



Report to Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council

by B J Juniper BSc, DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 8000

date 10 July 2008

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE TIPTON AREA ACTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Document submitted for examination on 31 October 2007

Examination hearing held on 13 May 2008 at the Training and Development
Centre, Parsonage Street, Oldbury

File Ref: G4620/LDF000639

1 Introduction and Overall Conclusion

- 1.1 Under the terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the purpose of the independent examination of a development plan document (DPD) is to determine:
- (a) whether it satisfies the requirements of s19 and s24(1) of the 2004 Act, the regulations under s17(7), and any regulations under s36 relating to the preparation of the document; and
 - (b) whether it is sound.
- 1.2 This report contains my assessment of the Tipton Area Action Plan (AAP) in terms of the above matters, along with my recommendations and the reasons for them, as required by s20(7) of the 2004 Act.
- 1.3 I am satisfied that the AAP meets the requirements of the Act and Regulations. In particular, Regulation 13(5) states that *'where a DPD contains a policy that is intended to supersede another policy, it must state that fact and identify the superseded policy'*. However, the Council has made it clear that none of the 'saved' policies in the Sandwell Unitary Development Plan (UDP) are superseded by the policies in the AAP. One allocation in the UDP, Key Employment Site EE17, is deleted and the reasons for this are set out clearly in the AAP at paragraphs 4.14 and 5.1. The document also contains a helpful plan (Plan 2) which shows the UDP allocations carried forward together with the sites to which the new Local Policies relate.
- 1.4 My role is also to consider the soundness of the submitted AAP against each of the tests of soundness set out in Planning Policy Statement 12: *Local Development Frameworks* (PPS 12). In line with national policy, this DPD is presumed to be sound unless it is shown to be otherwise by evidence considered during the examination. The changes I have specified in this binding report are made only where there is a clear need to amend the document in the light of the tests of soundness in PPS12. None of these changes should materially alter the substance of the overall plan and its policies, or undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes already undertaken.
- 1.5 My report firstly considers the procedural tests, and then deals with the relevant matters and issues considered during the examination in terms of the tests of conformity, coherence, consistency and effectiveness. My overall conclusion is that the Tipton Area Action Plan is sound, provided it is changed in the ways specified. The principal changes which are required are, in summary:
- a) Strengthening and clarification of the requirement for development to contribute to transport infrastructure improvements;
 - b) Adding milestones and greater detail to the AAP targets to allow for more sophisticated monitoring;

- c) Clarification of the means by which school playing fields will be retained.

The report sets out all the detailed changes required, including those suggested by the Council, to ensure that the plan meets all the tests of soundness.

2 Procedural Tests

- 2.1 The Tipton Area Action Plan is contained within the Council's Local Development Scheme, the updated version of which was approved in December 2007. There it is shown as having a submission date of October 2007 so test i of paragraph 4.24 of PPS12 is met.
- 2.2 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) has been found sound by the Secretary of State and was formally adopted by the Council before the examination hearings took place. It is evident from the documents submitted by the Council, including the Regulation 28 and 31 Statements, that the Council has met the requirements as set out in the Regulations. Test ii is therefore met.
- 2.3 Alongside the preparation of the DPD it is clear that the Council has carried out a parallel process of sustainability appraisal. I agree that, as a result of the scoping exercise carried out, there is no need for an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive and that the requirements of test iii have been complied with.
- 2.4 Accordingly, I find that the procedural tests i, ii and iii have all been satisfied.

3 Conformity, Coherence, Consistency and Effectiveness Tests (tests 4-9)

- 3.1 This part of my report considers the soundness of the AAP in respect of the above tests. In the interests of brevity, I shall proceed on the presumption (set out at para. 4.24 of PPS 12) that the AAP is sound unless it is shown to be otherwise. In particular, I have seen no substantive evidence that the Plan has failed to take into account the Council's Community Strategy (The Sandwell Plan 2006). This is referenced within the AAP and has clearly informed both the broad thrust of the AAP and a number of its specific proposals. I am therefore satisfied that the Plan meets soundness test v.
- 3.2 Having regard to the evidence before me, the representations made to the emerging AAP and the discussions which took place at the examination hearing, I have come to the view that there are five main issues which affect my consideration of the AAP in respect of soundness tests iv and vi to ix:
 - (a) whether the Plan's adoption at this stage would prejudice the proper consideration of alternatives in the forthcoming Black Country Joint Core Strategy (tests iv, vi and ix);

- (b) whether the Plan will deliver a balanced range of new housing, including affordable housing (test vii and viii);
- (c) whether the Plan includes sufficiently clear guidance to developers on the requirement to provide infrastructure in connection with new development (tests vii and viii);
- (d) whether the Plan makes proper provision for improvement to Tipton District Centre (test vii); and
- (e) whether the mechanisms in the Plan for implementation and monitoring are sufficiently clear and detailed and whether its policies are sufficiently flexible to cope with changing circumstances (tests viii and ix).

Issue (a) – Whether the Plan's adoption at this stage would prejudice the proper consideration of alternatives in the forthcoming Black Country Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and whether it is sufficiently flexible to accommodate any changes which adoption of the JCS might require.

- 3.3 Government guidance on what an AAP should include is set out in PPS12 and its Companion Guide. Essentially, an AAP should be a spatial plan that draws together the plans and programmes of all relevant bodies and authorities to provide the land use planning framework for areas where significant change or conservation is contemplated. An AAP should identify the distribution of uses and their inter-relationships, including site specific allocations and a timetable for action. A key feature should be the focus on implementation.
- 3.4 The Tipton Area Action Plan has been prepared in advance of the Black Country Joint Core Strategy (JCS). Regulation 13(6) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 requires that policies in a DPD must be in conformity with a core strategy (where one is adopted) or with relevant development plan policies. In this case the development plan comprises the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), which is currently under review, and the Sandwell Unitary Development Plan (UDP) which was adopted in 2004. The approach taken by the Council is not recommended in PPS 12 but there is no bar to its adoption provided that the AAP is in conformity with the development plan. In addition, the West Midlands Regional Assembly has indicated that the DPD is in general conformity with the approved RSS.
- 3.5 The Council accepts that, ideally, the AAP should have followed on from the JCS. However, there are a number of opportunities in the plan area to achieve substantial improvements, notably by replacing existing and former industrial premises with more satisfactory forms of development, and I recognise that the AAP would provide a means by which these schemes might proceed in a coordinated way. Preliminary work has also started on the Owen Street Relief Road which may help to regenerate the nearby district centre and has the potential to assist in achieving other aims of the

AAP. I judge that the plan provides a helpful mechanism in this regard.

- 3.6 The Preferred Options Report of the JCS defines sixteen regeneration corridors and most of the AAP area falls within two of them, RC9 and RC16. These are based on the Tipton/Dudley Port/Brades Village area and the Coseley/Tipton/Princes End areas respectively. In each case the regeneration proposals are intended to be housing led as well as providing environmental benefits and I find no conflict between the ambitions of the two DPDs.
- 3.7 The Council points out that the number of dwellings which the AAP proposals will create is taken into account in the JCS but I also note that the AAP covers only a small proportion of its area. Thus, even if the strategy of the JCS was subsequently to evolve in a way that is not envisaged in the AAP, the overall thrust of the JCS would not be materially threatened. The housing allocations in the AAP have been formulated in such a way as not to preclude a change to the envisaged density if, for example, the adopted JCS required additional dwellings. The programming of the allocations has potential for adjustment, subject to progress with relocation of existing occupiers, as has the level of contributions to infrastructure as set out under issues (b) and (c) below. The constraints on such changes are largely in terms of achieving a design which is appropriate for each sites' context and I am not convinced that this is an area where further additional flexibility could properly be included. In addition, I am conscious that the forthcoming site allocations DPD will provide the Council with an opportunity to re-examine other potential sites in its area. Given the comparatively modest size of the AAP area and the fact that relatively few specific allocations are proposed, I judge the plan to have sufficient capacity to adjust to changes resulting from the JCS or other alterations in circumstances.
- 3.8 I conclude that the AAP would not prejudice the proper consideration of alternatives in the forthcoming Black Country Joint Core Strategy and has sufficient flexibility to accommodate potential changes in circumstances. No changes are require to enable to plan to meet tests iv, vi and ix in respect of this issue.

Issue (b) – Whether the Plan will deliver a balanced range of new housing, including affordable housing

- 3.9 The Local Policies in the AAP include 4 sites which are intended wholly for redevelopment for residential purposes and a further area for mixed use in which housing would be the predominant use. Each of these is set in a largely residential context with the predominant form of existing buildings being two-storey, medium density housing. The Policies envisage higher density housing than that found in the vicinity at present, 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) for Sites Tip1, Tip4 and Tip7 and 40 dph for Tip2 and Tip6. However, this strategy accords with the aims of national policy, set

out in Planning Policy Statement 3 – *Housing* (PPS3), to ensure that efficient use is made of urban land for housing. With appropriate design, the proposals would not be out of place in their surroundings.

- 3.10 Given the context of existing development, most sites are specifically allocated for two storey development, the exception being the large site in Tip1 where the AAP states that higher buildings would be acceptable where design parameters allow. Whilst the plan would therefore accommodate open market housing to meet most needs, it is clear that the opportunities for schemes which would command premium values are limited. Even within the Tip1 site, where water features could be created by opening up the culverted Tipton Brook and, perhaps, recreating the abandoned canal, I judge that there is no realistic prospect of reaching the upper levels of the market. I do not, however, regard this as a shortcoming of the plan. Whilst I recognise the requirement in PPS3 to achieve a mix of housing, it is not reasonable to expect all parts of the housing market to be addressed in a comparatively small plan area. In 2004 the Council adopted, following a consultation exercise, a supplementary planning guidance document which gives clear advice on the way in which it expects residential development to achieve a high standard of design. To my mind the aims of national policy would be met by schemes which followed this guidance and that in the AAP.
- 3.11 For each of the residential areas proposed in the plan, the text indicates the quantum of affordable housing that is expected to be provided. The calculations are based on Policy H9 of the UDP and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Affordable Housing' which was adopted in May 2005. Those documents had an indicative threshold of 1ha as the minimum size of site from which affordable housing would be sought, a figure which would have excluded the site allocated in AAP Policy Tip6. However, following the publication of PPS3 in 2006, the Council has separately resolved to reduce its threshold to 15 dwellings to accord with current government guidance.
- 3.12 The AAP has been drafted in a way which is wholly consistent with the Council's existing policy base. There is evidence, from the Annual Monitoring Reports, that the policy has been successful in achieving provision of affordable housing and I consider this a sound basis for carrying the present arrangements forward. The text of the AAP makes it clear that the numerical requirement is to be viewed as a starting point for negotiations. Whilst this reduces certainty to some extent, I judge it to be a practical response to allocations on brownfield sites where ground conditions are uncertain since they are in a locality which has been the subject of industrial development over two centuries and is also a former mining area. I conclude that the plan provides sufficient certainty to developers about their obligations.

- 3.13 I am satisfied that the AAP will deliver a balanced range of new housing, including affordable housing. In this respect the Plan satisfies soundness tests vii and viii and no changes are required.

Issue (c) – Whether the Plan includes sufficiently clear guidance to developers on the requirement to provide infrastructure in connection with new development.

- 3.14 For each of the residential allocations in the AAP the text includes an indication of the infrastructure improvements which the Council considers necessary to enable the proposal to proceed. These refer to open space and play space provision, educational facilities, sports provision and transport. Specific calculations for each site are not, however, included in the plan. The Council is preparing a 'Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document' (POSPD) but this is not expected to be adopted before July 2009. It is therefore necessary to consider whether the plan provides sufficient certainty for developers to be able to assess the viability of each site.
- 3.15 So far as open space and play space are concerned, a basis for provision is set out in UDP Policy DC9 and I consider that this constitutes adequate outline guidance in advance of the pending POSPD. In the AAP there is a large existing open area known as 'The Cracker' and the improvement and development of this for community open space, playing fields and other open uses is set out in Policy Tip5. It is made clear in the text supporting the residential allocations that most contributions will be made towards the development of 'The Cracker' and there is an additional requirement in Tip1 that 1.5ha should be made available on site, together with an indication of where within the site it should be provided. I have come to the view that, in the comparatively short period between the adoption of the AAP and the completion of the forthcoming POSPD, the plan gives enough information to allow an estimate of the costs to a developer to be made.
- 3.16 Each of the residential allocations is expected to include a contribution to secondary educational facilities, the Council having established that there is no shortfall in primary provision in the plan area. An established formula calibrated with regard to dwelling size, population data, existing provision and DfES multipliers has been used by the Council for some time and is similar to that used in other authorities. Whilst the Council produced guideline figures for the hearing for each of the residential allocations, calculated in accordance with the formula, I do not consider that it would be helpful to amend the plan to include them as the actual requirement would vary, particularly in respect of the numbers and type of dwelling proposed. I judge the information in the plan to be sufficient.
- 3.17 Representations were made that evidence in the AAP concerning provision of sports facilities in the area is inadequate and that more specific requirements for developer contributions should be included. In particular reference was made to the Sandwell Playing

Pitch Strategy, completed in October 2007 and the Black Country Sports Facilities Strategy, which remains incomplete. However, neither of these documents was available when the AAP was submitted. The Council has no previous experience of requesting developer contributions to sports facilities but a mechanism exists in the form of Sport England's 'Sports Facilities Calculator'. The Council intends to integrate this model into its forthcoming POSPD.

- 3.18 It seems to me that, whilst it is possible to identify a guideline figure for each of the residential allocations (and the Council has done the relevant calculations), such guidelines are relatively meaningless since much depends on the nature of the development proposed. As neither of the strategies in preparation relate specifically to the AAP area, and the 2003 Sandwell Swimming Strategy is somewhat out of date and thus of limited reliability, proceeding with the proposed allocations at this stage would not prejudice subsequent requests for contributions.
- 3.19 The text of a suggested additional policy was provided which would have the effect of requiring developer contributions towards the cost of policing and other community services. Whilst there is likely to be a correlation between population numbers and policing costs, no evidence was submitted to establish how additional costs could be ascribed to the proposed allocations in this particular AAP. The suggested wording included reference to a UDP policy but this has not been the subject of public scrutiny. In my opinion such a matter should await the Council's POSPD.
- 3.20 Because of their size and location on the existing network, no significant improvements to the highways and transportation network would arise from the allocations. The one major road improvement scheme, the Owen Street Relief Road, is under way and is intended to relieve chronic congestion caused by a railway level crossing, unrelated to any forthcoming development. Nevertheless it is reasonable to assume that the some of the Local Policies will result in additional transport requirements and that developer contributions would be appropriate, as is commonly found elsewhere. I agree with the Highways Agency that the AAP is not especially clear on this point and the Council accept that the alterations to the text of Section 4 suggested by the Highways Agency are required.
- 3.21 Subject to the changes set out below, I am satisfied that the Plan will provide clear guidance to developers on the requirement to provide infrastructure in connection with new development and will meet soundness tests vii and viii
- 3.22 The following changes are needed to make the AAP sound in respect of this issue:

RC1: Paragraph 4.36: Delete text and replace with '*No major transport infrastructure improvements are required as a result of the major residential schemes, but these schemes will be expected to contribute towards improvements to the existing walking, cycling and public transport provision within the AAP area. The Council requires a transport assessment to be submitted for each major residential scheme so that it can properly assess the level of walking/cycling/public transport infrastructure improvements needed.*'

RC2: Paragraph 4.37: Delete all text after '*where*' in line 13 and insert '*required, contributions towards sustainable transport infrastructure and services will be secured through s106 agreements and implemented through Travel Plans.*'

Issue (d) – Whether the Plan makes proper provision for improvements to Tipton District Centre

- 3.23 There are no specific proposals in the plan to provide enhancements to the Owen Street District Centre, the only retail area of significance in the AAP area. On the face of it, this is surprising, given that a key infrastructure project, the Owen Street Relief Road, is under construction and due to be completed early in the plan period.
- 3.24 However, the Council submitted evidence which established that considerable discussion had taken place during preparation of the plan both with local traders and with the owners of the shopping development which comprises most of the retail and office space in the District Centre. I also saw that the centre comprised reasonably modern buildings which appeared to be in good repair and that the public spaces were well laid out and inviting. I note that planning permission has been granted for two additional mixed use developments in the Centre. The ownership of the Centre has recently changed and there is evidence of fresh marketing initiatives for the vacant retail and commercial floorspace.
- 3.25 It seems to me that the principal constraint on the Centre is the awkward road access which is restricted by the level crossing on the busy Birmingham to Wolverhampton railway. This makes access by car to the centre difficult from the north and east and has prevented the Centre being properly served by buses. The Council intends to participate with traders, landowners and tenants in the preparation of a 'master plan' to take advantage of the opening of the Owen Street Relief Road in 2010. Since this is not intended to involve new buildings, but rather to address existing vacancies, the land-use implications are limited and I conclude that little would be added to the prospects for improvements to the Centre by inclusion of a policy in the AAP.

- 3.26 I therefore find the plan sound in this regard and that it meets soundness test vii. No changes are required in respect of this issue.

Issue (e) – Whether the mechanisms in the Plan for implementation and monitoring are sufficiently clear and detailed.

- 3.27 A coherent strategy for implementation is a key aspect of a DPD and soundness test viii has to be met. Section 6 lists committed schemes which have a bearing on the AAP's strategy, identifies the principal parties to each of the allocations together with an indicative time frame. It also provides a series of indicators derived from the 27 national core output indicators and from the Council's own local indicators. Progress with the current UDP is already subject to review in the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and it is intended to carry this procedure forward for the AAP. In addition, the plan includes tables for each of its strategic objectives showing how the indicators are related to AAP targets.
- 3.28 I find this approach to be broadly satisfactory and it seems to me to conform to the national guidance in 'Local Development Framework Monitoring: Good Practice Guide'. However I share the view of the GOWM that some of the AAP targets could be better defined, with milestones during the plan period as well as indicating the ultimate goal in more detail. The Council accepts this and has suggested a more detailed range of targets, adding interim waypoints where appropriate.
- 3.29 Subject to the changes set out in Annex A, which are to the text in column 2 of the tables following paragraph 6.18, I am satisfied that the Plan will provide sufficiently clear and detailed for implementation and monitoring are and will meet soundness test viii.

4 Other Matters

- 4.1 Policy Tip2 The AAP was criticised because it could be interpreted as implying the loss of school playing fields as a consequence of the development of an existing school site for housing. In fact the playing field is not lost since it is retained for use with the adjoining replacement school which is proposed by Tip3. Nevertheless, I agree that the wording of the plan is unacceptably vague on this point. Following the hearing the Council suggested changes to the supporting text to Tip2 and Tip3 [RC3 to RC6 below] and I agree that these would address the matter.
- 4.2 Concern was expressed in the representations about the way in which the AAP deals with climate change in general and also in its relationship to the proposed changes to the RSS. These changes are not yet finalised and, since the West Midlands Regional Assembly has found the AAP to be in general conformity with the current RSS, I am satisfied that the plan does not need to be changed in this regard.
- 4.3 There was some criticism of the extent to which the plan includes references to the present policy framework and the extent to which,

particularly in Section 4, other documents are referred to. The Council, however, wish to make the AAP legible as a free-standing document and I have some sympathy with that view. Since the whole of the text of the submission document is contained within 55 pages I do not consider its length to be excessive.

- 4.4 My only reservation about the otherwise clear and cohesive presentation of the document concerns the plans. The quality of reproduction in the document is not ideal, but the plans can be interpreted with care. It would be helpful, however, to have a map setting the AAP area in its context in the conurbation and the Council has produced a suggested additional map which I recommend should be incorporated.
- 4.5 The following changes are recommended in respect of the above matters:

RC3: Insert between the existing 2nd and 3rd paragraphs of the supporting text to Local Policy Tip2 the following additional text as a separate paragraph: *'There is an existing playing field for this school. It was previously shared with the former Tipton Westminster Special School adjacent in whose grounds it is located. The new Summerfield School (Local Policy Tip3) therefore already has its playing field in place. Planning permission has been granted for the new school on this basis (Ref: DC/06/47215), as agreed with Sport England, and there is no overall loss of playing field.'*;

RC4: Insert in line 2 of paragraph 4 of the supporting text to Local Policy Tip3 the following additional text *'(Ref: DC/06/47215)'*;

RC5: At end of paragraph 5 of the supporting text to Local Policy Tip3 after *'6.00p.m.'* add a new sentence: *'A separate community and training room will be provided, together with a consulting room for health services'*:

RC6: In paragraph 6 of the supporting text to Local Policy Tip3 delete the second sentence and replace with *'The new playing field is to be constructed to Sport England requirements, and the level of community use is to be limited to what is practical and manageable given the available facilities, as agreed with Sport England.'*

RC7: Addition of a map, as Plan 4, showing the AAP area in its context in the conurbation.

5 Minor Changes

- 5.1 The Council wishes to make two minor changes to the submitted DPD in order to clarify or correct parts of the text. These changes do not address key aspects of soundness, but I endorse them on a general basis in the interests of clarity and accuracy. They are shown in Annex B. These changes do not include corrections to misspellings and typographical errors. For the avoidance of doubt, these and any other errors relating to matters of fact should be corrected following the check of the report by the Council.

6 Overall Conclusions

- 6.1 I conclude that, with the amendments I recommend, the Tipton Area Action Plan satisfies the requirements of s20(5) of the 2004 Act and the associated Regulations, is sound in terms of s20(5)(b) of the 2004 Act, and meets the tests of soundness in PPS12.

B J Juniper

INSPECTOR

Annex A

Revised Targets for Tables following Paragraph 6.18

Indicator (Core/Local Reference)	AAP Target
Projected net additional dwellings up to 2020 (C2a(iii))	2006-2010 = 0; 2011-2015 = 707 within sites Tip1, Tip2, Tip4, Tip 6 and Tip7; 2016-2020 = 120 within sites Tip1 and Tip7.
Percentage of new dwellings completed at: (i) less than 30 dwellings per hectare (ii) between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare (iii) above 50 dwellings per hectare (C2c)	77 units at 40 dwellings per hectare within sites Tip2 and Tip6 in 2011-2015. 750 units at 50 dph within sites Tip1, Tip4 and Tip 7, in 2016-2020.
Affordable housing completions (C2d)	207 units by 2020. (2006-2010 = 0; 2011-2015 = 177 within sites Tip1, Tip2, Tip4, Tip 6 and Tip7; 2016-2020 = 30 within sites Tip1 and Tip7.
Amount of new residential development within 30 minute public transport time of a GP; a hospital; a primary school; a secondary school; areas of employment; and a major retail centre (C3b)	100%. All AAP sites (827 units) are within the relevant public transport times, and will be developed by 2020.
Losses of employment (ha) (C1e).	Existing employment land converted to other uses = 12 hectares. 7.3 ha. Tip1 & Tip4 in 2011-2015; 4.7 ha. Tip7 in 2016-2020.
Amount of employment land lost to residential development (C1f).	Existing employment land converted to residential = 12 hectares. 7.3 ha. Tip1 & Tip4 in 2011-2015; 4.7 ha. Tip7 in 2016-2020.
Loss of employment land in AAP area other than allocated sites (L)	0 hectares. No other employment land to be lost in the AAP area up to 2020.
Amount of land (ha) granted planning permission away from open space use (L32).	0 hectares. No open space land to be lost in the AAP area up to 2020.
Proportion of eligible housing sites providing community open space (L3).	100%. The eligible sites will contribute open space as follows. Tip1: 1.5 hectares direct provision by 2016. Tip1, Tip2, Tip4, Tip 6 and Tip7: £1.58M (at 2008/2009 rates) - £1.34M in 2010-2015, £0.24M in 2016-2020.

Maintain Owen Street as District Centre (L).	Maintain District Level status throughout plan period to 2020.
Number of developments where S106 education contribution achieved (L).	5. The eligible sites will contribute education contributions as follows. Tip1, Tip2, Tip4, Tip 6 and Tip7: £0.90M (at 2008/2009 rates) - £0.77M in 2010-2015, £0.13M in 2016-2020.
Number of listed buildings demolished (L50).	0. No listed building to be lost in the AAP area up to 2020.
Proportion of new development providing cycle parking (L23).	100%. All new residential development to provide minimum standard of cycle parking (i.e. one per unit, plus one per two bedrooms), as follows. 2006-2010 = 0; 2011-2015 = 1580 within sites Tip1, Tip2, Tip4, Tip 6 and Tip7; 2016-2020 = 279 within sites Tip1 and Tip7.
Sites allocated for residential development providing Transport Assessments (L).	100%. Sites Tip1, Tip2, Tip4, Tip 6 and Tip7 all require TAs prior to their development start dates indicated in 6.21.
Loss of public transport routes (L).	0. No loss of routes serving Tipton AAP area (311, 402, 644) in plan period to 2020.

Annex B

Schedule of Minor Changes

MC1: Para 3.16 In line 5 after '*employment land*' insert '*in Sandwell*'.

MC2: At the end of the text of Local Policy Tip7 add two further paragraphs (similar to those in the other residential policies and omitted in error):

'Contributions may be required for the balance of open space and play provision, the balance of affordable housing, and local education provision. Consideration will be given to whether a contribution is necessary for sports or community provision.'

'The need for transportation improvements will be determined following a Transportation Assessment submitted at planning application stage'.