the SAD and the CIL, which would then require further reports to Cabinet.

6. Financial implications

- 6.1 Preparing the plans entails costs, notably for evidence that the council has to have to justify the policies and proposals. This is especially, for issues that the council cannot fully examine itself or where it is important to show there has been an external expert assessment. At the previous 'Preferred Options' stage the report to Cabinet referred to the commissioning of evidence, principally on complex issues concerning the viability and deliverability of development in Walsall.
- 6.2 Since the Preferred Options consultations, there has been a need to commission evidence on the implications of the EU Habitats Directive and associated regulations. This has cost £4,500 and is ongoing.
- 6.3 On the basis of experience at the previous stage, the printing of documents, maps and leaflets (etc.) for the 'Publication' consultation is estimated as likely to cost around £6,000.
- 6.4 The costs incurred so far, or due as a result of this consultation have been / can be met from existing and ear-marked reserve budgets. In June 2011 Cabinet endorsed the use of monies from the Government's New Homes Bonus for the preparation of the plans and CIL charging schedule. Sufficient monies remain to progress the plans to the next stage (submission to the Secretary of State), unless a need arises for a very large commission to address a complex (but hitherto unforeseen) issue.
- 6.5 The Council has been awarded £5 million of New Homes Bonus for 2015-2016 and Government incentives for support for new development appear likely to continue in some form. In December 2015 the Government stated that it would be likely to take account of whether or not authorities have up to date Local Plans when assessing and rewarding (or sanctioning) authorities' planning performance.

- 6.6 Besides government grants, support for new development will also be likely to generate Council Tax and Business Rates income. The introduction of a CIL regime has been estimated by the Council's consultants (DTZ) as potentially generating £4.5-£5.6 million up to 2026 for spending on the provision and maintenance of infrastructure. It is difficult to make a direct comparison with what might otherwise be collected through s106 obligations, because Government expects that resources for infrastructure will be gathered through CIL and it has tightened the rules on the collection and use of s106s (including, as of April 2015 with restrictions on the pooling of s106 contributions). For comparison, £309,000 was secured from s106 obligations in 2014-15. Some provision (on and off-site affordable housing, and site-specific infrastructure) will still be most appropriate for funding solely through s106s, but infrastructure funded through CIL cannot also benefit from contributions through s106.
- 6.7 Up-to-date Local Plans should also have financial (as well as other benefits), in enabling Development Management to function more efficiently, justifying the council's position at planning appeals and supporting bids for regeneration funding.

7. Legal implications

- 7.1 Formal 'Local Plans' are the basis of the planning system. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (Section 38(6)) requires that where a planning decision is to be made *"the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise"*. The Government strongly encourages authorities to have up-to-date plans, and the 2004 Act (as amended) requires that each authority should maintain a Local Development Scheme for plan preparation and that it should monitor the implementation of its plans.
- 7.2 Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning Regulations) 2012 (Regulation 5), any document that allocates sites for particular types of development has to be a local development document (otherwise known as a 'Local Plan'). This means the proposed documents will have to be prepared according to requirements set down in legislation (including the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Planning Act 2008, related regulations, EU Directives especially on Strategic Environmental Assessment and on Habitats) and Government Policy (particularly in the National Planning Policy Framework). Any planning document for Walsall has also to be consistent with the Black Country Core Strategy.
- 7.3 The preparation of an Infrastructure Plan and Charging Schedule should follow the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and subsequent amendments. Besides setting out how a CIL regime should be introduced, these give strong incentive to operate CIL as they limit the ability to pool planning obligations ('s106s') in respect on any particular infrastructure project or type of infrastructure.

- 7.4 The preparation, content and delivery of plans and proposals has also to take account of potential impacts in terms of matters that are the subject of other legislation (such as on equalities, on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas or on the environment and nature conservation).
- 7.5 The documents are being prepared in accordance with the approach to consultation as set out in legislation and national policy, as well as in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The work on the plans requires continuing positive engagement with nearby local authorities and with various statutory bodies under the 'Duty to Cooperate' introduced by the Localism Act 2011.
- 7.6 The need to follow the statutory and policy requirements has informed the work programme, including the need for various assessments, for evidence and for public involvement. This should help to ensure that the proposed plans will be sound and should help to deliver the Black Country Core Strategy for the regeneration of the area.

8. Property implications

- 8.1 One of the aims of the SAD and AAP will be to ensure land is allocated to meet the future land and property requirements of the Council and its partners in the most appropriate locations and planning for new homes and jobs (etc.) will help with this. Within the framework of planning policy Council and other assets have been taken into account where new facilities might be needed, existing provision improved or land or premises might be surplus to requirements.

9. Health and wellbeing implications

- 9.1 One of the objectives of the SAD and AAP will be to ensure that the provision and siting of new developments contributes to the health and well-being of residents of the borough. For example the location of development should help avoid exposure to pollution as well as providing opportunities to promote access by walking and cycling. Also, providing for the housing and economic needs of residents should have health benefits and planning to meet needs for housing and other activities should help planning for health and leisure facilities. Preparation of the SAD and AAP includes the carrying out of an integrated Sustainability Appraisal, Equality Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment. Monies collected through CIL might be available to support health-related initiatives, perhaps principally in relation to open space and leisure provision.
- 9.2 The Walsall Health and Well-being Board was included in the consultations on the plans and has responded positively to the proposals.

10. Staffing implications

- 10.1 The majority of the work is being carried out by officers in the Planning Policy Team with others in the Economy and Environment Directorate, together with other officers on a range of matters including public health, education, community facilities, highways and other infrastructure. Some independent expert advice has been commissioned, notably on investment interest and the land and property market in the borough and in Walsall town centre, minerals planning issues, and the implications for the EU Habitats Directive.

11. Equality implications

- 11.1 Preparation of the SAD and AAP includes the carrying out of an integrated Sustainability Appraisal, Equality Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment. One of the objectives of the SAD and AAP will be to ensure that jobs, homes and services are provided for and accessible to all residents of the borough including groups such as gypsies and travellers.

12. Consultation

- 12.1 As the plans cover a wide range of issues and have to be prepared through processes that require evidence and consultation. There has been a great deal of consultation within the council and with partners in the work done so far. Presentations have been made to Members of the Council and discussions / meetings held with Members and groups of Members. Among council officers, the Planning Policy team has worked with especially closely with Development and Delivery and with Development Management, Highways, Transportation, Pollution Control, the Employment Growth team and Housing. More widely there has been work with Clean and Green Services, Leisure and Community Health, Waste Management, and Communities and Public Protection.
- 12.2 All of those identified above as involved in the work on the plans, plus Finance and Legal Services, have been given the opportunity to comment on this report. There has also been an internal consultation on the Draft Plan documents and a 'drop-in' event for all Members of the Council has been arranged for 3 February. It is intended to keep Members, and services within the council, involved in the preparation of the plans as the work moves forward. If necessary they can participate in the public consultation (as well as residents, businesses, landowners, statutory bodies, etc.).
- 12.3 Some information on the meetings and events attended as part of the 'Preferred Options' stage is provided as APPENDIX A to this report, together with references to the numbers of representations / petitions received. Wherever possible (and those involved were willing) contact details were captured so that the 'Publication' consultations can build on earlier work.

Background papers

All published / to be published when the consultation begins – see the Council's website, especially:

http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/planning_policy/planning_2026.htm

http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/planning_policy/community_infrastructure/levy.htm

Existing Documents, including

1. *Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS)*
2. *Black Country Core Strategy Inspectors' Report*
3. "Saved" Policies of *Walsall's Unitary Development Plan (UDP)*
4. *Walsall Council Statement of Community Involvement*
5. *National Planning Policy Framework & National Planning Practice Guidance*

Local Plan Documents and Evidence from the earlier stages of consultation ('Issues and Options' and 'Preferred Options for the SAD and CIL, and 'Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for CIL) – as provided on the Council's website.

Local Plan Documents for the Proposed Consultations

6. *Walsall Site Allocations Document (SAD) – Publication Draft Plan*
7. *Site Allocations Policies Map – Publication Draft*
8. *Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) – Publication Draft Plan*
9. *Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan Policies Map – Publication Draft*
10. *Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule*
11. *Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan and 'Section 123' List.*
12. *Draft Delivery Plan (for the SAD & AAP)*
13. *Sustainability Appraisal*
14. *Statement on Habitats Regulations Assessment*
15. *Walsall Site Allocations Document Preferred Options Consultation – Representations and Council Responses*
16. *Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan Preferred Options Consultation – Representations and Council Responses*
17. *Preliminary Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule Consultation - – Representations and Council Responses*
18. *Statement on Preferred Options and CIL Consultation*

Updated Evidence, including

19. *Walsall Employment Land Review Update*
20. *Advice on the Application of the Habitats Regulations in respect of Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation.*
21. *Updated Walsall Town Centre Characterisation Study*
22. *Updated Draft Walsall Town Centre Car Parking Strategy*

Author

Mike Smith
Planning Policy Manager

☎ 658024

✉ Mike-E.Smith@walsall.gov.uk



Simon Neilson
Executive Director
Economy and Environment

3 February 2016



Councillor Andrew
Deputy Leader and
Portfolio Holder Economy,
Infrastructure and Development

3 February 2016

APPENDIX A
‘Preferred Options’ Consultation Autumn 2015
Events and Meetings and Numbers of Representations Received

‘Planning 2026’ Specific Events

Event	Date	Attendance
Blakenall Village Centre Meeting on the SAD	Thursday 1st October	25
Walsall Town Centre Market Stall	Friday 2nd October	52
Darlaston Market Stall	Monday 5th October	28
Old Hall and Bentley meeting	Tuesday 6th October	100
Town Hall Drop-in Event	Friday 9th October	55
North Walsall Meeting on the SAD	Thursday 15th October	30
Bloxwich Market Stall	Friday 16th October	40
Saddlers Shopping Centre Consultation Stall	Monday 19th to Friday 23 rd October	233
Willenhall Market Stall	Friday 23rd October	38
Aldridge Shopping Precinct Consultation Stall	Tuesday 27th October	119
Brownhills Tesco	Wednesday 28th October	69
Masjid Hamza Islamic Centre, Mill Street - Meeting	Friday 30th October	30

Meetings Attended

Event	Date
Walsall Economic Board	Tuesday 8th September
Area Panel Meeting - Darlaston and Bentley Planning 2026 Event	Wednesday 16th September ¹
Walsall South Area Partnership – Councillor and Partner Review Meeting	Wednesday 16th September
Willenhall & Short Heath Area Partnership Meeting	Wednesday 16th September
Walsall Disability Forum	Thursday 17th September.
Area Panel Meeting - North Walsall	Thursday 17th September
Area Panel Meeting - Willenhall and Short Heath	Tuesday 22nd September
Area Panel Meeting - Brownhills / Pelsall / Rushall – Sheffield	Monday 28th September
Area Panel Meeting - Aldridge and Beacon	Tuesday 29th September
North Walsall Partner Meeting	Tuesday 6th October
Area Panel Meeting - Walsall South	Tuesday 6th October
Walsall Chamber of Commerce	Monday 12th October
Walsall Health & Wellbeing Board	Thursday 22nd October

¹ Although this was a Area Panel Meeting it was attended by 250+ members of the community wanting to find out more about the SAD Gypsy and Traveller Sites.

Consultation Representations Received

There were approximately 1,200 written representations to the Site Allocation Document. About 900 of these consisted of a standard letter objecting to the proposal for a traveller site in Bentley.

There were around 20 official representations on the Town Centre Area Action Plan.

We also had around 20 official representations to the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy consultation.

The main issues raised and how these have influenced the plans are captured in the tables provided in **APPENDIX B** to this report.

In addition to formal written representations we received 3,526 names or signatures on petitions covering the following:

- 1) Petition urging the Council to recognise detrimental impact of having Gypsy/ Traveller sites in Mill Street and ask to remove them from any allocation and not house traveller/ gypsy sites on both sites - 244 signatures
- 2) Support for Darlaston Multi Purpose Centre site to be allocated for use as housing - 1,403 signatures
- 3) Opposition to Darlaston Multi Purpose Centre being used as a site for travellers - 380 signatures (Plus 859 names on change.org)
- 4) Support for the retention of land at Dolphin Close and Former Goscote Copper Works for housing land only - 40 signatures
- 5) Expressions of concern that Goscote Lodge Crescent is being considered for use as a permanent travellers site as it could compromise the development and success of this regeneration and seek assurance that this site will be removed from the list - 80 signatures;

And,

Strong objection to any proposal to place a travellers site in this area as we consider this would hamper the regeneration process currently under way and also wish for consideration to make a plan to clear up the adjacent heavily contaminated Elkington site - 52 signatures

- 6) Opposition against proposed plans for former Metal Casements site - 300 signatures
- 7) Call on Council to designate Royal British Legion Club for traditional housing to help young people to get on the housing ladder – 168 signatures

APPENDIX B

‘Preferred Options’ Consultation

A schedule of all of the representations received with responses on behalf of the council will be published as part of the consultation on the plans.

i) Main Issues considered to arise as a result of consultation on the SAD

Topic/ Policy	Issue / Point Raised	If subject to representation who made them (* = Duty to Cooperate body)	Changes to the Plan for Publication Stage
1. Introduction			
Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment	<p>Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment do not appear to be available. Possible impact on Special Area of Conservation needs to be assessed</p> <p>[Similar comments were also made by some respondents in relation to Policy EN1 - see Natural and Built Environment below]</p>	Lichfield DC*, Cannock Chase DC*, Natural England* and Local Resident	<p>No change to existing approach. Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the SAD and AAP have been carried out. The SA is an integrated assessment which incorporates the requirements for SEA. The SA has included an Options Appraisal and an Appraisal of the Draft SAD and AAP covering each Draft Policy, and has considered the potential impacts of site allocation policies on biodiversity and designated sites as well as on other environmental, social and economic interests. The emerging results of the SA were summarised in the PO documents, and the SA Matrices setting out the detailed appraisal</p>

			<p>outcomes have been published on the Evidence page of the Council website.</p> <p>In accordance with the relevant regulations, a SA/ SEA Report and a statement on HRA including any necessary screening and assessment work will be published for public consultation alongside the final versions of the SAD and AAP.</p>
2. Objectives			
SAD – General Approach	<p>Should consider a review of the Green Belt as an option.</p> <p>Cannock Chase has subsequently clarified that it is seeking a reference to a Green Belt Review being undertaken as part of the planned Review of the Black Country Core Strategy.</p>	Lichfield DC*, Cannock Chase DC*	<p>No change proposed to policies or evidence. Development in the Green Belt has been rejected as an option as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. The SAD is to implement the Black Country Core Strategy.</p> <p>A change is proposed to the introduction of the Plan to say that the review of the Core Strategy will have to consider a review of the Green Belt.</p>
	Request more detailed development management policies	Police and Crime Commissioner	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The purpose of the SAD is to allocate land to meet strategic needs for homes, jobs and other land uses</p>
	SAD does not take account of up to date housing need, including that arising from Birmingham, so is unsound. More land should be released for housing, in particular sites that are currently in the Green Belt	Various landowners and Home Builders' Federation	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Sites in SAD, together with other sites already identified, provide a housing land supply that exceeds the needs of the borough to 2026 and beyond. The possible need for redistribution of Birmingham's housing requirement relates largely to the period after 2026. Such issues will be for future work on the review of the Black Country Core Strategy.</p>

			This issue has been raised mainly on behalf of landowners seeking to release their individual sites for development.
SAD Objectives	Support SAD as building on Black Country Core Strategy and Strategic Economic Plan	Black Country LEP*, South Staffs District Council*, Birmingham City Council*	No change proposed, Welcome support.
SAD Objective 5	Consider including an objective around the need to support and encourage renewable and low carbon energy developments including district heating. This could be included as part of Objective 5 or as an entirely new objective.	Natural England*	Change proposed. -Addition of text to support/encourage renewable and low carbon energy developments where appropriate and deliverable.
SAD Objective 6	Historic environment objective should refer to wider historic landscape in addition to built environment	Historic England*	Change proposed. Reference to the historic environment to reflect the main point made. The SAD refers to 'heritage assets' and the national definition of such assets includes landscapes.
SAD Objectives 9 & 10			Changes Proposed. To better reflect the relationship with the Black Country Core Strategy approach and other policies, including national policies.
3. Homes for Our Communities			
General Housing Requirements	It has been agreed that options for dealing with Birmingham's housing	Birmingham City Council*	No change proposed. Such work is being done separately and

	shortfall are developed and tested in tandem with work on Walsall's current plans.		involving authorities for the Birmingham / Black Country Housing Market Area. It is to be considered and tested be through the review of the Black Country Core Strategy.
	Strong indication that there will be an increased demand in providing affordable housing within established market and centre areas. Elderly residents are looking to downsize whilst young professionals are looking to reduce commuter time by living closer to employment and training	Walsall Housing Group	Change proposed. The SAD already seeks to allocate housing sites in accessible locations. However, the housing policies and supporting text are to be amended to seek to encourage housing for those who need sheltered accommodation and other support to be provided in the most accessible places.
	Green Belt should be reviewed to meet housing need, including that arising from Birmingham	Various landowners	No change proposed. Sufficient land for housing has been identified to meet the Black Country Core Strategy target to 2026, avoiding the need to allocate land in the Green Belt. Housing needs arising from Birmingham and into the longer term, and possible implications for the Green Belt, will be matters for the review of the Core Strategy.
Policy HC1: Land Allocated for New Housing Development	Table of housing sites should be added showing breakdown of housing supply by source.	Cannock Chase DC*	Change proposed. The Council has published a separate document showing housing sites by source, including small sites and sites in town and district centres that lie outside the areas to be covered by the SAD. However, it is agreed that this should be clarified in the SAD.
	The widest possible range of housing sites should be identified,	Home Builders' Federation	No change proposed. The borough's housing supply provides a wide

	by size and market location as required. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets		range of sites in various locations and of different sizes.
	Support allocation for housing on sites that are also identified as potential sites for travellers. These sites include HO62 (Metal Casements), HO306 (Darlaston Multi-Purpose Centre), HO28/HO29 (Dolphin Close and Goscote Copper Works)	Local Residents	Changes proposed. The total capacity of potential traveller sites identified in the Preferred Options SAD was well in excess of identified need. It is intended that the Publication version of the SAD will propose a smaller number of sites and these will be allocated solely for travellers, with the other potential sites to be allocated solely for general housing.
Policy HC3: Affordable Housing and Housing for Special Needs	Support affordable housing/ starter homes on sites that are also identified as potential sites for travellers. These sites include HO306 (Darlaston Multi-Purpose Centre), HO313 (Royal British Legion Club) and HO27/ HO28/ HO29 (Goscote Lodge Crescent, Dolphin Close and Goscote Copper Works)	Local Residents	Changes proposed. As a result of changes in respect of proposed provision for gypsies and travellers, some of these sites will be allocated for housing. In accordance with the Black Country Core Strategy, on sites for general housing of 15 or more units, 25% of homes will be expected to be affordable, subject to viability. The Government has not yet implemented the 'Starter Homes' regime and the Council might have little say in how it might be applied.
Policy HC4: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Proposed allocation of general housing sites as potential traveller sites is a recipe for non-delivery of the latter. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment is out of date	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	Changes proposed. The majority of potential traveller sites that have been identified are owned by the local authority or other landowner who is believed to be willing to deliver. However, it is intended that, to provide greater certainty over delivery, the Publication version of the SAD will propose sites

			<p>to be allocated solely for travellers, with the other potential sites to be allocated solely for general housing.</p> <p>The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) has been considered to update its analysis and conclusions. Changes in national policy since the previous GTAA, in particular the revised policy issued in August 2015, imply that the future need for sites will be less than previously assessed.</p>
	<p>Oppose allocation of sites for gypsies and travellers. Reasons include (these apply to all or most of the proposed sites):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in crime/ anti-social behaviour/ flytipping and rubbish - Impact on schools and health services that are already overloaded - Traffic and access difficulties for large vehicles/ caravans - Will travellers pay Council Tax/ utility bills etc.? - Property devaluation - Physical conditions on some sites: poor drainage, mineshafts, air pollution - Site is in middle of built up area: traveller site will not integrate with existing community 	Local Residents	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>The total capacity of potential traveller sites identified in the Preferred Options SAD was well in excess of previously identified need. The Publication of the SAD will propose a smaller number of sites to be allocated solely for travellers, with the other potential sites to be allocated solely for general housing.</p> <p>The criteria for identifying sites for gypsies and travellers are being refined and applied to derive the sites proposed in the Publication version of the Plan.</p> <p>It should be recognised that some of the matters raised are not planning issues or could be applicable to any provision anywhere for gypsies and travellers.</p>

	- Alternative uses preferred, including affordable housing, open space, community facilities and car parking		
4. Providing for Industrial Jobs and Prosperity			
General	Support for the approach	Black Country LEP*, Holford Farm Group	No change proposed. Welcome support
Policies IND1-5	Policies should state that all employment land will be kept under review (with a view to considering alternative uses such as housing), not just IND4, in order to be consistent with the NPPF paragraph 22	Birway Garage, Harris Lamb, Tetlow King	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguards and protects industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The Core Strategy is in conformity with the NPPF (see the BCCS website). The entire Walsall industrial land supply was assessed in the Employment Land Review, which underpins the SAD allocations and policies, and takes NPPF paragraph 22 into account. The ELR identified a total of 30ha of land where there was no reasonable prospect of employment use, for reallocation to other uses, such as housing, open space and town centre uses (subject to the sequential approach and issues of impact and accessibility). The ELR also identified the 'Consider for Release' sites that could be used for other uses if industry leaves, as they are unlikely to be suitable for industry in the longer run, following Core Strategy policy DEL2. SAD policy IND5 allocates these sites as Consider for Release. It should also be noted that the NPPF

			paragraph 7 stresses the need for the planning system to ensure that sufficient land is available in the right places and at the right time.
Site IN92, IN118.2, IN333	Support for the allocation of these vacant sites for potential high quality industry	London & Cambridge properties, Severn Trent, Savills	No change proposed. Welcome support
New site	New site proposed for industry adjacent to One Stop, Pelsall Road	Fisher German	No change proposed. This site is in the Green Belt. There is a good supply of deliverable sites from brownfield sources.
Site IN52.2 (Walsall Enterprise Park West)	<p>The site currently vacant and is proposed to be retained as potential high quality industrial land. Agents acting for the landowner consider this site to be unviable for industry, and should be re-allocated for residential. They state that the landowner is in discussions with Midland Heart, a housing developer.</p> <p>However, Majestic Aluminium, who would like to acquire the site and develop it for industry, enabling the creation of 40 new jobs, support its industrial allocation. They have submitted a plan showing how industry would be accommodated</p>	Simply Planning, Majestic Aluminium	No change proposed. The site is a better than average industrial site, forming part of the West Midlands Enterprise Park. It should remain as industrial land.

	on site.		
Sites IN9.9, IN9.10, IN9.11, IN9.12, IN9.13, IN9.14, IN69.4	These sites are proposed to be retained as industrial in the SAD. However the landowner would like them to be reallocated as 'Consider for Release' for alternative uses.	Malcolm, Griffiths, Richard Hardy, Bell Cornwell	No change proposed. These sites have been assessed in the ELR and they do not perform poorly (see ELR P96-97). They clearly form part of the critical mass of an industrial area, and the introduction of other uses, such as housing, could compromise adjoining industry and undermine regeneration.
Site IN122, the former Moxley Tip.	This site, the Former Moxley Tip, is proposed for allocation as industrial, but with an open space element, in the SAD. It is currently made up of a large element allocated in the UDP for Open Space and a smaller element with an allocation for housing that has not been taken up. The landowner, Park Hill Estates, appears to consider that the whole site should be used for industry. However there are concerns from an adjacent landowner about industry as it is considered it could affect the amenity of future residents on his adjacent housing site (the former AP UK).	Park Hill, Savills	No change proposed. The Darlaston area has a quantitative and qualitative deficiency of accessible open space, notwithstanding the need for economic regeneration. The 2010 and 2013 planning permissions for housing and industry provide for an element of open space and the proposed allocation preserves this principle. The objector has not justified why this should be overridden. In regard to the amenity concerns, any proposed industry will be subject to saved UDP policy JP8 and other policies relating to amenity.
Site IN69.4	Site should be released for housing, retail and other commercial development	Bell Cornwell on behalf of landowner	No change proposed. There is enough capacity to meet Walsall's housing needs without recourse to this site. The objector has not provided any evidence to justify a retail allocation, particularly in relation to the

			sequential approach and the impact on centres. The land has a reasonably good score in the Employment Land Review and the area has a good track record of industrial development and redevelopment.
Various			Changes proposed. There are some minor changes based on further survey and monitoring work. Firstly these involve some sites in Aldridge and Darlaston that have previously been identified as 'high quality' being allocated as 'local quality' or 'potential high quality'. Secondly, some sites delineated as vacant in the Preferred Option have been taken up or are under construction, and the Publication Document will reflect this. Thirdly, a few very small garage/construction type sites in the Green Belt will be deleted as they are no longer considered industrial.
5. Strengthening Our Local Centres			
Policy SLC1: Local Centres	Churn Hill should be added to list of Local Centres	Local Resident	No change proposed. There is no evidence to suggest that this is more than a row of local shops and provides a focal point for the local community therefore it has not been added to the Local Centres list.
6. Open Space, Leisure and Community Facilities			
Policy OS1: Open Space, Sport and Recreation	Site HO72 Festival Ave should be designated as open space and not as a development opportunity.	Local Resident(s)	No change proposed. The site is proposed as a housing development opportunity on the basis of its status according to the council's Green Space Strategy, 2012.

			The strategy categorises the site as poor quality with low priority for improvement, also its transfer to another use is supported by the council's Clean and Green department.
	Site HO71 – a covenant exists in perpetuity for the site to be used as a playing area. The Council do not own the land therefore it is not theirs to offer for development.	Local Resident	No change proposed. Having checked the title deeds and appropriation from recreation there is no evidence of any restrictive covenants attached to the site.
	Site HO44/HO180 Poplar Ave and Churchill Road site is one of few open sites available in the area and should be protected as open space.	Local Resident(s)	No change proposed. Site HO180 has outline planning permission for residential development, whilst site HO44 does not lie within the open space area on the existing UDP Proposals Map. Area partnership 5, in which the allocations are located, has a clear surplus of amenity open space.
	Sport England does not consider the current evidence base for the playing pitch element to be robust. Walsall MBC together with the Sport England and other partners are currently working on to create a Playing Pitch Strategy using a methodology endorsed by DCLG. The new playing pitch strategy is expected to be ready by 31 March 2016 with its adoption by Cabinet in June by the latest. It may be appropriate to refer to this fact in future reiterations/final publication of the Walsall Site Allocation	Sport England	Change proposed. Add reference to emerging playing pitch strategy - Sport England's response confirms Walsall MBC has committed to a new Playing Pitch Strategy. The council fully appreciate the health and well-being benefits associated with sports playing fields and have allocated more open space for protection through the SAD. The council will progress with the SAD to the publication stage, and will discuss the evidence base and its implications with Sport England during the publication consultation of the SAD/AAP and beyond.

	Document		
	Darlaston Multi Purpose Centre was one of few public amenities in Darlaston, it attracted shoppers into the area and should be replaced by another public amenity use.	Local Resident	No change proposed (in response to this point). Without proposals for an alternative use forthcoming the preferred option for the site is considered to be for housing.
	Site HO305 Cricket Close. Would like best interests of tennis club to be preserved. Interested in why tennis is not included in playing field strategy	Local Resident	No change proposed. Estimated dwelling capacity takes account of retention of tennis courts within site. However, there is only a limited policy basis to justify requiring any developer to make this provision. The Playing Pitch Strategy does not cover tennis following consultation with the LTA and Sport England. The council has and will continue to support the club towards relocating to another site within the borough.
	Minor alterations to Open Space allocation boundaries and renaming of sites where considered appropriate.		Changes proposed. Increase accuracy of allocations, including altering the allocation at Lower Bradley Playing Fields (OS4021) to reflect latest Park and Ride proposal, and ensure site names are largely consistent with what residents know them by.
	The Development Plan should encompass financial support and a clear strategy for investment in tennis facilities within the borough over the next 10 years. Existing tennis courts within public parks in the borough are all in a poor condition.	Local Resident	No change proposed. The council has an Urban Open Space SPD which sets out local standards and the contributions that developer are required to make towards the provision and improvement of the borough's open space. Also, running in conjunction with the SAD and AAP, the council's CIL draft charging schedule proposes to largely

			take over from section 106 and identifies a funding gap for the infrastructure projects that are required to meet the needs of the area. The funding gap demonstrates a significant shortfall between the cost of this infrastructure and the predicted revenue the area can expect from new development. Along with other infrastructure we anticipate receipts from CIL will help to fund the maintenance and improvement of open space generally.
	Consider use of the State of the Environment "Dashboard" it could be referred to in Para. 6.2.3 Evidence. It also has the potential to be used in terms of monitoring (6.2.5 Monitoring refers	Birmingham and the Black Country Local Nature Partnership* Birmingham and the Black Country Wildlife Trust*	Change proposed. The council will refer to the value of the dashboard in relation to SAD policy OS1. However the council's primary focus is to safeguard and improve accessibility to open space for its residents generally and not to specific elements of the network.
Policy LC5: Greenways	Vigo Utopia Quarry should be a new greenway.	Local Resident	No change proposed. The nearest existing Greenway is along the other side of the canal towpath to the west of the Quarry. Without a means of linking the site with the greenway it is not possible for it to form part of the Greenway. Respondent had a number of questions about the Vigo Utopia site and has been provided with information on the site and the issues and management plans proposed for the area.
Policy LC5: Greenways	Developers should only be expected to fund the construction	Landowner	Change proposed.

	or enhancement of the Greenway network where this is consistent with the CIL Regulations.		Addition of text to Policy LC5.
Policy LC11: Land for Cemetery Extension, Bentley Lane [N.B. Comment also made in relation to Policy LC1]	Should existing graveyards be designated for new burials?	Local Resident	No change proposed. Graveyards and cemeteries fall within scope of the NPPF's definition of open space and are afforded protection under NPPF paragraph 74. Those sites that are >0.4 hectare have been designated accordingly. The designation and related policies should ensure these areas can remain for burial purposes.
Policy UW1: University of Wolverhampton, Walsall Campus	Recommend that policy include a specific requirement that all development proposals should promote safe and inclusive environments which reduce crime and the fear of crime.	Police and Crime Commissioner	Change proposed. Additional bullet point to be included as part of UW1 (b) with text relating to safety.
Natural and Built Environment			
Policy GB2: Control of Development in the Green Belt and Countryside	Support policy but suggest that in relation to b) the impact on the natural environment is an important factor which should also be taken into consideration and should be added to the policy set out in b).	Birmingham and the Black Country Local Nature Partnership *	No change proposed. Policy GB2 (b) provides criteria that are to be used to specifically assess development in terms of its impact on openness and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The impact on the Natural Environment does not influence these factors, however natural environment impacts can be considered under 'any other harm' associated with development within the Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF, and if appropriate through the application of Policy GB2 ix.

Policy EN1: Natural Environment Protection, Management and Enhancement	Has an SEA, SA and HRA been undertaken?	Lichfield DC*, Cannock DC*, Natural England* and Local Resident	N.B. This comment relates to SAD as a whole rather than to Policy EN1 specifically. See 1. 'Introduction' above for response to comments on the SEA, SA and HRA.
	Turners Wood SLINC has been recently endorsed.	Birmingham and the Black Country Wildlife Trust*	Change proposed. Addition of Turner's Wood to the Publication document Policy Map.
	The plan should refer to wildlife corridors.	Birmingham and the Black Country Wildlife Trust*	Change proposed. Insert references to how open spaces and links provide wildlife corridors that should be maintained and where possible enhanced. Consideration of the how this might be done with reference to a diagram is under consideration at the time of writing because it does not appear practical to do this on the Policy Map.
	Reference needs to be made to the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. Whilst there are no allocations proposed within this zone at this time, it needs to be firstly clarified if there are any non-allocated small sites likely to come forward within the zone, and secondly the approach to be taken if windfall sites come forward within the zone (both residential and non-residential proposals).	Cannock Chase Council*	Change proposed. Amendments to reasoned justification to identify the potential issue in respect of residential development.
	Policy should be expanded to cover	Environment	Changes proposed.

	<p>nature conservation specifically in rivers and other watercourses, as required under Water Framework Directive (WFD) and delivered through the Humber River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). All watercourses in Walsall required to meet Good Ecological Status by 2027 and this plan should support that objective. Updated RBMP is due to be published in December 2015. Recommend that WFD is implemented by including overarching requirement to support implementation of Humber RBMP. Refer specifically to the designations shown on the policies map.</p>	Agency*	<p>Amendments to Policy and reasoned justification to refer to the relevant issues and documents to be taken into account (including the Humber River Basin Management Plan). References will be made to other environmental features on the Policy Map.</p> <p>It is not proposed to provide a general policy on the water environment as the purpose of the SAD is to provide for the allocation of sites. Existing policies, in the saved policies of Walsall's UDP, the Core Strategy and the NPPF together with national policy and legislation are considered adequate to address development management issues. The reasoned justification has been amended to make stronger reference to links to other policies, including in respect of nature conservation.</p>
EN2: Ancient Woodland	Text of policy requires tightening for clarity and to ensure it is effective.		Change proposed. To clarify policy..
Policy EN3: Flood Risk	No mention of risks from flooded coal and limestone workings (ground water)	Local Resident	Changes proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to refer to the risks identified.
	Support content of this policy; advise that where appropriate evidence is available policy is revised to provide more bespoke and focused policy reflecting local characteristics of flooding and constraints to development in	Environment Agency*	Changes proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to clarify the approaches to flood risk and to issues specific to particular sites and / or watercourses, including references to other relevant legislation, policies and guidance.

	<p>Walsall.</p> <p>Needs to reflect that many watercourses are culverted and could be affected by blockages and feasible opportunities should be taken to keep them open. Revised climate change allowances will be published in autumn 2015 including changes to peak river flow allowances, these should be taken into consideration for any updates to SFRA or other flood risk or climate change documents.</p> <p>Continuing discussions indicate that the Environment Agency needs to give more detailed consideration to all of the evidence provided.</p>		
EN4: Canals	No mention of responsibility for maintenance of canals and the effect of any embankment breach	Resident	Change proposed. Insert reference to the issues into reasoned justification.
	<p>Reference could be made to the proposal within Cannock Chase District Local Plan (Part 1) Policy CP15 to consider designating a Conservation Area along the Cannock Extension Canal, which crosses into Walsall (either in policy or supporting text).</p> <p>There is no reference to the</p>	Cannock Chase Council*	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>Refer to possible proposal for Conservation Area (which would be designated through a separate process outside of plan-making) in supporting text.</p> <p>Add 'possible' route for link between Hatherton Canal and Wyrley and Essington Canal to the Policy Map and provide policy to support such a link, subject to water supply, drainage and nature conservation issues (including potential</p>

	Hatherton Branch Canal proposals.		impacts on the Cannock Extension Canal SAC, which would need to be addressed in accordance with the Habitats Regulations).
	Support policy but ask that route of Lichfield and Hatherton Canal is safeguarded. Request that reference to working with local canal groups is added to delivery text.	Lichfield and Hatherton Canals Restoration Trust	Changes proposed. Insert a reference in the policy to 'in principle' support for the Lichfield Canal link, with supporting text to explain that it would join the Wyrley and Essington Canal on the borough boundary. Such support should be subject to the same requirements as for the Hatherton Canal link (see above).
	Support policy but request detailed changes. Pleased to note that canalside developments will be expected to contribute towards the enhancement and maintenance of canal infrastructure and to improve access. Where appropriate, this money should be made available to the Canal & River Trust to implement the works.	Canal & River Trust	Change proposed. Insert reference to the general approach that where feasible and appropriate the resources obtained for maintenance / improvement may be shared with or passed to other bodies. However, it would not be appropriate for a development plan document to imply any specific commitment in respect of a particular body.
	Any development next to a canal should look to incorporate some form of edge softening to aid in establishment of marginal vegetation and enhance value as a wildlife corridor.	Environment Agency*	Changes proposed. Amendment to policy to reflect the points made with appropriate references in supporting text.
Historic Environment Section	Welcome the inclusion of a specific section on the historic environment,	Historic England*	Changes proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to make

	yet raise issues about why it focuses on development in conservation areas only.		it clear that the policies in the SAD relate to designated sites and that Saved UDP Policies, Core Strategy policies and national policies will apply to heritage issues generally.
EN5: Conservation Areas	Recommend revision to policy wording and justification to include reference to designated and non-designated heritage assets.	Historic England*	Changes proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to reflect the points made.
EN6: Highgate Brewery	Impact of development on Heritage assets should be considered at this stage to assess whether principle of development is acceptable.	Historic England*	Changes proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to reflect the points made, insofar as feasible.
	Welcome recognition of ongoing Source Protection Zones around former abstraction borehole. Suggest addition of text referencing need for future developers to surrender abstraction licence and decommission borehole to Policy Justification.	Environment Agency*	Change proposed. Amendment to the policy justification.
EN7: Great Barr Hall and Estate and St. Margaret's Hospital	Impact of development on Heritage assets should be considered at this stage to assess whether principle of development is acceptable. What assessment work has been undertaken to assess level of harm to heritage assets and their settings that may be affected by this	Historic England*	Changes proposed. Amendment to the policy and justification where appropriate and feasible.

	development?		
	Generally support policy but would favour a change to paragraph f). Believe any scheme to provide public access should incorporate pedestrian access at least during the hours of daylight and that vehicle access should be limited to Chapel Lane, with Sutton's Drive being adopted as a footpath with access through to the Queslett Road	Walsall Group of the Ramblers	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>The proposed wording has been incorporated from the existing policy in the UDP. It is considered appropriate to refer to the objective of securing public access to the park insofar as would be possible and consistent with its maintenance and with the functioning of any enabling development.</p> <p>As the form of any enabling development is not fixed it would not be appropriate to be categorical about access arrangements, although the potential issues raised by vehicular access through the site can be acknowledged</p>
	ACCA of 36 Wolverhampton Rd, Walsall WS2 8PR would like to be included in the Walsall Site Allocation plans as a Landmark Building	Community or Other Organisation	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The ACCA is not within the Town centre boundary, and the SAD does not provide the same detail as the Town centre AAP and does not single out landmark buildings.</p> <p>The ACCA might wish to consider putting the building forward to be locally listed (a process that is separate to the making of development plans).</p>
8. Sustainable Waste Management			
W1: Future Waste Management Requirements	Agree that policy identifies appropriate waste management requirements, and recognises role of existing non-hazardous landfill sites in meeting requirements for	Cory Environmental	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Welcome support.</p>

	waste disposal.		
	Support possible creation of additional capacity for recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste and treatment hubs for contaminated soils.	Environment Agency*	No change proposed. Welcome support.
W1: Future Waste Management Requirements	The Plan should encourage the development of additional recycling capacity for construction, demolition and excavation waste (CD&EW) to meet the requirements for materials arising from regeneration projects within the urban area. Consideration should be given to use of the EU Waste Framework Directive target of 70% recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste across Europe by 2020 and consider sustainable construction practices as a means for increasing the use of recycled C&D waste.	Staffordshire County Council*	Changes proposed. Amendments to Part d) of the policy and to the justification to make reference to these targets. No further changes proposed - realistically the scope for developing new CD&EW recycling facilities in a largely urban area such as Walsall is limited, and Black Country Core Strategy Policy WM5 already encourages developers to recycle and optimise the use of site waste.
W2: Existing Waste Management Sites - General	Allowing new developments to be situated near existing waste management sites leaves sites open to criticism and conflict It is also unclear whether the waste sites identified in the Draft SAD include sites operating under Waste Exemptions as well as sites	Environment Agency*	Change proposed. Addition of a reference to the weight given to comments from the regulatory authorities on proposals at Part b) of the policy. All sites with planning permission or lawful land use for waste management operations have been identified on the SAD Policies Map, because for a land use plan this is the most important consideration, although it is acknowledged that most sites will

	operating under Waste Permits.		also require a Waste Permit, so this has also been checked. The purpose of SAD Policy W2 is to clarify how the existing Black Country Core Strategy Policy WM2 on safeguarding of existing waste infrastructure will be implemented in Walsall, and which sites in Walsall will be safeguarded. The overall approach has not changed from that in the Core Strategy. Identifying these sites on the Policies Map as potential constraints to other development will also help reduce the risk that land use conflicts will occur.
W2: Existing Waste Management Sites – Strategic Waste Sites	Agree with policy approach. Support identification of Highfields South Landfill Site as a Strategic Waste Site.	Cory Environmental	No change proposed. Welcome support.
	Support identification of four aggregate recycling sites as Strategic Waste Sites.	Staffordshire County Council*	No change proposed. Welcome support.
	Metal & Waste Recycling, Jute Works is listed as Strategic Waste Site. Currently closed but permit is still held by operator. Downturn in scrap metal prices is having huge impact on metal recycling sector causing mothballing of sites.	Environment Agency*	No change proposed. Vacant Strategic Waste Sites are still identified on the Policies Map if there are no alternative proposals, and if there is a reasonable prospect that the site could be brought back into waste management use in the foreseeable future. There are no current applications for redevelopment of this site, the operator has not confirmed any intention to dispose of it, and it is not currently on the market.
W3: New Waste	There is no recognition in the policy	Local Resident	No change proposed.

Management Development – Waste Treatment and Transfer	to show the increase in the number of HGVs travelling through local "B" class roads on their way to the sites identified in Aldridge. Nowhere are there weight limits to prevent these huge vehicles from passing through residential areas. Surely the policy should indicate that designated routes are being planned to take these massive vehicles away from places where schoolchildren frequent?		Applications for new waste management developments are already subject to existing local plan policies (for example, saved UDP Policies ENV10 and T4 and Black Country Core Strategy Policies TRAN3 and WM4). These policies require applicants to provide information about the number of HGV movements anticipated, the types of vehicles used, and the effects this is likely to have on the road network, highway infrastructure, and communities living along the haulage routes. While it is not necessary to duplicate the existing policy in the SAD, any specific access and highway constraints affecting individual sites have been identified in SAD Waste Technical Appendix 5. The locations identified for new waste management facilities in the SAD, including those identified in Aldridge, are mostly in existing employment areas where various industrial operations may already be lawfully carried out, which could generate similar levels of HGV traffic to a waste management operation. However, the local highway authority will be consulted on applications and where additional effects are likely to occur conditions can be imposed requiring measures to reduce the effects, such as restricted times of deliveries, restricted size/ weight of vehicles, and the use of designated haulage routes.
	There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites	Historic England*	Change proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to provide clarification. The potential effects of

	<p>may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p>		<p>waste management development on the historic environment have been evaluated for each of the Potential New Waste Sites identified in the SAD. The main constraints and opportunities for each site identified in SAD Policies W3 and W4 are identified in SAD Waste Technical Appendix 5. The Technical Appendix has been expanded following the Preferred Options consultation to include further information about potential effects on historic environment. The majority of the Potential New Waste Sites identified are previously-developed industrial sites, the only exceptions being quarry voids and other voids that require infilling with waste. Enclosed waste treatment and transfer operations are similar to industrial operations, and are unlikely to have any materially greater impact on the historic environment than an industrial development. The SA has also considered the effects of the SAD Waste Policies on the historic environment, and the outcomes of the appraisal are summarised in the SA Matrix (SAD SA - Appraisal of Draft Plan) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. The SAD Waste Policies will be applied in combination with other policies (from Saved UDP Policies, Core Strategy Policies and national policies) to protect the historic environment.</p>
	<p>Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) Waste</p>	<p>Environment Agency*</p>	<p>Changes proposed. It is proposed to amend the policy to address the</p>

	<p>Management Permit or Exemption rules often require operations to take place within a building. However, operations conducted outside the building can still cause considerable stress to neighbours.</p> <p>Waste transfer operations pose significant fire risk so Potential Waste Sites should not be located next to major travel routes</p> <p>Applications for sites located within 500m of SSSI or within 50 m of a well, spring or borehole require bespoke permits.</p>		<p>fire risk issue. It is also proposed to add a reference to the weight given to comments from the regulatory authorities on waste management development proposals at Part b) Policy W2 and Part a) of Policy W3, and to explain in the policy justification to Policy W3 that waste management operations will often require Waste Permits and/ or Environmental Permits as well as planning permission.</p> <p>The suitability of the Potential New Waste Sites identified in SAD Policy W3 for enclosed waste management operations has been evaluated against the criteria in BCCS Policy WM4 and the criteria in the National Planning Policy for Waste (2014). The SAD CIL Deliverability and Viability Study (2015) has considered suitability in terms of proximity to “sensitive receptors”. A summary of the main constraints and opportunities for each site identified in Policy W3 is provided in SAD Waste Technical Appendix 5.</p> <p>Nearly all of the Potential New Waste Sites identified in Policy W3 are previously-developed industrial sites. They are considered appropriate in terms of national policy and will be subject to the application of policies in the Black Country Core Strategy.</p>
	<p>Strongly suggest Potential Waste Site at Former McKechnie’s Site is not taken forward as site is located adjacent to illegal waste site Aldridge Aggregates which has had</p>	<p>Environment Agency*</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The SAD CIL Deliverability & Viability Study (2015) concluded that this site is potentially suitable for a waste management development of this scale, and recommended allocating the</p>

	<p>extensive Council and EA resources to deal with it. Local residents are still very sensitive to the issues of waste site in the area so a waste operation dealing with over 100,000 tonnes of waste would be unsuitable here due to negative impact on local amenity.</p>		<p>site for waste management - it was one of only two sites recommended for allocation in the SAD.</p> <p>The site has also been evaluated for suitability against the criteria in BCCS Policy WM4 and the criteria in the National Planning Policy for Waste (2014). The site is in an employment area which is considered to be a suitable location for waste management operations in national policy guidance (National Policy for Waste, paragraph 4). The SAD CIL Deliverability & Viability Study identified no "sensitive receptors" near to this site.</p> <p>As there is no evidence of any interest from waste operators, it is not proposed to allocate the site exclusively for waste management development. It is therefore identified as a site for Potential High Quality Industry (IN12.8) which could be suitable for development with an enclosed waste treatment or transfer facility - which might not necessarily have any greater impacts on the amenity of local residents than an employment development.</p> <p>Other policies, including from the Core Strategy, will ensure that impacts on amenity will be fully evaluated if an application comes forward.</p>
W4: New Waste Management Development – Waste Disposal	<p>Aldridge and Sandown Quarries have to be filled with inert materials or turned into water based sites. If the former then a proper traffic plan should be added to the policy (see</p>	Local Resident	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Although Aldridge Quarry is required to be restored by infilling with inert waste as a condition of the existing planning permission, the conditions relating to restoration of Sandown</p>

	<p>comments on Policy W3) to identify the number of HGV movements, weight restrictions and designated haulage routes. A water based resource would be more suitable for one or both of these sites and it could be attached to existing leisure facilities.</p>		<p>Quarry are less explicit. As there are no approved restoration programmes for either site, the requirements that restoration programmes will be expected to address, including evaluating the effects of increased HGV movements on highway infrastructure and on local communities, are set out in the Draft SAD Minerals Policies (policy for these sites is now in Policies M4 and M7). These policies also identify appropriate restoration methods and after uses for each site, including publicly accessible open space and outdoor recreational uses. To avoid duplication, Policy W4 includes cross-references to these policies.</p>
	<p>There is an inconsistency between the proposed restoration of Sandown Quarry with inert wastes and/ or water, and the suggestion that imported pre-treated non hazardous waste would be an option. Question evidence statement that life of Highfields South is probably less than 5 years. Based upon waste inputs and remaining void, the remaining life of the Highfields South landfill is until 31 December 2025. This will be reflected in the proposed planning application and is already identified in the Screening Opinion request which was submitted in September</p>	<p>Cory Environmental</p>	<p>Changes proposed. Amendment to Part c) of the policy to refer to comments about the estimated life remaining of the landfill site. It is acknowledged that it may take longer to complete the infilling of this site than the timescale indicated in the Preferred Options, and that further evidence on this has been provided. However, planning permission has not yet been granted for the proposed time extension, hence, the estimated remaining life of the landfill is regarded as uncertain, and the policy has been amended accordingly. No change is proposed to the table at Part f) of the policy in relation to Sandown Quarry. This site is identified as a potential non-hazardous landfill site in the policy because infilling with waste is one possible method of restoration that could be chosen. It is not the only option and the</p>

	2015.		relevant SAD Minerals policy for the site (now M8) allows for alternative methods of restoration. The operator of Sandown Quarry has not made any representations in relation to either policy.
9. Sustainable Use of Minerals			
Minerals Policies - General	N/A	N/A	<p>It is proposed to change the ordering and format of the policies on sand and gravel and brick clay in this chapter so that each policy covers a specific location. It is also proposed to group the policies into five broad Sections:</p> <p>Section 9.1: Introduction</p> <p>Section 9.2: Minerals Safeguarding: Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources Policy M2: Safeguarding of Minerals Infrastructure</p> <p>Section 9.3: Construction Aggregates: Policy M3: Secondary and Recycled Aggregates Policy M4: Sand and Gravel Extraction – Birch Lane (covers MP1: Aldridge Quarry and MXA1: Birch Lane Area of Search) Policy M5: Sand and Gravel Extraction – Branton Hill (covers MP4: Branton Hill Quarry and MXA2: Branton Hill Area of Search)</p> <p>Section 9.3: Industrial Minerals: Policy M6 (formerly M7): Brickworks Policy M7: Brick Clay Extraction – Stubbers Green (covers MXA3: Stubbers Green Area of Search, MP2: Atlas Quarry, MXP3: Recordon</p>

			<p>Land and MP7: Sandown Quarry)</p> <p>Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – Other Sites (covers MP6: Highfields South, MP8: Vigo/ Utopia, MP9: Highfields North and other potential sites for brick clay extraction)</p> <p>Section 9.4 Energy Minerals:</p> <p>Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction - Brownhills(no change to policy coverage)</p> <p>Policy M10: Unconventional Hydrocarbons</p>
Mineral Policies - General	<p>There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting. We are also keen to see minerals working for locally distinctive building material and stone that can contribute to wider objectives of local distinctiveness and place making.</p>	Historic England*	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>Amendment to justification to Policy M1 explaining why the building stone resources present in Walsall, why they are unlikely to be worked during the plan period, and why it is sufficient to rely on existing BCCS policy to evaluate any proposals that do come forward (see BCCS Policies MIN4 and MIN5)., Minerals Technical Appendix 2 to include further information on building stone resources.</p> <p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p>
Mineral Policies - General	<p>Policies recognise most potential environmental issues, but wish to highlight that mineral development</p>	Environment Agency*	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>General support for policies welcomed.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to policies on mineral</p>

	proposals will require information on how hydrological impacts and impacts on water resources and water quality from mineral extraction, dewatering, and pollution will be addressed. This should include evidence that relevant environmental permits have been applied for where importation of waste for restoration purposes is proposed, including evidence relating to potential risks to Controlled Waters, and evidence that the Council's contaminated land strategy has been complied with and an appropriate pollution control regime is in place to manage the impacts of potential contamination such that the site will not be capable of being determined as statutory contaminated land.		extraction (now M4, M5, M7, M8 and M9) to include references to the issues identified, where they were not already addressed in the Draft SAD. It is also proposed to add references to the weight the Council will give to comments from the relevant regulatory authorities and statutory environmental bodies when decisions are made on proposals for new or expanded quarrying operations. All site specific environmental constraints have been highlighted in the relevant policies to a level of detail appropriate for a local plan, including the need for applicants to evaluate impacts on hydrology and the water environment. The SAD Minerals Policies will also be applied in combination with the existing Black Country Core Strategy policies on Minerals (MIN1 - MIN5).
Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources - Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)	There should be separate MSAs for each mineral even if they overlap, rather than one amorphous area for all minerals.	Mineral Products Association	No change proposed. The proposed minerals safeguarding area (MSA) is in conformity with the Black Country Core Strategy 2011, which identifies a single MSA on the Minerals Key Diagram. It is not possible to show separate MSAs for each mineral commodity on the SAD Policies Map for the reasons explained in the Preferred Options document.
Policy M1: Safeguarding	Welcome inclusion of surface coal	Coal Authority	No change proposed.

of Mineral Resources Minerals Safeguarding - Area (MSA)	in MSA. Council should ensure Coal Authority data of surface coal is used to accurately demonstrate the extent of the coalfield element of the MSA.		Support welcomed. It is proposed that the SAD Minerals Technical Appendix will include a map showing surface coal resources based on the mapping provided by the Coal Authority.
Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources	General support for principle/ approach towards safeguarding of mineral resources in the plan.	Holford Farm Group, Coal Authority	No change proposed. Support welcomed – no change required in response to these comments.
Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources	Statement that prior extraction is rarely feasible is not justified. Objection to approach towards safeguarding of resources. Policy has been overly influenced by principle of prior extraction and has not adequately considered proximal sterilisation. Thresholds for mineral assessment and prior extraction should be removed Criterion c) undermines the principle of mineral safeguarding and prior extraction set out in criteria a) and b), is not in conformity with the Black Country Core Strategy and NPPF paragraphs 143 and 144 and will render the plan unsound if it is retained. There is also no mention of any assessment of mineral potential for the proposed housing and employment allocations.	Mineral Products Association, Coal Authority	Changes proposed. It is acknowledged that the statement about prior extraction rarely being feasible refers specifically to previously-developed urban sites, and it is proposed to amend the policy accordingly to clarify this. Further changes in response to other comments will also ensure that new non-mineral development on the periphery of the urban areas does not needlessly compromise future working on Permitted Mineral Sites or in Areas of Search. Otherwise, the approach in the SAD is justified, realistic, proportionate, and in general conformity with Black Country Core Strategy Policy MIN1 and national policy guidance. Nearly all new development is expected to take place on previously developed urban land within the MSA, which covers nearly the whole of Walsall's administrative area. There is no "reasonable alternative" to allowing non-mineral development in the MSA, if the Core Strategy requirements for housing and employment development are to be met. It is not necessary

			to undertake a detailed evaluation of the mineral potential of urban sites within the MSA, because SAD Policy M1 and Core Strategy Policy MIN1 support “prior extraction” of mineral resources where feasible, viable and deliverable.
Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources	Policy as drafted – and recognition in policy that “prior extraction” of minerals will rarely be feasible - supported. This approach has informed by an up-to-date review of the evidence base for minerals and is therefore justified.	Gallagher Estates	No change proposed. Support acknowledged but in response to other comments, it is proposed to amend the policy to clarify that “prior extraction” will rarely be feasible on previously-developed urban sites. Any proposal for non-mineral development on sites of 0.5 hectare and over in the Green Belt – including the Sandhills site being promoted by the respondent - will be expected to be supported by evidence that mineral resources will not be needlessly sterilised in accordance with Black Country Core Strategy Policy MIN1. The information provided by the respondent in 2013 in support of the Sandhills proposal does not by itself provide sufficient justification that a non-mineral development on this site would not needlessly sterilise sand and gravel resources.
Policy M1: Safeguarding of Mineral Resources	The minerals safeguarding policy is generally supported but it is suggested that the policy also recognises the need to safeguard permitted mineral sites and allocations proposed in the Plan.	Staffordshire County Council*	Change proposed. Support for general approach welcomed. It is proposed to amend the policy to make it clear that non-mineral developments proposed near Permitted Minerals Sites and in Areas of Search must demonstrate that future mineral working will not be compromised, in accordance with Black Country Core Strategy Policy MIN1, as it is acknowledged that this requires clarification.

<p>Policy M2: Safeguarding of Minerals Infrastructure</p> <p>Policy M3: Secondary & Recycled Aggregates</p>	<p>The policy to safeguard minerals infrastructure sites is supported including sites used for processing secondary aggregates and recycling waste aggregates.</p>	<p>Staffordshire County Council*</p>	<p>No change proposed. Support welcomed – no changes required in response to this comment.</p>
<p>Policy M4: Sand & Gravel Extraction – Permitted Sites</p> <p>MP4: Branton Hill Quarry</p>	<p>Support the policy especially the determination by Walsall Council to reinstate the route of ALD37, (linking Branton Hill Lane to the A452 Chester Road and Daniel's Lane via Public Right of Way Ald38), back to its original line or similar as part of the new restoration programme for this site.</p>	<p>Walsall Group of the Ramblers</p>	<p>No change proposed. Support welcomed – no changes required in response to this comment. N.B. Policy for Branton Hill Quarry is now in Policy M5 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.</p>
<p>Policy M5: Sand and Gravel Extraction – Areas of Search</p>	<p>The policy is supported in principle as a means of planning for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. Where mineral development is located near Lichfield border consideration should be given to impacts on residents beyond the Walsall Boundary, particularly impact of transport and amenity and suitable mitigation should be secured.</p>	<p>Staffordshire County Council,* Lichfield District Council*</p>	<p>Change proposed. Support for approach in principle is welcomed. Black Country Core Strategy Policy MIN5 already requires the cross-boundary impacts of mineral working to be taken into account, and no sites have been identified for sand and gravel extraction adjacent to the boundary with Lichfield District. However, to ensure that cross-boundary impacts are fully taken into account, it is proposed to amend the policies for the Birch Lane and Branton Hill Areas of Search to require proposals in these areas to consider potential harmful impacts on residential areas, businesses and transport infrastructure in neighbouring areas of Lichfield District in</p>

			Staffordshire. N.B. Policy for Birch Lane Area of Search is now in Policy M4 and policy for Branton Hill Area of Search is now in Policy M5 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.
Policy M5: Sand and Gravel Extraction – Areas of Search MXA2: Branton Hill Area of Search	Agree that potential impacts on the two local wildlife sites and ecological networks should be included in the policy.	Natural England*	No change proposed. Support welcomed - no changes required in response to this comment.
Policy M6: Brick Clay Extraction - Permitted Sites	Support policy to minimise impacts of mineral extraction at Atlas Quarry on Stubbers Green SINC, Dumblederry Farm SLINC, Anchor Brook Valley SLINC, and support policy on restoration of Highfields North. Would like guarantees that wherever possible, Public Rights of Way will remain open throughout the working phases of mineral sites and that Local Access Forum is consulted on proposals to divert or extinguish them. Would also like to see other routes linking to Public Right of Way ALD1 re-instated. Also have concerns about public access to Highfields North if it is eventually opened up for mineral extraction.	Walsall Group of the Ramblers	Change proposed. It is proposed to amend policy on MP7: Sandown Quarry has been amended to include a reference to the need for the restored site to link to the public footpath network including Public Right of Way Ald1. Otherwise, the minerals policies have already identified the Public Rights of Way that could be affected by future mineral extraction, or could help to link open spaces created on restored sites. N.B. Policy for Sandown Quarry is now in Policy M7 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.

<p>Policy M6: Brick Clay Extraction - Permitted Sites</p> <p>MP1: Atlas Quarry</p> <p>Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – New Sites</p> <p>MXP3: Recordon Land</p>	<p>Supportive of policy wording for Atlas Quarry but disappointed there is no reference to impacts on Stubbers Green Bog SSSI in policy on Recordon Land. Environment Agency consider that policies for both sites should make reference to Stubbers Green Bog SSSI and Swan Pool & the Swag SSSI as these are of national importance. Consideration should also be given to the restoration of the Anchor Brook in line with the Water Framework Directive objectives.</p>	<p>Natural England*</p>	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the policy for Atlas Quarry (MP2) and Recordon Land (MXP3) to make references to both SSSIs in response to these comments and for consistency with the current planning application to expand the existing quarry onto the Recordon Land (14/0619/CM), which has identified impacts on hydrology and on the SSSIs as important “material considerations.” The level of detail included in the SAD is appropriate for a local plan.</p> <p>N.B. Policy for Atlas Quarry and Recordon Land has now been combined and brought together in Policy M7 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.</p>
<p>Policy M6: Policy M6: Brick Clay Extraction – Permitted Sites</p> <p>MP6: Highfields South</p>	<p>Policy is appropriate and supported. Requirements for complying with the already approved schemes will be reflected in our proposals for the site. We can confirm there remains a small amount of clay reserve within the area of the permitted extraction void. This is just sufficient to provide the material needed for the engineering of the next cell in the base of the site and for restoration.</p>	<p>Cory Environmental</p>	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>Support welcomed. Although no change to the policy for MP6: Highfields South is sought by the respondent, it is proposed to amend it to reflect the respondent’s comments, in response to comments received from Natural England.</p> <p>N.B. Policy for Highfields South is now in Policy M8 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.</p>
<p>Policy M6: Policy M6: Brick Clay Extraction – Permitted Sites</p>	<p>Question why extraction of remaining reserves at this site are not being pursued ahead of fresh reserves within the proposed new</p>	<p>Environment Agency,* Natural England*</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>There is an approved restoration programme for this site (07/0046/WA/E1), which already includes proposals to enhance the wildlife</p>

MP6: Highfields South	Area of Search MXA9: North of A461' (SAD Policy M8). Consideration should be given to impact or enhancement of wildlife corridors leading to Jockey Fields SSSI immediately to the north.		corridors and does not permit any further mineral extraction. The sterilisation of reserves was justified at the time the programme was approved because it would reduce the impact of working on nearby residential properties, accelerate restoration and provide a valuable link between the SSSIs in the area. The existing restoration programme is designed around the existing void which is filled in a cell by cell basis. A new extraction scheme would require redesign of the restoration programme, phasing plan and cell design and the site would take even longer to restore than is currently proposed (recent EIA Screening Application proposes this will take until 2025). The operator has also confirmed (see above) that the remaining clay reserve is just sufficient to provide the material needed for the engineering of the next cell in the base of the site and for restoration purposes, indicating that it is not feasible to extract any further clay from this site for supply to brickworks. N.B. Policy for Highfields South is now in Policy M8 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.
Policy M6: Brick Clay Extraction – Permitted Sites MP7: Sandown Quarry Policy M7: Brickworks	Support policy for Sandown Brickworks, and agree that restoration of this area should look to create habitats that compliment the adjacent Stubbers Green SSSI.	Environment Agency,* Natural England*	No changes proposed. General support for policies on Sandown Quarry and Brickworks welcomed - no change proposed in response to this comment. However, the policies have been updated to reflect the recent planning permission to increase imports of clay to the brickworks to up to 95% (15/0303/FL), and a review of the requirements of the existing

MB3: Sandown Brickworks			<p>permissions for the quarry. The SAD cannot impose requirements that conflict with existing planning permissions, and the amendments to the policies reflect this limitation.</p> <p>N.B. Policy for Sandown Brickworks is now in Policy M6 and Policy for Sandown Quarry is now in Policy M7 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.</p>
<p>Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – New Sites</p> <p>MXA3: Stubbers Green Area of Search</p>	<p>Natural England would object to any proposals for mineral extraction on Stubbers Green Bog SSSI and Swan Pool and the Swag SSSI which are within the Area of Search. Policy recognises the limitations upon further potential extraction within this area, over and above those already identified at Atlas and Sandown Quarries and Recordon land. However, both agencies note that Part d) of policy supports deeper working at existing permitted sites subject to a number of criteria, but does not require assessment of impacts on protected sites. They advise that this be amended to include ‘the environment’ and, specifically, protected sites such as Stubbers Green Bog SSSI and Swan Pool and the Swag SSSI.</p>	<p>Environment Agency,* Natural England*</p>	<p>Changes proposed.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the policy for the Stubbers Green Area of Search in response to these comments. While the potential impacts of further mineral working on designated sites are already identified in general terms in Black Country Core Strategy Policy MIN3, it is agreed that there is merit in adding appropriate cross-references in the relevant SAD policy, to ensure that the effects on SSSIs are fully evaluated if new proposals for deeper working on permitted sites come forward.</p> <p>N.B. Policy for Stubbers Green Area of Search and the sites within it (Atlas Quarry, Recordon Land and Sandown Quarry) have now been brought together in Policy M7 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.</p>
Policy M6: Brick Clay	Objections to proposed Area of	Holford Farm	Changes proposed.

<p>Extraction – Permitted Sites</p> <p>MP9: Highfields North</p> <p>Policy M8: Brick Clay Extraction – New Sites</p> <p>MXA9: Land North of A461</p>	<p>Search (MXA9) North of the A461 on grounds that there are no defined boundaries, there is no proven reserve, and there would be harmful impacts on agricultural land and farming businesses at Grange Farm and Blackcock Farm, as well as harmful effects on nature conservation sites in this area. This is a highly sensitive area and alternative sites that would have lesser ecological impacts should be considered first. If deemed acceptable proposals must look at recreating and restoring habitat to equal or better quality than that lost. Mineral extraction within the Jockey Fields SSSI would permanently destroy the site's special features. Natural England should therefore be consulted on any proposals affecting the SSSI.</p>	<p>Group, Environment Agency*, Natural England*</p>	<p>It is proposed to remove the Area of Search designation from the SAD and replace it with a more general policy statement on further brick clay extraction proposals outside the Highfields North permitted site. This reflects the view that proposals are unlikely to be supported in this area unless they facilitate revocation of the “dormant” permission and minimise impacts on agricultural land and holdings and designated nature conservation sites. Further correspondence with the Holford Farm Group following the Preferred Options consultation has confirmed that the land in this area includes some of the "best and most versatile" agricultural land, and that mineral working is likely to have harmful effects on the farming business as well as being detrimental to designated nature conservation sites other than the Jockey Fields SSSI and SLINC. As the land owner is not willing to entertain mineral working, there is no justification for identifying an Area of Search in this location.</p> <p>However, minerals can only be worked where they are found, and the area to the north of the A461 is the only area where Etruria Formation brick clay resources are found in Walsall, other than at Stubbers Green. It is therefore the only area in the borough likely to have the potential to provide a supply of clay for Sandown Works. While it would not be possible to avoid the significant harm to the Jockey Fields SSSI that would result from working within the permitted</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>area of Highfields North (MP9) once a suitable schedule of working conditions is in place, it is proposed to amend the policy for this site to ensure that the impact on the Jockey Fields SSSI and SLINC is minimised as far as possible, and that the restoration of the site includes recreated habitats of equivalent type and value to those within the SSSI across at least 90% of the worked area, reflecting the proportion of the Highfields North site covered by the SSSI designation.</p> <p>N.B. Policy for Highfields North and the surrounding brick clay resource area is now included in Policy M8 following re-organisation of Chapter 9.</p>
Policy M9: Coal and Fireclay Extraction - Brownhills Common	Support requirement for assessment of impacts on Chasewater and Southern Staffordshire Coalfield Heaths SSSI. However, policy should require sites to mitigate for their impact during operation of the site not just retain existing habitats as long as possible and then restore them. Early phasing of restoration should be sought to ensure retention of a nature conservation corridor. Natural England should also be consulted on any potential impact on the SSSI.	Lichfield District Council,* Environment Agency*	<p>Change proposed.</p> <p>Support for policy welcomed. It is acknowledged that the policy could be clearer with regard to the need for compensation for loss of habitats while working is underway, and it is proposed to amend it accordingly.</p>
Policy M9: Coal and	Support not taking forward an	Staffordshire	Change proposed.

Fireclay Extraction - Yorks Bridge	allocation for minerals development at Yorks Bridge in light of the current evidence, and criteria for assessing mineral extraction proposals in this area. However, it would be helpful to refer to the local road network, particularly Lime Lane.	County Council,* Cannock Chase District Council*	Comment about impacts on transport network is noted, and it is proposed to amend the policy accordingly. However, as is explained in the Policy Justification, the BCCS designation of Yorks Bridge as an Area of Search remains in place, and the SAD will not have any effect on this. The Core Strategy review, which is expected to begin in 2016, will consider whether it is appropriate to retain the area of search designation, having regard to the most up-to-date evidence of viability and deliverability.
Policy M10: Unconventional Hydrocarbons	Policy is supported.	Coal Authority	No change proposed. Support welcomed - no change proposed in response to this comment.
10. Transport and Infrastructure			
General	Support for the policies	Black Country LEP*, WMITA*, Highways England*, Pegasus Planning	No change proposed. Welcome support
Policy T3	Support for the safeguarding of the current disused rail alignment between Walsall and Brownhills	WMITA*, Lichfield District Council*	No change proposed. Welcome support
Rapid Transit Study	Any recommendations of Walsall MBC for its site development allocations which are related to the Rapid Transit Study need to be mindful of ensuring they are	WMITA*	No change proposed The rapid transit project will use the rail lines between Walsall and Wolverhampton and Walsall and Wednesbury, which are protected for rail use. The SPRINT bus service to

	compatible with the forthcoming way ahead for development of a rail and rapid transit network which serves the Black Country and the wider West Midlands.		Birmingham will use the existing highway.
Policy T3	WMITA wishes that proposed new stations at James Bridge and Willenhall and any associated park and ride facilities are referenced and protected in the SAD	WMITA*	No change proposed. At present there is no proposal for a station at James Bridge. This can be brought forward through a planning application at the appropriate time. The SAD does not cover Willenhall District Centre; however there is provision for a station in the UDP Willenhall Inset Plan. This will continue to apply.
Policy T4	A 25m wide buffer adjacent to the carriageway is protected in the Darlaston Local Development Order, as a set-back to enable any potential future requirement for improvement or maintenance works. HE would recommend that this precedent be followed in all forthcoming development sites, so as not to impede future access for the purpose of improvement and maintenance of the Strategic Road Network.	Highways England	Changes proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to reflect Highways England's points and ensure it interests can be considered in relation to future decisions. The approach is proposed to be similar to that in the Local Development Order for Darlaston.
Policy T4			A change is proposed to reflect emerging work across the West Midlands that is proposing to use the Highways England 'Strategic Road Network' and the WM authorities' & WMITA 'Key Route Network' as the basis for defining the

			borough's Strategic Highway Network. This means that some additional routes (Including Sutton Road (B4151) and Northgate (B4152) are identified on the Policies Map.
Policy T4			There will be some minor changes to Policy T4 to update the situation in relation to policy guidance and to refer to the West Midlands Strategic Transport Plan.

APPENDIX B - continued

‘Preferred Options’ Consultation

A schedule of all of the representations received with responses on behalf of the council will be published as part of the consultation on the plans.

ii) Main Issues considered to arise as a result of consultation on the AAP

Topic/ Policy	Issue / Point Raised	If subject to representation who made them (* =DtC party)	Changes to the Plan for Publication Stage
2. Walsall Town Centre – Strategy and Objectives			
Historic Environment	Request that we utilise the Characterisation Study and detailed site appraisal work further to ensure the historic environment is given sufficient consideration. Some policies need a stronger reference to the historic environment.	Historic England*	Changes proposed. Amendments to policies and supporting text to include more detail on the potential impact to the historic environment sites, and to make better reference to the Characterisation Study.
Safety and Security	Some policies need more reference to creating safe and secure environments. Also request there should be a specific ATM policy.	PCCWM	Change proposed. Minor changes to policy wording to reflect the importance of safe and secure environments generally. The considerations will be applicable to ATMs, but it is not proposed to have a specific policy on ATMs.
Environment Objective	Include reference to the value and benefits of multi-functional green	Natural	Change proposed. Slightly revisiting the wording of the objective to

	infrastructure	England*	reflect the point made.
3. A Place for Shopping			
AAPS1: Primary Shopping Area (PSA)	Request for Former Shannon's Mill site to be considered as 'PSA Expansion Area' and therefore immediately in accordance with the sequential test. Also a request for Jerome Retail Park to be included in the PSA.	Norton and Proffitt Developments Ltd (Planning Prospects)- Shannon's Mill site and AEW UK (Brooke Smith Planning) – Jerome Retail Park	No change proposed. There is no evidence to justify the expansion of the PSA and this would be contrary to the advice given by the council's consultants.
4. A Place for Business			
AAPB1: Office Development	Post-consultation discussions with Walsall College have resulted in a suggested change to land allocated for the college expansion.		Changes proposed. Site TC47 is being changed from a site proposed for College expansion in AAPLV2 to a potential office development site under AAPB1. (now part of TC46 which boundary has changed to exclude east of Portland Street). A new site at Day Street/ Garden Street (currently called TC48a) which was previously part of TC46 office allocation has been added, still as office allocation.
AAPB2: Social Enterprise Zone	Support the policy. Have ambitions to expand the area and also develop a business park in St Matthew's Quarter.	The Vine Trust Group	Change proposed. The Social Enterprise Zone allocation is being expanded to include Millennium House and policy will also be slightly amended to include

			educational uses in the list of suitable uses.
5. A Place for Leisure			
AAPPLE1: New Leisure Development	There have been some recent enquires around suitable locations for drive-through facilities but the plan does not currently provide guidance on locations for such uses.		Change proposed. Amendment to include guidance of suitable locations for drive-through facilities to ensure they are well integrated with the centre as a whole.
AAPPLE2: Sport and Cultural Facilities	In the long term, it may be appropriate to move the Gala Baths to a new site with more facilities that are suitable, sustainable and cost effective.	Sport England	No change proposed. Any long term changes to Gala are likely to be outside of the plan period and there are unlikely to be the resources available for a major new development.
AAPPLE3: Hotel Provision	There have been some recent enquiries around suitable locations for conferencing and banqueting facilities but the plan does not currently provide guidance on locations for such uses		Change proposed. Expansion of policy to provide guidance around suitable locations for banqueting and conference facilities.
AAPPLE4: Walsall Canal	Any additional secure moorings in Walsall Town Centre should include facilities for both visiting and residential boats	Canal & River Trust	Change proposed. Amendment of supporting text to identify that there might be potential for moorings for residential boats. There is, however, no evidence of demand or feasibility.
6. A Place for Living			
AAPLV2: Education	Post consultation discussions with the College have resulted in a suggested change to land allocated for the college expansion.		Change proposed. Site TC47 is being changed from a site proposed for College expansion to a potential office development whilst some of the land

			allocated under site TC46 as potential office development (east of Portland Street) (Policy AAPB1) will be allocated for College expansion.
AAPLV4: Community Facilities	We have had no response from community groups in support of the allocation of Challenge Block for a community hub.		Change proposed. The community hub allocation is being removed from Challenge Block but reference remains in the justification text.
APPLV7: Enhancing the Public Realm [See also AAPT1 Access and Linkages - 7. Transport Movement and Accessibility]	Internal discussions around the public realm strategy have concluded that further work is needed to improve connections between the new cinema and Park Street		Change proposed. The area allocated for public realm improvements is being expanded to include the Art Gallery Square and space connecting Crown Wharf, the new cinema and Park Street. Further 'opportunities for improved linkages' are being shown to encourage better linkages with the cinema.
AAPLV8: Environmental Infrastructure	Where feasible, opportunities to open up culverted watercourses should be sought. SuDS can also play an important part in alleviating surface water flooding problems that exist in some parts of the town centre. Consider further flood resistance and resilience measures.	Environment Agency*	Change proposed. Strengthening references to flood mitigation and management where relevant and feasible.
AAPLV8: Environmental Infrastructure	Request specific policy support for local renewable and low carbon energy projects including district heating.	Natural England*	Change proposed. Including a statement in the policy to say we would support deliverable proposals that come forward in the town centre. No feasible schemes have been identified for which land would be required.

AAPLV8: Environmental Infrastructure and AAPLV7: Enhancing the Public Realm	There should be better connections between public realm and green infrastructure.	Environment Agency*	Change proposed. Amendment to policy and public realm strategy to reflect the need for better linkages.
AAPLV8: Environmental Infrastructure [See also AAPT1 Access and Linkages - 7. Transport Movement and Accessibility]	There has recently been an application for a bridge across the Canal so there is potential for better linkages on both sides of the canal.		Change proposed. Allocation of a proposed Greenway on the cinema side of the canal.
7. Transport, Movement and Accessibility			
AAPT1 Access and Linkages and AAPT3: Public Transport [See also AAPLV7: Enhancing the Public Realm - A Place for Living]	The plan needs to say more about St Paul's bus station as many people feel it is unsafe and difficult to use. West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority offered to work with us on general public transport improvements including a signage strategy and connectivity throughout the centre	Informal comments at consultation events and West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority*	Change proposed. Amendment to the policy to include a statement saying we will look for opportunities to improve St Paul's bus station and the general usability of public transport. Also expanding the area of allocation for improved public realm to cover more of the bus station and including some further 'opportunities for improved linkages' to the bus station.
AAPT3: Public Transport	Object to the new bus interchange proposal as this impacts on retail floorspace and parking. Also object to cycle path proposal as this could mean loss of land.	AEW UK Brooke Smith Planning – Jerome Retail Park	No change proposed. The bus interchange is considered crucial to improving the centre. We will continue to work with Centro to understand the land requirements in light of these objections. It is not considered that the cycle path proposal will have any negative impact on the Jerome Retail Park.

AAPT3: Public Transport and AAPT4: Road Improvements	Need to ensure there is road capacity for bus, cycle and pedestrians.	West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority*	Changed proposed. Amendment to policy to include references to road capacity to support improvements in bus services.
AAPT4: Road Improvements	Modelling is being undertaken on road network in the centre to test that the amount of development and locations identified can be accommodated		Change proposed. Amendment to policy to incorporate relevant findings and to update proposed 'Location for junction improvements' designations where necessary.
AAPT5: Car Parking	There were no formal responses to the proposed allocation of a new multi-storey car park as such the Council is undertaking further work on the deliverability model for a car park and the highway implications		No change proposed. Work on delivery is continuing and will be reflected further work on the plan.
AAPT5: Car Parking	Need to consider what impact the loss of Day Street would have on the accessibility of the new Heritage Centre if delivered	The Civic Society	No change proposed. Both the planning for the Heritage Centre and the future development of the Day Street site will need to take account of the other policies of the plan, including for pedestrian linkages.
8. A Place for Investment			
AAP13: Walsall Gigaport	Site TC41 (Challenge Block) has the Ford brook bordering the site to the west. Any development on this site should look to improve the structure and habitat of the brook. Consideration should be given to setting back development from the river and improving the water	Environment Agency*	Change proposed. Amendments to the policy and the justification to ensure that flooding, drainage, water and amenity issues can be taken into account insofar as feasible.

	quality of any site drainage going into the river. Opportunities to deculvert the Ford Brook through site TC44 should be explored and the exact line of the culvert obtained.		
AAPI3: Walsall Gigaport	We have had no response from community groups in support of the allocation of Challenge Block for a community hub.		The community hub allocation is being removed from Challenge Block but reference remains in the justification text.
AAPI3: Walsall Gigaport	Discussions around proposals at the site have raised a number of issues around design requirements.		Change proposed. Amendment to policy to provide more guidance to developers as to what is expected at this site.
AAPI7: Addressing Potential Site Constraints	Issues of contaminated land remediation and general aquifer protection (quality and quantity) have not been addressed sufficiently.	Environment Agency*	Change proposed. Amendment to policy and supporting text, to better identify the issues and to explain how the issues have been taken into account insofar as appropriate and feasible.
AAPI7: Addressing Potential Site Constraints	Recommended that further assessment and clarification should be included within the AAP indicating precisely which of the proposed allocations are affected by mining legacy. The site allocation methodology and assessment process needs to be revised taking into account unstable land as a relevant consideration.	Coal Authority	Change proposed. Amendment to policy and supporting text, to better identify the issues and to explain how the issues have been taken into account insofar as appropriate and feasible.

APPENDIX B - continued

‘Preferred Options’ Consultation

A schedule of all of the representations received with responses on behalf of the council will be published as part of the consultation on the plans.

iii) Main Issues considered to arise as a result of consultation on the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

Issue / Point Raised	If subject to representation who made them (* =DtC party)	Changes to the draft CIL Charging Schedule, draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan or viability review for next stage of consultation.
The charging zones should be re-drawn to reflect urban form and boundaries on the ground (instead of postcode sectors) to avoid development sites falling within multiple charging zones.	Planning Prospects (on behalf of Norton and Proffitt Developments Ltd)	Postcode sector data is used as a standard way of grouping areas of similar value together. Whatever the approach used it is likely to be difficult to avoid some sites falling within multiple charging zones because not all development site boundaries will be known to the Local Planning Authority.
The proposed £5 nominal charge should be removed as it is not supported by evidence and could put delivery of development at risk.	Planning Prospects (on behalf of Norton and Proffitt Developments Ltd)	No change proposed. A £5 nominal charge has been accepted by an Inspector and adopted by Leeds City Council on the basis that it would represent a very small proportion of development costs and unlikely to put delivery of development at risk. The proposed £5 nominal charge, if not introduced at Walsall would result in around £1 million less funding towards necessary

		infrastructure to support development. It is considered that this issue will best be explored through the Examination process.
Request inclusion of Police and Emergency Services on Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Regulation 123 List to benefit from CIL funds.	Tyler Parkes (on behalf of Police and Crime Commissioner West Midlands)	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The forecast CIL receipts of around £5 million fall significantly short of the identified funding gap of over £180 million and it is unlikely that the Council will be able to fund all infrastructure projects put forward. The Local Planning Authority will however prepare, and review the Regulation 123 List from time to time. A process to prioritise CIL expenditure is also likely to be necessary to ensure some of the infrastructure necessary to support development, which has limited, or no other sources of funding such as Open Spaces benefit from CIL.</p> <p>A funding gap has not been identified or provided in respect of the services referred to and specific details cannot therefore be included within the IDP at this time. The draft IDP refers to use of CIL towards other social / community infrastructure and enables this type of infrastructure to be considered further in the future as and when evidence can be provided.</p>
CIL rates should not be set at a rate that would affect the delivery of affordable housing.	Tetlow King Planning (on behalf of West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium)	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The proposed CIL rates have been set taking account of the Council's affordable housing requirements as set out in the published viability study.</p>
Viability study does not include	Tetlow King Planning (on behalf of	No change proposed.

worked examples.	West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium)	Residential archetypes have been used and affordable housing requirements and other policy associated costs have been taken account of as set out in the residential chapter of the published viability study. Site appraisals have been provided in the published viability study.
Viability study suggests affordable housing will comprise 100% affordable rent but BCCS states tenure will be worked out on site by site basis. CIL should be reviewed every 3 years or a 10% change in house prices.	Tetlow King Planning (on behalf of West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium)	No change proposed. The Local Planning Authority has been advised by Strategic Housing that the tenure for affordable housing required in Walsall is currently affordable rent. Should this position, or the market change the charging schedule would be reviewed at that time.
Would like clarification if the 60 bed care home tested in the viability study included C2 Extra Care uses or just C3 due to the different requirements and characteristics these involve.	Tetlow King Planning (on behalf of West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium)	Change proposed. Clarification will be provided on the approaches taken to different kinds of housing uses, including where various levels of care are to be provided.
Require clarification on whether any small non-allocated housing sites area to be located within the 8km zone of influence of Cannock Chase SAC as these would be liable for contributions. Require clarification that if windfall sites come forward in the area CIL would be top sliced for SAC	Cannock Chase Council*	No change proposed Walsall is not intending to allocate small sites for housing in the SAD. Few, if any small housing sites are expected to come forward for development within the 8km zone of influence of the Cannock Chase SAC where the SAC Partnership is currently proposing to levy charges meant to mitigate impacts on the SAC. No change proposed at this time.

contributions in line with approach used by other authorities in the SAC zone of influence.		The forecast receipts from CIL over the plan period across the whole of the borough fall significantly short of the identified funding gap. This means the Council will need to prioritise the expenditure of any funds to ensure the necessary infrastructure is funded to support development in the borough and it is likely there will be insufficient funds to meet the needs of all infrastructure projects. This will be a matter for the Council to consider and agree and will form part of discussions throughout the forthcoming stages of consultation, including in relation to the Habitats Regulations.
Rate may be too high and discourage development from taking place rather than encouraging it.	Persimmon Homes	No change proposed. Proposed CIL rates have not been set at the margins of viability and sufficient headroom has been provided (46% to 74% below maximum amount available for residential development) to avoid impacts on delivery of development. Evidence should be submitted to the Council if further assessment is to be justified.
Believe higher rate has been set due to reluctance to release green belt for development and gives impression that borough is unwilling to take a share of Birmingham's shortfall of housing which Peter Brett Associates report suggests should go in area covered by Zone 1 [i.e. Walsall's Green Belt]. Urges	Persimmon Homes	No change proposed. CIL rates cannot be set to suit policy objectives and the proposed rates have been calculated on the basis of the evidence set out in the published viability study. The issue of the projected 'Birmingham' housing shortfall will be a matter for the review of the Black Country Core Strategy. The work so far by Peter Brett Associates, whilst

caution about £100 p/sq m rate for residential as will discourage development in Zone 1.		referring to the likelihood of a need for Green Belt reviews over a wide area does not make any specific proposals for the location on additional housing.
Discourages use of £5 nominal rate in challenging areas in favour of CIL Free Zones as well as 'no minimum' requirement on affordable housing to encourage development in challenging areas.	Persimmon Homes	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>A £5 nominal charge has been accepted by an Inspector and adopted by Leeds City Council on the basis that it would represent a very small proportion of development costs and unlikely to put delivery of development at risk.</p> <p>The proposed £5 nominal charge, if not introduced at Walsall would result in around £1 million less funding towards necessary infrastructure to support development.</p> <p>It is considered that this issue will best be explored through the Examination process.</p> <p>In respect of affordable housing generally, the council has to work within the policies of the Black Country Core Strategy. It does this flexibly with arrangements to take account of viability issues.</p>
Proposed charge for food retail uses over 2,000sq m would make development unviable and would prevent new 'deep discounter' retail stores being developed throughout the borough. Threshold size should be increased to 3,000 sq m as discounter supermarkets are now developing above 2,000sq m.	JLL (on behalf of Lidl)	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Viability study shows the proposed rates (set at between 73% to 88% below the maximum available for retail development) would not affect the delivery of development. Evidence should be submitted to the Council if further assessment is to be justified.</p>

Require sight of development appraisals to enable full review of proposals.	JLL (on behalf of Lidl)	No change proposed. Site appraisals have been provided in the published viability study.
<p>Proposed £75/sq m charge for retail warehousing could impact on developers ability to redevelop existing retail parks.</p> <p>Needs to clarify that this charge applies to A1 use class not other uses.</p>	Quod (on behalf of Walsall Bescot Predera Ltd)	<p>No change proposed. Viability study shows the proposed rates (set at between 73% to 88% below the maximum available for retail development) would not affect the delivery of development. Evidence should be submitted to the Council if further assessment is to be justified.</p> <p>No change proposed. In some cases retailing might not fall within use class A1. For example retail warehouse club operations which require a membership are <i>sui generis</i> but share many of the characteristics of retail warehousing.</p>
<p>Proposed residential rates in Zones 1 and 2 are unviable and concerns over viability approach.</p> <p>Raises a number of concerns and queries about the approach taken in the viability study</p>	Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey PLC)	<p>No change proposed – in respect of the main point. Proposed CIL rates have not been set at the margins of viability and sufficient headroom has been provided (46% to 74% below maximum amount available for residential development) to avoid impacts on delivery of development. Evidence should be submitted to the Council if further assessment is to be justified.</p> <p>Changes proposed. Clarification will be provided in response the detailed issues raised.</p>

Garden centres should be excluded from 'non food retail warehousing' category.	Pleydell Smithyman	No change proposed. Garden centres are a <i>sui generis</i> use and would not fall within the definition of a retail warehouse (unless a garden centre area is provided as an ancillary use to a retail warehouse).
Proposed CIL charge of £100/sq m on residential would make residential schemes unviable when cost of other infrastructure requirements such as S106 are added.	Lioncourt Strategic Land	No change proposed. Proposed CIL rates have not been set at the margins of viability and sufficient headroom has been provided (46% to 74% below maximum amount available for residential development) to avoid impacts on delivery of development. Section 106 costs have been accounted for as set out in the published viability study. Evidence should be submitted to the Council if further assessment is to be justified.
Charging zone boundaries need to be shown more clearly on the map and should follow existing linear features (roads, railway, watercourses). Inset maps of individual zones would help identify boundaries.	Lioncourt Strategic Land	No change proposed. A higher quality large version of the draft charging zones map has since been published. The evidence has been assembled and assessed by the council's consultants on the basis of postcode geography.
Concerns with the model used to test viability for specialist accommodation for elderly people.	The Planning Bureau Ltd (on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd)	Change proposed. Clarification will be provided on the approaches taken to different kinds of housing uses, including where housing is for people, such as the elderly, that might have specialist needs,

APPENDIX C
Walsall Site Allocation Document – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling
Showpeople
Draft Site Assessment Matrix

Current Council Policies

Black Country Core Strategy Policy HOU4 sets out indicative targets for new pitches and plots and states that the local authorities will allocate sites through Site Allocation Documents and Area Action Plans. The policy sets out criteria to be used to assess proposals where there is demonstrable need not met through allocated sites.

The BCCS does not provide criteria to be used directly to allocate sites. However, SAD Policy HC4 uses the BCCS criteria as the basis for the selection of the proposed sites in the SAD.

A large number of potential sites would meet these criteria. The total capacity of the sites listed in the Preferred Options version of the SAD is well in excess of that required to meet the BCCS targets, particularly for gypsies and travellers (the capacity of the potential showpeople sites is only just sufficient). Changes since the accommodation need assessment was made in 2008, especially in current and emerging Government policy, mean that the current need for sites is also likely to be less. It is therefore necessary to develop a more refined matrix to identify which of the potential sites would be most suitable for allocation.

The total capacity of the sites identified in the SAD would be 120 traveller pitches and 13 showpeople plots. Some of the traveller sites, with a total capacity of up to 40 pitches, are identified as also being suitable as showpeople plots. If used as such, the total capacity would be 80 traveller pitches and 53 showpeople plots. However, the Preferred Options SAD suggested that a maximum of only 28 permanent pitches and 30 plots are required between now and 2026. These numbers could be reduced further depending on the methodology used to calculate need.

Government Policy

The Government formerly published a Good Practice Guide on Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites. This addressed both site location and selection, and site layout. The Guide was referred to in a large number of representations received from residents objecting to a site proposed in the SAD at Poplar Avenue, Bentley (however, the Guide had not been referred to in any documents produced by the Council for the Preferred Options consultation). However, the current Government withdrew this guide at the end of August 2015.

The only current Government guidance that might help in producing a site assessment matrix is in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, a revised version of which was also issued in August 2015. Relevant points in this Policy include the following.

Paragraph 4:

Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:

- d. plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.
- e. to promote more traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites.
- i. to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities
- j. to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure
- k. for local planning authorities to have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment

Paragraph 10:

Local planning authorities should, in producing their Local Plan:

- a) identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites
- b) identify a supply of specific, developable sites, or broad locations for growth, for years 6 to 10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.
- d) relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density.
- e) protect local amenity and environment.

Paragraph 13:

Local planning authorities should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally. Local planning authorities should, therefore, ensure that their policies:

- a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community
- b) promote, in collaboration with commissioners of health services, access to appropriate health services
- c) ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis
- d) provide a settled base that reduces both the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment
- e) provide for proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality (such as noise and air quality) on the health and well-being of any travellers that may locate there or on others as a result of new development
- f) avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services
- g) do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans
- h) reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles (whereby some travellers live and work from the same location thereby omitting many travel to work journeys) can contribute to sustainability.

Paragraph 16:

Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.

Paragraph 18:

Local planning authorities should consider, wherever possible, including traveller sites suitable for mixed residential and business uses, having regard

to the safety and amenity of the occupants and neighbouring residents. Local planning authorities should consider the scope for identifying separate sites for residential and for business purposes in close proximity to one another if mixed sites are not practical.

Paragraph 19:

Local planning authorities should have regard to the need that travelling showpeople have for mixed-use yards to allow residential accommodation and space for storage equipment.

There is no current published Government guidance on the design of plots for Showpeople. However, the Showmen's Guild has produced its own guidance, and this has been used to estimate the capacity of potential showpeople sites.

Preferred Options Consultation

Representations received at the Preferred Options stage raised a number of issues. Some of these are similar to those in the Government policy above, whilst some could be useful in a site assessment matrix. Other issues however, are not planning issues or could apply to any proposal for gypsies, travellers and/or travelling showpeople. The points raised included:

- Increase in crime/ anti-social behaviour/ flytipping and rubbish
Not a site specific issue so would not be appropriate for matrix
- Impact on schools and health services that are already overloaded
Relates to Govt Policy paragraph 13 clauses b) and c). However, impact on these services is also an issue for sites proposed in the SAD for general housing so is not specific to GTTS sites. All the GTTS proposed in the SAD would have at least moderate access to these services.
- Traffic and access difficulties for large vehicles/ caravans
Some of the proposed sites might have access difficulties, so this issue should form part of the matrix. Could also be considered under Impact on infrastructure in Govt Policy paragraph 13 f).
- Will travellers pay Council Tax/ utility bills etc.?
- Property devaluation
Neither of these issues are material to site selection
- Physical conditions on some sites: poor drainage, mineshafts, air pollution
These issues would affect some of the proposed sites, and are related to Govt policy paragraph 13 e).
- Site is in middle of built up area: traveller site will not integrate with existing community
Relates to Govt policy paragraph 13 clause a) and paragraph 18
- Alternative uses preferred, including affordable housing, open space, community facilities and car parking
Relevant where there is evidence of a shortfall of land for these uses in the area.

Scoring Mechanism

A traffic light system is proposed as follows. This is similar to that used in the original Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Survey carried out for the Council in 2010.

Red – site does not meet the required standards, and issues are incapable of being addressed

Amber – site does not fully meet required standard but could be brought forward if alternatives are limited or if the issue can be mitigated

Green – site meets required standard.

This scoring mechanism has only been used to assess the potential traveller sites. Given that fewer potential showpeople sites have been identified, and they have not raised the same degree of controversy, the mechanism has not been used to assess showpeople sites.

Proposed Matrix

1) What is the potential capacity?

This assumes a density of 22 pitches per hectare. There is no longer a maximum recommended size in national guidelines of 15 pitches per site, however this size limit has still been adhered to because of community cohesion and to minimise the concentration of sites in any single part of the borough.

2) Is site in Green Belt?

3) Ownership? Walsall Council/ willing landowner/ other?

4) Would location promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community?

5) Would there be a potential adverse impact on amenity and the local environment?

This relates to issues such as nature conservation sites on or adjacent to the site that are not examined under the other criteria in the matrix.

6) Is the site deliverable within 5 years, or does it lie in a broad location that could be delivered in years 6 to 10?

It is possible that other sites might come forward during the period of the plan. These could include “consider for release” surplus employment land or other small areas of previously developed land that could be suitable either for general housing or for traveller sites. The potential sites that are named below as deliverable in years 6 to 10 therefore only represent a sample of such sites.

7) Are there any local environmental quality issues such as noise and air quality that might impact on travellers locating on the site?

8) Is site affected by any physical constraints such as ground conditions or flooding?

9) Would there be any adverse impact on local infrastructure and services relating to issues such as access? The response assumes that the number of pitches is limited to that stated (more pitches, for example, would generate more traffic)

10) Is there potential for mixed residential and business use?

11) Is there an identified need to use the site for an alternative use that cannot be easily accommodated elsewhere?

This matrix only assesses potential permanent gypsy and traveller sites. Some of the criteria could also be used to assess transit sites (although none are proposed in the SAD) or showpeople sites. Some of the sites might also be suitable for use by showpeople. However sites for travelling showpeople are expected to be all privately owned and developed. The Preferred Options consultation identified potential sites that should be sufficient to meet the projected need for to accommodate travelling showpeople. The consultation did not raise any issues as to why any of these sites should not be taken forward. Therefore, it is proposed that all of the identified sites for new accommodation for travelling showpeople should be included in the Publication version of the SAD.

Suitable for Allocation?	Comments	11) Need site for alternative uses?	10) Potential for mixed use?	9) Impact on local infrastructure	8) Physical constraints	7) Environmental quality issues?	6) Deliverable?	5) Impact on local environment	4) Integration with Local Community	3) Ownership	2) In Green Belt?	1) Potential capacity (pitches)	Reference	Site Name
Yes, residential only	Site currently has temporary planning permission granted on appeal pending SAD	No	No. Area is entirely residential	None	None	None	Yes – existing site	No adverse impact	Site originally allowed on appeal but no recent adverse representations	Private – existing site	Yes	4	GT5	Cartbridge Lane
Yes, residential only	Site currently has personal planning permission	No	No. Surrounding area is open countryside	None	None	None	Yes – existing site	No adverse impact	Isolated site with no nearby community. Only one representation received at Preferred Options stage	Private – existing site	Yes	4	GT6	34-38 Gould Firm Lane (a)
Yes	Site is already at maximum recommended size for community cohesion. Location in Green Belt and proximity of motorway noise also rules out further substantial expansion	No	Yes, existing industrial area nearby	None	Part of site is in flood zone	Close to motorway: noise and air quality issues but may be within acceptable limits	Yes, subject to funding. Green belt location would be an obstacle	No adverse impact	Isolated site. No representations received at Preferred Options stage	Council – existing site	Yes	2	GT1	Willenhall Lane (b)
Yes, residential only	Small site would have minimal impact on surroundings if used for residential only	No. Planning application for conventional residential development has been refused previously because of limited amenity space	No. Area is entirely residential	Narrow access may not be suitable for larger vehicles	None	None	Would require private developer	No adverse impact	Backland development adjacent to existing single pitch. Large GT community in bricks and mortar housing nearby	Private – owned by traveller	No	3	GT50	Rear of 48-72 Foster Street, Blakenall

Goscote Lodge Crescent	HO 27	15 (d)	No	Council (additional surrounding land is owned by WHG)	Site is currently isolated but is part of larger regeneration area with new housing proposed. History of unauthorised encampments on site. 132 signature petition and 11 individual letters at PO stage refer to site. Large GT community in bricks and mortar housing nearby	No adverse impact	Would require funding and consideration of layout in relation to surrounding proposed housing development	None	None	None	No. Area is proposed for residential development	Potential impact on viability of regeneration proposals for wider area if conventional housing is omitted from part of site	Difficult to design site in isolation from consideration of residential layout of wider area	No, unless as part of wider development. Would not be allocated if Dolphin Close goes ahead
Dolphin Close (Goscote Site C)	HO 28	10	No	Council	Adjacent to supported housing scheme. 40 signature petition and 22 individual letters at PO stage refer to site. Large GT community in bricks and mortar housing nearby	Canal adjacent but forms defined boundary	Yes, subject to funding	None	None	Adjacent canal bridge unsuitable for larger vehicles, but alternative access to west	Yes. Existing industrial estate opposite	There are regeneration proposals in wider area but this site is capable of freestanding development	Self contained site that is separated from main residential area. Potential for business use on vacant land opposite	Yes
Goscote Copper Works	HO 29	15 (d)	No	Private – owner did not respond to Preferred	Part of large regeneration site (the largest potential housing site)	Canal adjacent but site is large enough to allow	Would require willing owner, funding and	None	Site believed to be contaminated as result of	None	Site is former factory, but surrounding area is residential	Potential impact on viability of regeneration proposals for wider area if conventional	Difficult to design site in isolation from consideration of residential layout of wider area	No, unless as part of wider development. Would not be allocated if Dolphin Close

				Options consultation	in the borough) but adjacent to established residential area. 40 signature petition and 35 individual letters at PO stage refer to site. Large GT community in bricks and mortar housing nearby, also existing showpeople site	screening	consideration of layout in relation to surrounding proposed housing development		previous use			housing is omitted from part of site		goes ahead
Poplar Avenue	HO 44	13	No	Council	Currently open space but adjacent to established residential area. Large number of objections at PO stage: 835 letters received (most with standard format)	Currently open space	Yes, subject to funding. Would require substantial landscaping to screen from existing housing and open space	Close to motorway: noise and air quality issues but may be within acceptable limits	Former landfill site adjacent. Any development would need to address ground gas	None	No. Area is entirely residential	Currently open space but there is a surplus in area	Use would be out of keeping with bricks and mortar housing in surrounding area. Also substantial community opposition	No
Churchill Road (c)	HO 180	15	No	Private – site has outline planning permission for residential development and current reserved matters	Currently open space but adjacent to established residential area. Large number of objections at PO stage: 832 letters received (most with	Currently open space	Unlikely in view of private ownership and advanced stage of housing proposals	Close to motorway: noise and air quality issues but may be within acceptable limits	Former landfill site adjacent. Any development would need to address ground gas	None	No. Area is entirely residential	Currently open space but site already has planning permission for housing	Use would be out of keeping with bricks and mortar housing in surrounding area. Also substantial community opposition and site is now in private ownership with advanced proposals for housing	No

				applicatio n, but no represent ation received from owner at PO stage	standard format)									
Land East of Mill Street	HO 49	5	No	Council	Adjacent to mosque and established but deprived residential area. Potential cultural tensions between communities . 41 letters and 244 signature petition received at PO consultation stage	Site is within boundary of SLINC, but this designatio n mainly relates to the railway cutting to the rear	Yes, subject to funding	None	None	None	No. Immediate area is entirely residential or community uses	Local community have requested that site should be car park to serve mosque and church	Substantial community opposition in immediate vicinity, area is very congested, especially in terms of car parking.	No Site is too small to make an allocation for another use in the SAD.
Former Metal Casement s	HO 62	15 (d)	No	Private – owner did not respond to Preferred Options consultati on	Adjacent to established but deprived residential area. 8 individual letters and 300 signature petition received at PO consultation stage.	Canal adjacent but site is large so room to screen	Would require willing owner and funding, including need to address limestone working if this part of site was used	None	Northern part of site is within limestone working	Access is through narrow residenti al streets	Yes. Site is former factory and area is mix of residential and industry	Potential housing site but any development would need to address limestone working	Unsuitable ground conditions under much of site. Willingness of landowner is also unclear, and there is substantial community opposition	No, except for part of site not affected by limestone and unless landowner confirms support. However, this part of the site is also close to existing houses and has poor access
Darlaston Multi- Purpose Centre Site	HO 306	15 (d)	No	Council – under offer	Within established residential area. Large number of representatio ns received at PO stage: 134	Protected trees on edge of site but would not significantly constrain developm ent	Yes, subject to funding and dependent on whether sale for housing proceeds	None	None	Access is through narrow residenti al streets. Limited visibility	No. Industry nearby but immediate surroundings are residential and community uses	Potential general housing site. Local community have also suggested community uses	Substantial community opposition, also access may not be suitable. Potentially not available if discussions on a housing	No

					individual letters and petitions with total of 2642 signatures.					splay if access was from Victoria Road			development are progressed.	
Royal British Legion Club, Broad Lane Gardens, Bloxwich	HO 313	15	No	Council – current leaseholder seeking to terminate	Adjacent to established residential area. 2 individual letters and 168 signature petition received at PO stage. No known existing GT community nearby, but existing Council site is in same ward	No adverse impact. Japanese Knotweed on part of site	Yes, subject to funding and termination of lease	Railway adjacent but noise unlikely to be sufficient to make site unsuitable	None	None	No. Surrounding area is entirely residential	Potential general housing site. Local community have requested starter homes	Self-contained site but no potential for business use and also some community opposition	No
Mill Street	HO 41	10	No	Private – one of the owners submitted representation at Preferred Options stage opposing GT use	Mixed use area with industry and deprived residential area. 41 letters and 244 signature petition received at PO consultation stage	None	No, landowner of part of site opposes proposal	None	None	Access through narrow residential streets, but industrial traffic already uses some of these	Yes. Mix of residential and industrial uses adjacent	Potential general housing site	Landowner is opposed to proposal. Also substantial community opposition	No

Notes:

- (a) This is the existing traveller site that has a personal planning permission. The site was incorrectly described in the Preferred Options SAD as The Paddock, which is actually the adjacent site.
- (b) Addition of two pitches to existing site through conversion of former community room/ office. It should be noted that this conversion would not require planning permission, but details are included in this assessment to ensure details of all potential additional sites are listed.
- (c) This is part of the site described as Poplar Avenue in the Preferred Options SAD.
- (d) Total physical capacity would be more than this if the whole site was used.

Total Capacity of Potential Sites

Willenhall Lane, Bloxwich (GT1)	2 (additional pitches on existing site)
Cartbridge Lane, Rushall (GT5)	4 (existing temporary site to be made permanent)
Gould Firm Lane, Aldridge (GT6)	4 (existing site with personal permission to be made permanent and unrestricted)
Dolphin Close (HO28)	10
48-72 Foster Street, Blakenall (GT50)	3
Total	23

The GTAA revision methodology suggests that between 10 and 20 additional pitches are required by 2026, in addition to the retention of the temporary or personal pitches at Cartbridge Lane and Gould Firm Lane. Willenhall Lane, 48-72 Foster Street and Dolphin Close would provide a total of 15 pitches.

Subject to confirmation in any revised GTAA, the above sites would therefore provide adequate capacity and no further sites would be required to meet identified need. Other sites may come forward as “windfalls” in the same way as small general housing sites, through vacant land in the urban area. An example is a single family pitch that has recently been developed in Croft Street, Willenhall, although this does not at present have planning permission.

Should the above sites not be deliverable or developable, one of the following sites might be a potential alternative, although each of the three sites fails to fully meet several points in the scoring mechanism:

POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE SITES IF ABOVE ARE NOT DELIVERABLE/ DEVELOPABLE

Goscote Lodge Crescent, Goscote (in place of Dolphin Close) (HO27)	15
Goscote Copper Works, Goscote (in place of Dolphin Close) (HO29)	15
Metal Casements, Birchills (part of site outside limestone area) (HO62) (but note concerns above about proximity to existing residents and poor access)	15

The following potential sites identified in the Preferred Options SAD fail to meet one or more significant points in the scoring mechanism and these points are incapable of being addressed. They are therefore no longer proposed as potential traveller sites:

SITES NO LONGER PROPOSED AS POTENTIAL TRAVELLER SITES

- Poplar Avenue, Bentley (HO44)
- Churchill Road, Bentley (HO180)
- Mill Street, Walsall (HO41)
- Land East of Mill Street, Walsall (HO49)
- Darlaston Multi-Purpose Centre Site, Darlaston (HO306)
- Royal British Legion Club, Broad Lane Gardens, Bloxwich (HO313)