



Sandwell
Metropolitan Borough Council

Sandwell Local Plan
Response to Reg.18 Draft Plan
Consultation Representations
September 2024

This document sets out the representations received to the Regulation 18 consultation on the Draft Sandwell Local Plan and the Council's initial response to those representations.

Regulation 18 consultation on the Draft Sandwell Local Plan took place between Monday 6 November and Monday 18 December 2023. 649 comments were received. The Council is grateful to those individuals who took the time to partake in the consultation. The comments have been logged according to the policy or text within the Draft Sandwell Local Plan that they relate to and are quoted verbatim in the table below.

Officers reviewed each comment in early 2024 and the Council's initial response to each comment is provided on the corresponding row in the table.

Additional technical evidence has been prepared since the Regulation 18 consultation finished, including a Climate Change Study, an updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and an Open Spaces Assessment. The majority of comments received have directly shaped the production of the Regulation 19 Publication Version of the Sandwell Local Plan. However, in some instances the evidence has indicated that policies and site allocations within the Publication Version should reflect the findings of technical studies and only partially reflect the comments received, or not at all.

Comment Reference	Respondent Name	Agent Name	Document Element	Representation (verbatim as received)	Support/Objection/Comment	Officer Response
C001	1278 Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]		1. Introduction	<p>We have reviewed the Spatial Strategy Paper, Local Site Assessment Report including Appendix D Site Assessment Forms and the Sustainability Appraisal as we had thought one of these documents would explain how the Sequential Test has been applied and what conclusions were drawn. We acknowledge that two sites (North and South of Tamebridge Parkway Station) had been rejected due to the presence of Flood Zone 3 as part of the Local Site Assessment screening process. However, unfortunately there doesn't seem to be a clear or consistent approach to how these assessments have considered flood risk or clear conclusions as to whether this means the Sequential Test has been passed or not. There also appear to have been some missed opportunities to have incorporated the aims of the Sequential Test either within one or more of the growth strategies as a distribution of spatial growth consideration, or the Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective Framework and subsequent appraisal of sites.</p> <p>We acknowledge the difficult balancing act the Council must grapple with and the preferred growth strategy of 'Balanced Green Growth' having appraised the options will likely have some positive effects. However, a number of site allocations are proposed in areas of Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) and/or Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and will now need evidence to (a) demonstrate whether they have passed the Sequential Test (there are no alternative sites at a lower risk of flooding) and (b) be assessed by a Level 2 SFRA. The Council will need to ensure this is considered and demonstrated prior to the next iteration of the Local Plan, either as an update to the Sustainability Appraisal or as a standalone document.</p>	Comment	All reasonable alternative sites for both housing and employment have been through detailed assessments prior to being considered for inclusion in the SLP. This assessment considered the impact of flooding and the presence of flood zones within or adjacent to the site, and under certain circumstances sites were excluded from further consideration if they failed to meet certain gateway criteria. Sites affected by flood zone 3 were excluded from further consideration. Further work will be undertaken to establish whether any of the sites identified by the EA need to be excluded or mitigation undertaken to alleviate any potential future risks. An SFRA / WCS is being undertaken prior to the submission of the SLP under Regulation 19 and its conclusions will inform the list of sites taken forward.
C002	1273 National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		1. Introduction	We note that a Sustainability Appraisal process has been undertaken to streamline the different housing and employment growth options and acknowledge that the allocation of sites has taken into consideration the location, availability of greenfield/ brownfield sites, and sustainability elements through a 'Balanced Green Growth' approach	Comment	Comment noted.
C003	1240 Consortium of Housebuilders and Land Promoters [240]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	<p>231218 FALLING EVEN SHORTER - SANDWELL REG 18 CONSULTATION REP</p> <p>We write on behalf of a consortium of housebuilders and land promoters (listed below) to submit the enclosed Turley 'Falling Even Shorter: as updated review of unmet housing needs in the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area' report (December 2023).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bellway Strategic Land •Gatesby Estates Plc •Gladman Developments Ltd •Hallam Land Management •Haworth Group Plc •Taylor Wimpey •Mistry Group Plc •Wain Estates •William Davis Homes <p>The report has assessed the conclusions of the most recent Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area ('GBBCHMA') updated Position Statement Addendum ('the Addendum') dates April 2023 but not published until October 2023. To reflect the Addendum, the report also assesses the housing need and supply for the plan period 2011-2031.</p> <p>The Addendum claims the GBBCHMA's shortfall arising between 2011 to 2031 has now reduced to 2,053 homes. This is however predicated on a base date of 31 March 2021, nearly three years ago. In that time, there is now additional monitoring data, and updated supply positions, which is not reflected in the Addendum's findings.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Addendum continues to reference a need for 205,099 homes between 2011 and 2031, based on the GBBCHMA Strategic Growth Study (2018) that is increasingly dated having been produced almost eight years ago. The standard method has since been introduced, offering the consistency the study itself sought to provide. While this cannot be backdated to 2011, it can be reasonably used in place of the Strategic Growth Study as an indicator of future needs.</p>	Comment	Amend to reflect the housing and employment land shortfall in the introduction to the SLP.
C004	908 Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	<p>1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives</p> <p>The ten ambitions for a successful Sandwell as set out in the Sandwell Vision 2030 continue to represent a set of aspirations to which the waterway network can successfully contribute, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ambition 1 (delivering strong policy support to combatting climate change adaptation and mitigation; and protecting and enhancing the natural environment, nature conservation and open spaces; and delivering opportunities for biodiversity net gain, landscaping and tree planting) -Ambition 2 (protecting, enhancing and making accessible land for sport and leisure including active and passive recreation; and providing clear policy support for development aimed to deliver health and welfare infrastructure) -Ambition 5 (promoting the development and improvement of attractive, safe and accessible public realm, support services and community infrastructure as part of new development and project delivery) -Ambition 6 (delivering a co-ordinated and strategic travel and transport network through Sandwell that links communities to opportunities both within and beyond its boundaries, supported by appropriate planning policies and land use designations), and, -Ambition 8 (promoting and supporting sustainable development that helps to meet local need/demand; and providing for sufficient services and facilities in locations accessible to all in Sandwell's communities.) <p>As such the Trust endorses the Sandwell Local Plan Vision 2041 and its emphasis on tackling climate change, and the promotion of the natural and historic environments, active and passive recreation and leisure opportunities, access to district and low-cost energy and heating projects, delivery of sustainable drainage, and emphasis on active and sustainable travel opportunities. In particular we support and acknowledge our allied role in delivering a number of the draft Plan's key priorities and objectives under the headings of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Climate Change (notably Objective 1: Ensure new development takes a proactive approach to climate change mitigation, adaptation and carbon reduction, and that development is resilient to climate change, and Objective 2: Deliver sustainable development in locations where people can access jobs and services, delivering wider positive social and economic outcomes and protecting and enhancing local built and natural environments) -Enhancing our natural environment (notably Objective 3: To protect and enhance Sandwell's natural environment, natural resources, biodiversity, wildlife corridors geological resources, countryside and landscapes, whilst ensuring that residents have good access to interlinked green infrastructure) -Enhancing our historic environment (notably Objective 4: To protect, sustain and enhance the quality of the historic built environment, ensuring the retention of distinctive and attractive places and beautiful buildings, including listed parks, scheduled monuments and their settings, and Objective 5: To manage and maintain the wider historic environment across Sandwell, including parks and gardens, areas of industrial heritage value, sites of geological and archaeological interest and locally listed buildings, structures and historic assets) -Improving the Health and Wellbeing of residents and promoting social inclusion (notably Objective 10: To provide a built and natural environment that supports the making of healthier choices through provision for physical activity and recreation, active travel, encouraging social interaction and discouraging harmful behaviours; Objective 11: Ensure new development and open spaces support health and wellbeing for all, reduce health inequalities and encourage active and healthy lifestyles, and Objective 12: To provide a built and natural environment that protects health and wellbeing through minimising pollution (air, noise and other forms), providing healthy homes, reducing the negative health effects of climate change and providing streets safe for active travel, and low emission travel for all) -Good Design (notably Objective 13: Require new development to deliver a high standard of design reflecting local character and distinctiveness and that creates greener and safer places that people feel proud to live and work in) 	Comment	comment noted and welcome support
C005	1110 National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	<p>The draft Local Plan contains locally specific policies and strategic / non-strategic site allocations to support the housing and employment requirements across Sandwell for the plan period of 2022 to 2041. We note that when adopted, this Local Plan will</p> <p>replace the Black Country Core Strategy (adopted in 2011), the Sandwell Site Allocations and Development Plan Document (the SAD, adopted in 2012) and Area Action Plans for West Bromwich, Smethwick and Tipton. We also note that the Local Plan will incorporate elements of former supplementary planning documents as appropriate and will include details from the West Bromwich Masterplan and Interim Planning Statement.</p> <p>National Highways agree in principle to the vision and objectives of the Draft Local Plan.</p>	Support	Comment noted on employment

C006	902	Clowes Developments (UK) Limited [214]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	Ambitions 1, 3 and 9 all state "delivering a healthy supply of land for economic growth and employment". Harris Lamb supports the proposed wording on account that it is consistent with "Building a strong, responsive and competitive economy" as one of the three overarching objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is however evident that the Plan as drafted is likely to fail to deliver on this aspiration as the proposed supply of employment land i.e. 42 hectares is significantly less than the identified need / requirement of 211 hectares (includes 26 hectares likely to be lost to other land uses) as set out in the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2020 to 2041 (August 2023).	Comment	Comment noted on employment , will work with the other local authorities in the Black Country FEMA and those with strong economic links to Sandwell to meet the need.
C007	1173	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	second to last paragraph on page 35 of the consultation document - support the broad intentions of this part of the vision, with regards to helping to meet the wide range of housing needs within Sandwell, supporting green living and being located in close proximity to local services and facilities via sustainable transport modes. However, within the associated Priorities, Strategic Objectives and Policies set out within Table 3 to support this vision, there is no recognition of the chronic shortage in housing provision to date and how a marked change in strategy will be required to try and address both the historic shortfalls and future demands. Instead, Objective 6 – Housing to Meet all Needs is relatively generic and indicates there is no proposed change in approach or strategy for new development, particularly the provision of housing. Reference is then made to the relevant emerging policies which support the capability to meet this objective and help deliver the vision for Sandwell. Wain Estates are of the view that if these policies are progressed as proposed, they do not provide the capability to meet objective 6 and the provision of housing to meet all needs, including the borough's chronic shortfall in both affordable and market housing, which is a fundamental part of the proposed vision for Sandwell.	Object	Note and welcome support. Sandwell recognises that there will remain a significant level of housing need given the lack of suitable sites available in the borough. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council's development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough's green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence to demonstrate that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell. Amend to reflect the housing and employment land shortfall in the introduction to the SLP.
C008	829	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	2.00bjective 6 as part of the Housing that meets all our needs priority, seeks to address Sandwell's identified and wide-ranging housing need by supporting the provision of high-quality new homes with a wide mix of housing types and tenure that: meet the needs of current and future residents; provide sufficient internal and external space; and support climate change adaption through good design. Objective 6 needs to be explicit that for the achievement of this objective clear housing requirements needs to be articulated, to set a baseline for the housing need that it is planned to be met over the plan period. 2.1The local authority should have a clear understanding of the land available within their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. Planning policies should then identify a sufficient supple and mix of sites, considering their availability, suitability, and likely economic viability. Objective 6 should explicitly commit to meeting this obligation of identifying sufficient land for homes.	Comment	Note comments. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council's development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough's green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence to demonstrate that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell.
C009	828	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	2.00bjective 7 of the Housing that meets all our needs priority, is to ensure that communities in Sandwell are safe and resilient. This objective is supported.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C010	933	West Midlands Housing Association Planning Consortium [91]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Iwan Evans, Assistant Planner) [90]	1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	The WMHAPC welcomes the 'Local Plan Vision 2041' set out on pages 33 and 34 in that it seeks to ensure that "Affordable, social and local authority-provided homes are available to those who need them".	Comment	Noted and welcome support
C011	1124	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	Page 29 - Ambition 1 would benefit from a reference to the historic environment and recognising the benefits the historic environment can bring to a community and an area. Ambition 2 would benefit from a reference to the historic environment and recognising the benefits the historic environment can bring to a community and wellbeing. Would be worthwhile to check through the ambitions to consider where the historic environment would best be suited.	Comment	noted. These Ambitions are not set through the SLP itself but represent the Council's wider vision. The aim is to demonstrate how the SLP will help to deliver them. It is not possible for the SLP to amend these aspects of the Council's Vision 2030 but when the strategic Vision is reviewed, there will be an opportunity to ensure the aims and objectives of the SLP are represented in any revised text, to ensure both strategies are integrated and mutually reinforcing.
C012	898	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	The lack of any policy in the plan on energy We have failed to find any policy in the plan on energy generation, particularly where it is (and is not) appropriate to locate large solar arrays. It is our view that the right place for this is on rooftops and brownfield land, not on green field and certainly not on Green Belt land. The plan should contain a policy to this effect. See CPRE Rooftop Revolution Report (attached) on this subject.	Comment	Policy SCC6 relates to renewable and low carbon energy and supports its provision in suitable locations.
C013	825	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	Sport England supports Ambitions 2, 4, 8 where they relate to protecting, enhancing and providing places and spaces for the local communities across Sandwell to play sport and be physically active, as this is proven to enrich peoples lives and benefit their physical and mental health and well-being. Sport England supports the Vision set out in para 1.4, particularly the references in para 7 to enjoying longer and healthier lives through a range of interventions including promoting active recreation. Sport England supports Objectives 10-12 under the priority of improving the health and well-being of residents and promoting social inclusion. We also support the objectives relating to good design (13), active travel (16) which relate well to our Active Environments Big Issue as set out in our strategy (Uniting the Movement) and to our Active Design guidance. We support objective 18 which relates to meeting infrastructure needs for active travel.	Support	Support noted and welcomed.
C014	1125	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		1. Sandwell 2041: Spatial Vision, Priorities and Objectives	Page 33/34 - We support the vision and the reference to heritage within it. We would welcome a reference to a wider variety of heritage such as heritage landscape/ archaeology etc. rather than a narrower definition of built heritage. Objective 4/5 - We are very supportive of specific objectives that seek to protect the historic environment. We would welcome a reference to heritage landscape and features and ensuring the wide range of historic environment is fully reflected and considered within the Plan. Objective 15 - We support the reference to heritage within this objective.	Support	Support noted and welcomed. Amend text to include additional scope of historic environment
C015	920	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		10. West Bromwich	9.Sandwell's Centres and 10. West Bromwich The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council's draft Centres policies and allocated sites can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific polices identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals (as requested amendments above refer). However, inclusion of the canal network within relevant policy and allocation maps (ACTION REQUEST) will enable developers to identify canal-related constraints at an early stage and engage with us accordingly, ideally at pre- application stage. The Trust requests on-going engagement from the Council on submitted pre-application enquiries, and also encourages developers to seek pre-application advice from us direct: https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consultee-role/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice (ACTION REQUEST). See also comments on Appendix D below.	Comment	Comment noted, the CRT is a consultee that appears within the relevent buffer zone of CRT waterways in SMBC Constraints layer. The transportation key diagram will show the Canal Network
C016	862	Mr Kevin Priest [210]		10. West Bromwich	The whole of this plan seems to be based on a similar theory to trickle down economics whereby investment will be primarily targeted for West Bromwich and then that will attract further funding and investment to other areas. West Bromwich is mentioned 197 times in the plan, far more frequently than any other town. West Bromwich is the strategic centre, tier 1. All of the other towns and areas fall into tier 2 or 3. Lots of investment went in New Square, decimating the remainder of the town centre. The Kings and Queens Square are mostly empty units and it's a walkway through to the New Square. There wasn't any benefit to the rest of Sandwell. How will this local plan do things differently?	Comment	W Brom is the Strategic Centre as it is has most of the comparison retail offer, and is the largest centre in Sandwell. W Brom is not the only recipient of investment. Eg., Rowley Regis has gained Towns Fund monies for a Satellite Education Hub, Haden Hill New Leisure Centre, Smethwich has new Metropolitan Hospital, Aquatics Centre etc, Wednesbury has its Heritage Action Zone, Friar Park its Urban Village et al. SLP looking to repurpose existing vacant Centres floorspace, also seeks to restrict additional retail floorspace as Centres Study shows no capacity going forward to 2039. With specific regard to WB, the Retail Diversification Fund project looking to repurpose Queens Square and former M & S site ,re locate the indoor Market-ongoing projects. Queens Square has many vacancies and its leasehold is currently being sought for purchase ,however, Kings Square has very near full occupancy, with the indoor market to be relocated to the High Street.
C018	866	Matthew Nairn [211]		11. Transport	It appears to be an exciting time for the area, however from the document I have gone through not much is given on road safety. An increase in homes will result in more traffic which will no doubt be an increase in poor driving currently being experienced. What is the plan to combat this?	Comment	Policy STR1 seeks to ensure that the delivery of infrastructure to support active travel will be prioritised at key transport corridors including to support road safety. Planning proposals will be considered on an individual basis in relation to highway safety, as required by the NPPF (2023) Chapter 9.

C019	1008	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		11. Transport	Road Space Reallocation and Speed Management: The plan is unclear on the need for road space reallocation or changes in speeds to prioritise active travel. We suggest that a default consideration of reallocating road space and managing speeds should be incorporated to promote active travel.	Comment	Noted. Consideration will be given to road space reallocation whilst accommodating the Council's duties under the Traffic Management Act 2004.
C020	1011	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		11. Transport	Car Parking on Kerbs as an Issue: The plan should address concerns related to car parking on kerbs as it may impact the safety and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists. Policies should be developed to minimise such issues and promote a safer environment for active travel.	Comment	Noted
C021	1023	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		11. Transport	TFWM strongly welcomes reference to the importance of regional transport links being made and how the borough may impact other areas. We must point out however, that our 'West Midlands Local Transport Plan 5 Core Strategy: Reimagining Transport in the West Midlands' has now been approved, and while other elements of the suite of Local Transport Plan 5 (WMLTP5) documents have yet to be approved including our Six Big Moves and Area Strategies, these should all be approved by the end of 2024. Once all elements of the WMLTP5 are endorsed by the WMCA Board, Movement for Growth will be superseded by the WM LTP5. Additionally, as a general comment whilst decarbonisation is mentioned within the Climate Change chapter, a key objective of our WM LTP5 is to decarbonise our transport system. We would therefore strongly encourage greater consideration of decarbonisation throughout all of the transport-related policies and in particular, be mindful of the work WMCA is undertaking as part of Adept's Live Lab 2 programme with the Centre of Excellence for the Decarbonisation of Local Roads (CEDR).	Support	Noted. The SLP will continue to refer to plans and strategies that have been adopted at the time of publication. The Council will be reviewing its climate change evidence and policies prior to the next stage of consultation.
C022	1061	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		11. Transport	Other transport related comments In terms of traffic modelling, the growth estimated from the data TFWM have received in the uncertainty log for our models from local authorities (the log which records housing and employment developments) is considerably different from that of national forecasts. This was first an issue based on the WBHE business case work, and while we have developed an approach to deal with this, we believe we need to re-look at this in the new year. The Black Country Authorities including Sandwell are aware of these issues and it will be important to continue working closely with TFWM's Transport Planning Team (with this function now being brought in-house). Especially in terms of the certainty of development so we can better control the process and requirements and fully align our transport schemes with those of new development coming forward.	Comment	Noted. Traffic modelling will be updated prior to the next stage of consultation. Sandwell welcomes continued working with TFWM's Transport Planning Team
C023	1086	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		11. Transport	TFWM strongly welcomes reference to the importance of regional transport links being made and how the borough may impact other areas. We must point out however, that our 'West Midlands Local Transport Plan 5 Core Strategy: Reimagining Transport in the West Midlands' has now been approved, and while other elements of the suite of Local Transport Plan 5 (WMLTP5) documents have yet to be approved including our Six Big Moves and Area Strategies, these should all be approved by the end of 2024. Once all elements of the WMLTP5 are endorsed by the WMCA Board, Movement for Growth will be superseded by the WM LTP5. Additionally, as a general comment whilst decarbonisation is mentioned within the Climate Change chapter, a key objective of our WM LTP5 is to decarbonise our transport system. We would therefore strongly encourage greater consideration of decarbonisation throughout all of the transport-related policies and in particular, be mindful of the work WMCA is undertaking as part of Adept's Live Lab 2 programme with the Centre of Excellence for the Decarbonisation of Local Roads (CEDR).	Comment	Noted. The SLP will continue to refer to plans and strategies that have been adopted at the time of publication. The Council will be reviewing its climate change evidence and policies prior to the next stage of consultation.
C024	1098	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		11. Transport	In terms of traffic modelling, the growth estimated from the data TFWM have received in the uncertainty log for our models from local authorities (the log which records housing and employment developments) is considerably different from that of national forecasts. This was first an issue based on the WBHE business case work, and while we have developed an approach to deal with this, we believe we need to re-look at this in the new year. The Black Country Authorities including Sandwell are aware of these issues and it will be important to continue working closely with TFWM's Transport Planning Team (with this function now being brought in-house). Especially in terms of the certainty of development so we can better control the process and requirements and fully align our transport schemes with those of new development coming forward.	Comment	Noted. Traffic modelling will be updated prior to the next stage of consultation. Sandwell welcomes continued working with TFWM's Transport Planning Team
C025	1116	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		11. Transport	We note that the Black Country Transport Modelling Report (2023) has been submitted as an evidence base to support the Local Plan and includes the draft scenario assessment, and we welcome this. We acknowledge that the modelling exercise will further be revised in the future as the Local Plan progresses and we look forward to hearing more on this in the Regulation 19 consultation. We have undertaken a high level review of this report and have the following comments: 1. There isn't enough information available to understand the list of development allocations considered for the modelling exercise. Tables 2-2 and 2-3 of the report indicate the level of population and employment growth on a high-level basis, however no supporting appendices are available that list the development allocations included. Table 2-1 provides a list of the transport schemes coded within the model, and note that M5 J1 has been included in this list as a highway scheme. However, no further detail on the scope/extent of improvement is available. National Highways request clarification. 2. Table 2.1 details the transport schemes added to form the DS network. Several schemes were not included due to agreement between BCLA and the consultants, "...due to negligible impact on the network." National Highways request some justification/documentation of these decisions. 3. Based on the information set out in section 1 of the report, it is to be understood that the modelling exercise was undertaken to support the Black Country Plan allocations proposed at the time. Also, the modelling report is dated 10 Jan 2023 and therefore, it's highly unlikely that the current set of development allocations proposed in Sandwell and Dudley Draft LP has been included within the development uncertainty log of this PRISM model. National Highways request clarification. 4. Assumptions are only discussed where they differ from the RC work detailed in the previous stage. Our technical partners, are therefore unable to review the unchanged parameters such as highway generalised cost, PT fare, values of time, vehicle operating cost and bus speed etc.. National Highways request this information is provided. 5. Highway model convergence: delta and link cost stability is achieved, but link flow stability (>98% of link with link flow change <1% for 4 successive iterations) appears to be still improving (Tables 3-3 and 3-4). Stopping conditions appear to be too lenient. 6. Observation on numbers of iterations: the DM scenario appears to reach convergence much quicker than the equivalent DS scenario. This is counter intuitive, as the DM and DS have the same levels of development, with the DS having additional transport schemes. Additional capacity usually aids convergence. National Highways request further information from the model appliers. 7. Highway network statistics: average speeds (calculated by veh-km/veh-hr) decline between the RC and DM and the DM and DS. National Highways request some justification/commentary from the model appliers. 8. Flow difference plots. We note the commentary on page 29 and agree. National Highways request results of investigations into the model noise be supplied. 9. Journey time results seem to show that DS has slightly worse network performance than DM, which would benefit from explanation from the model appliers and National Highways requests this. Some large differences also support the previous comments about model noise. 10. If possible, National Highways requests the models are made available for review.	Comment	Noted and comments welcomed. The Transport Modelling evidence will be reviewed prior to the next stage of plan consultation.

C026	885	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	12. Infrastructure and Delivery	<p>Background to S106/CIL contributions towards Police infrastructure</p> <p>The scale of the development during the plan period will inevitably have implications for the maintenance of safety and security in the Borough and there will clearly be a need for additional and/or enhanced Police infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy SDS1 'Development Strategy' which provides the overarching spatial strategy for Sandwell, sets out the scale and distribution of new development for the Plan period to 2041. The policy is clear that at point (1) 'To support the attainment of the Sandwell SLP Vision, drive sustainable and strategic economic and housing growth and meet local aspirations, Sandwell, working with local communities, partners and key stakeholders, will make sure that decisions on planning proposals (c) ensure that sufficient physical, social, and environmental infrastructure is delivered to meet identified requirements'.</p> <p>This is compatible with legislation and national planning policy, as follows:</p> <p>Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 states, 'Without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it, it shall be the duty of each authority to which this section applies to exercise its various functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent, crime and disorder in its area'. The PCCWM therefore has a statutory duty to secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force for the area. Sandwell Council is also statutorily required to consider crime and disorder and community safety in the exercise of its duties with the aim of achieving a reduction in crime.</p> <p>The NPPF, September 2023, Paragraph 2 states that the NPPF must be taken into account in preparing the development plan and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.</p> <p>Paragraph 7 of the NPPF explains that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and Paragraph 8 confirms that achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives: an economic, a social and an environmental objective. These objectives include supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment.</p> <p>Paragraph 20 of the NPPF includes, inter alia, a requirement for policies to deliver sufficient provision for infrastructure, including those related to security, with paragraphs 16, 26 and 28 indicating that this could be delivered through joint working with all partners concerned with new development proposals.</p> <p>Section 8 of the NPPF 'Promoting health and safe communities', Paragraph 92, identifies that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which are safe and accessible, so that crime and disorder and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.</p> <p>Paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF calls for the creation of safe places where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.</p> <p>Annex 2 (NPPF) identifies the police as 'Essential local workers', defined as 'Public sector employees who provide frontline services including health, education and community safety'.</p> <p><i>It is also especially noteworthy that Part 10A Infrastructure Levy, Enacted of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 confirms at Section 204N(2) relating to Infrastructure Levy regulations that</i></p>	Comment	<p>Agree need to introduce new policy - Following on from the draft BCP, the SLP has not referenced general or routine contributions towards police infrastructure in the policy or list infrastructure types. The NPPF, paragraph 57, requires that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests: a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It is considered that this cannot include non specific pooled contributions towards revenue expenditure where this is typically funded through alternative areas of public funding and government departments. Following the Regulation 18 consultation Sandwell has carefully considered the range of necessary infrastructure and viability of development typologies. The Council are preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will inform the SLP Regulation 19 Publication Plan. Where appropriate, specific infrastructure (e.g. capital investment) required to address the additional demands of planned growth will be identified in the IDP and policy SID1 allows for delivery of this infrastructure.</p>
C027	886	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	12. Infrastructure and Delivery	<p>The PCCWM objects to the lack of reference in Chapter 12 and policies SID1 – SID3 to the requirement for Police infrastructure to serve the new development proposed in the draft Sandwell Local Plan. Chapter 12 of the Local Plan 'Infrastructure and Delivery' acknowledges at paragraph 12.1 that 'Ensuring effective delivery of this amount of development [11,167 new houses and provide for 1,206ha of employment land] will require strong collaborative working with public, private and third sector partners, involving a robust process of infrastructure planning and delivery', however the policies in that chapter solely reference digital infrastructure and the chapter covers no other forms of infrastructure, despite the 'Introduction' to the chapter at paragraph 12.1 stating 'A key role of the SLP is to plan for the growth required for a sustainable and prosperous Sandwell.'</p> <p>To achieve sustainable development, as required by the NPPF and PPG, the necessary supporting infrastructure must be identified through proactive engagement between the Council and the infrastructure providers, including the WMP. Infrastructure needs and costs arising as a result of the proposed growth in the draft Sandwell Local Plan should be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) – and representations have already been made by the PCCWM in this regard - and Viability and Delivery Study and specific requirements should be clearly set out in the individual site allocation policies and/or accompanying masterplans, Area Action Plans (AAPs) or Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), to ensure that developers are aware of their obligations at the outset. In addition, as the primary document for planning decisions, the draft Sandwell Local Plan must also address the need for sustainable safe developments supported by essential infrastructure including Police infrastructure. There also needs to be wording in relevant policies to require this, to ensure that developers are aware of the importance attached to issues of crime and safety by Sandwell MBC, as well as the need to maintain an appropriate level of community infrastructure and Emergency Services infrastructure.</p> <p>The definition and support for infrastructure should be explicitly set out in the draft Local Plan, to meet national and local policy objectives relating to safety and security, and it should be clearly set out that contributions will be required through CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of facilities and equipment for Police services, in order to sustain the level of growth proposed in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>There are numerous examples of adopted planning policies in Local Plans which have been found sound after examination, which specifically refer to police infrastructure provision and contributions.</p> <p>At the time of the Police's representations to the Draft Black Country Plan Consultation (Regulation 18), it was noted that there was inclusion in the Viability and Delivery Study of an indicative contribution of £43.00 per dwelling towards the funding gap in Police infrastructure from the need for additional services arising directly from the proposed scale of growth. This was welcomed and the need for financial contributions in the form of CIL/S106 needs to be taken forward into policy, as well as the contribution figure needing to be increased/ linked to inflation.</p> <p>Harm will result if West Midlands Police do not have the necessary funding to maintain an appropriate level of service for existing and for future residents, work and visitors within Sandwell (and surrounding areas) and therefore it is imperative that the draft Sandwell Local Plan addresses the need for sustainable safe developments supported by essential infrastructure.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the clear omissions in these policies, there appears to be only limited reference to the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan in the draft Local Plan, it is only referenced 4 times and only in the justifications to Policy SDS3 – Towns and Local Areas, Policy SHW2 – Healthcare Infrastructure and Policy STR4– The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics. Most surprisingly, there is no reference to it whatsoever in Chapter 12 'Infrastructure and Delivery' which is a great concern. The IDP should be regarded as integral to the local plan process with a commitment given to ensuring that it is maintained as a 'live document' throughout the plan period.</p> <p>As with many publicly funded services, Police forces within England have seen significant reductions in resources since 2010 due to reduced budgets. During this period, WMP has seen real terms funding</p>	Object	<p>Agree need to introduce new policy - to cover planning obligations etc. Following on from the draft BCP, the SLP has not referenced general or routine contributions towards police infrastructure in the policy or list infrastructure types. The NPPF, paragraph 57, requires that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests: a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It is considered that this cannot include non specific pooled contributions towards revenue expenditure where this is typically funded through alternative areas of public funding and government departments. Following the Regulation 18 consultation Sandwell has carefully considered the range of necessary infrastructure and viability of development typologies. The Council are preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will inform the SLP Regulation 19 Publication Plan. Where appropriate, specific infrastructure (e.g. capital investment) required to address the additional demands of planned growth will be identified in the IDP and policy SID1 allows for delivery of this infrastructure.</p>

C028	1252	Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]		12. Infrastructure and Delivery	<p>Black Country Councils Water Cycle Study Phase 1 Scoping (2020)</p> <p>Our concern is that since the Phase 1 was published, Severn Trent Water and South Staffordshire Water have been preparing and are in an advanced stage of developing their new and latest Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP24) and Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans. The data and assumptions relied on in respect of available water supplies, sustainable abstraction and impact of sustainability reductions to licences, wastewater capacity and climate change data have now changed. The study should be updated to reflect these latest plans and the water companies approached again for their input. The Council will need to be confident that the Sandwell Local Plan chosen growth strategy (and strategic sites) both in terms of distribution and timing can be adequately served by both water resources and wastewater infrastructure and considering the wider cross-boundary service needs of the neighbouring districts.</p> <p>•Water resources</p> <p>In addition, some of our plans and strategies have been updated. Our West Midlands Abstraction Licencing Strategies (ALS) have been updated since 2020. The Tame Anker and Mease ALS was updated and republished in June 2022, Worcestershire Middle Severn ALS in July 2022 and Staffordshire Trent Valley ALS in July 2021. Whilst the outcomes on water availability designations have not changed, some of the assessment points (e.g. Worcestershire Middle Severn ALS) and Common End Date (CED) (Staffordshire Trent Valley ALS) have changed.</p> <p>The River Basin Management Plans have also been updated with a 2022 online version and has water efficiency as a key measure. As of July 2021, Severn Trent Water and South Staffs Water are now classified as operating in seriously water stressed areas (excluding Chester Water Resource Zone). Having said that we support the recommendations on water efficiency for new developments which have informed your draft Policy SDM2 Development and Design Standards. Whilst our plans and strategies have been updated, the primary reason for reviewing the study is to consider the latest water company plans as stated above.</p> <p>•Water quality</p> <p>Sandwell district is served by two Wastewater Treatment Works: Minworth WwTW and Roundhill WwTW. Given the additional growth proposed in the Local Plan it is important that this growth can be accommodated by the wastewater network and receiving Wastewater Treatment Works without risking deterioration of the receiving waterbodies in the district and beyond.</p> <p>Chapter 7 on Wastewater Treatment assesses the headroom capacity for both WwTW and has classed them as 'green' i.e. having significant headroom capacity and no other constraints. However, Figure 7.16 which shows the summary map of headroom based on quality assessment suggests that for most of Dudley and Sandwell the classification is 'amber' stating 'limited headroom based on quality assessment.' It is important that any discharge consent implications are discussed with us at an early stage, and any delays that might prevent development being accommodated within a catchment area due to permit restrictions or other are clearly indicated. If phasing of development or restrictions are necessary within a particular catchment area as a mitigation measure this should be outlined.</p> <p>We concur with the conclusions within chapter 9 that a further assessment of the impact upon water quality from increased wastewater discharges should be undertaken as part of a Phase 2 Outline Study. This could also incorporate a review of the latest data from Severn Trent's Drainage and Waste Water Management Plan.</p> <p>We are concerned there is very limited reference to water quality within the draft Local Plan across a range of relevant policies. The Water Framework Directive classification of water bodies across Sandwell is 'moderate.' Treated effluent discharges from WwTW, discharges from sewer outfalls and urban and transport runoff will all have a bearing on the waterbodies overall classification and the reason it does not currently achieve 'good' status or potential.</p>	Comment	Comments noted. The Council have commissioned JBA to undertake a refresh / review of the BCP SFRA and WCS for the SLP. outcomes from that work will be used to amend or update the current policies relating to water, flooding and environmental issues.
C029	1281	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		12. Infrastructure and Delivery	<p>It is noted there are several major housing allocations proposed along/nearby the boundary with Dudley borough including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SH25- Bradleys Lane/High Street, Tipton (189 dwellings)- no planning permission. •SH1- Brown Lion Street (27 dwellings)- planning permission. •SH7- The Boat Gauging House and adjacent land (50 dwellings)- subject of planning application. •Several allocations around Cradley Heath including: SH16- Cradley Heath Factory Centre, Woods Lane (196 dwellings)- partly subject of planning application; SH4- Lower High Street – Station hotel and Dunns site (20 dwellings)- no planning permission; SH13- Silverthorne Lane/Forge Lane (81 dwellings)- no planning permission; SH15- Mcarthur Road Industrial Estate (13 dwellings)- no planning permission. •SH34- Brandhall Golf Course (190 dwellings)- subject of planning application. <p>•Whilst located near to Rowley Regis, given the scale of the proposed allocation at SH37-Edwin Richards Quarry (526 dwellings within the plan period and 100 dwellings post plan period, partly subject of planning permission/application for 276 dwellings) we also note the relative proximity of this site to Dudley borough.</p> <p>These allocations should take account of cross-boundary infrastructure considerations given the potential for the cross-boundary use of and impacts upon highways, health, and education services. Matters related to impacts upon amenity and character of the local area should also be considered on a cross boundary basis. Dudley MBC would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on any future masterplans/other planning documents that may be produced for these sites going forward (and any planning applications, as appropriate). We would also welcome the opportunity to be engaged on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will support the SLP as its progresses to the next Regulation 19 stage so that any cross-boundary issues can be identified and addressed.</p> <p>In respect of education provision specifically, we would note that historically for cross-border flow of pupils the largest flow for Dudley MBC is with Sandwell MBC. As such Dudley MBCs education team would welcome ongoing discussions in relation to housing allocations nearby the boundary including updates on the proposed delivery timescales and Sandwell MBCs position on the education provision for such schemes. We particularly note that the SH25 allocation at Bradley's Lane and the various allocations around Cradley Heath are located closer to primary schools within Dudley borough than those in Sandwell.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Sandwell will continue to work through DTC to discuss potential impacts and issues with neighbouring authorities, including where the implications of cross-boundary infrastructure arise.
C030	1283	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	12. Infrastructure and Delivery	<p>The need for contributions towards Police infrastructure to ensure sustainable growth</p> <p>In order to sustain the level of growth proposed in the draft Sandwell Local Plan consultation and to meet the national and local policy objectives relating to safety and security, contributions will be required through CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of Police services to create environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or social cohesion. The PCCWM objects to Policy SHO1 as it should include reference for the need for contributions for social, environmental and physical infrastructure to support sustainable housing growth in accordance with the aspirations of the policy and the plan – however point 4 of the Policy states 'The development of sites for housing should demonstrate a comprehensive approach, making best use of available land and infrastructure and not prejudicing neighbouring uses.'</p> <p>As set out elsewhere in this representation, in the comments of the PCCWM on the Sandwell Spatial Portrait and Chapter 12 'Infrastructure and Delivery', a growth in housing and population in the Borough will bring increased demand for police services and there is a need for developer contributions to fund that growth for the reasons set out.</p> <p>Therefore, new development, including larger housing sites/ housing allocations, should be subject to CIL/ S.106 agreements as appropriate to help fund the provision and maintenance of Police services, and the requirement for this infrastructure should be enshrined in the wording of Policy SHO1.</p> <p>Of note, point 5 to Policy SHO1 refers to 'ancillary uses appropriate for residential areas' in sites with existing planning permission, sites allocated for housing by the Plan and windfall sites, in tacit acknowledgement that such uses as health facilities, community facilities and local shops are linked to housing development and that there may be a gap in provision. However, funding for such community services as policing is necessary and contributions should be required through CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of, inter alia Police services to create environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or social cohesion.</p>	Comment	Agree need to introduce new policy - to cover planning obligations etc. Following on from the draft BCP, the SLP has not referenced general or routine contributions towards police infrastructure in the policy or list infrastructure types. The NPPF, paragraph 57, requires that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests: a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It is considered that this cannot include non specific pooled contributions towards revenue expenditure where this is typically funded through alternative areas of public funding and government departments. Following the Regulation 18 consultation Sandwell has carefully considered the range of necessary infrastructure and viability of development typologies. The Council are preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will inform the SLP Regulation 19 Publication Plan. Where appropriate, specific infrastructure (e.g. capital investment) required to address the additional demands of planned growth will be identified in the IDP and policy SID1 allows for delivery of this infrastructure.
C031	1268	City Of Wolverhampton Council (Michele Ross, Planning Policy Manager) [250]		13. Waste and Minerals	<p>The City Council is a member of the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (WMRTAB) which helps member authorities to meet their DTC obligations regarding strategic waste management. WMRTAB has submitted responses to the Sandwell Local Plan consultation on behalf of the member authorities which cover technical issues regarding strategic waste management.</p>	Comment	Comment noted

C032	967	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]	13. Waste and Minerals	<p>WMRTAB generally supports the development considerations set out in Policies SWA1, SWA2, SWA3, SWA4 and SWA5 in relation to employment areas, minimising harm to human health and the environment, and other impacts of waste management proposals such as on surrounding buildings, resources and constraints on development.</p> <p>WMRTAB suggests that the meaning of Policy SWA1-Waste Infrastructure Future Requirements could be clarified. Currently this states (with emphasis added):</p> <p>‘Waste Infrastructure Future Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposals for relevant, major development shall evidence how its operation will minimise waste production, as well as facilitating the re-use and recovery of waste materials including, for example, through recycling, composting and energy from waste. 2. Waste operators will be expected to demonstrate that the greenhouse gas emissions from the operations involved and associated transport of waste from source to processing facility have been minimised, in line with national and local targets for the transition to a net zero carbon economy. 3. Proposals for waste management facilities will be supported based upon the following principles; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Managing waste through the waste hierarchy in sequential order. Sites for the disposal of waste will only be permitted where it meets a need which cannot be met by treatment higher in the waste hierarchy; b. Promoting the opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises and encouraging the co-location of waste developments that can use each other’s waste materials; c. Ensuring that sufficient capacity is located within Sandwell to accommodate the waste capacity requirements during the plan period and reducing the reliance on other authority areas; d. Enabling the development of recycling facilities across Sandwell, including civic amenity sites, and ensuring that there is enough capacity and access for the deposit of municipal waste for re-reuse, recycling, and disposal; e. Waste must be disposed of, or be recovered in, one of the nearest appropriate facilities, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies, to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health; f. Ensuring new waste management facilities are located and designed to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts on the townscape and landscape, human health and well-being, nature conservation and heritage assets and amenity; g. Working collaboratively with neighbouring authorities with responsibilities for waste who import waste into, or export waste out of, Sandwell, to ensure a co-operative cross boundary approach to waste management is maintained. <p>Firstly, regarding clause 1, the term ‘relevant major development’ has not been defined. WMRTAB suggest additional clarity could be provided within the SLP to make it clearer what ‘relevant major development’ consists of and so therefore what type of proposal would this part of the policy apply to. Point 1. Also states that there is a need to demonstrate how ‘operation’ of the facility will ‘minimise waste production’, however, the construction phase seems to have been not considered within the policy whereas this is frequently a source of significant quantities of waste.</p> <p>Part 2 of the policy expects that greenhouse gas emissions will be minimised ‘in line with national and local targets for the transition to a net zero carbon economy’, however there is no indication of what these targets are and so it is recommended that information be included to provide clarity and in turn allow proper implementation of the policy.</p> <p>WMRTAB strongly supports part 3, clause ‘g’ of the policy, however the extent to which Sandwell will rely on other areas in future to meet its needs and how it is meeting the capacity requirements of other areas is not clear with the Draft SLP (see comments above regarding the Duty to Cooperate) but WMRTAB recognises that this should be resolved via the ongoing Duty to Cooperate engagement.</p>	Support	Comment noted - look at incorporating addition wording to the Policy
C033	923	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	13. Waste and Minerals	<p>The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council’s draft Minerals and Waste policies and allocated sites (identified as being preferentially within Local Employment Sites) can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific policies identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals (as requested amendments above refer). However, inclusion of the canal network within relevant policy and allocation maps (ACTION REQUEST) will enable developers to identify canal-related constraints at an early stage and engage with us accordingly. The Trust therefore requests on-going engagement from the Council on submitted pre-application enquiries, and also encourages developers to seek pre-application advice from us direct:</p> <p>https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consultee-role/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice (ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>See also comments on Appendix E and Appendix F below.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - request for canals to be shown on the Policies Map
C034	966	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]	13. Waste and Minerals	<p>Although at the bottom of the waste hierarchy, non-hazardous landfill is still an important type of waste management that needs to be planned for and WMRTAB notes that there is little consideration of this matter in the Draft SLP, with no mention how non-hazardous landfill would be planned for.</p> <p>A report prepared for WMRTAB on landfill in the West Midlands indicates the following for 2019:</p> <p>There are five landfill sites for inert, non-hazardous & hazardous waste in the Black Country. At the end of 2019, active inert landfill capacity was estimated at 690,000 (m3), non-hazardous LF capacity estimated at 11,666,401 (m3) and non-hazardous LF capacity with SNRHW cell estimated at 418,953 (m3). Landfill sites have been allocated in Walsall which allow a further increase inert landfill capacity of 3,000,000 (m3) in future.</p> <p>WMRTAB notes that it is important that the future management of waste requiring disposal is planned for in the SLP and recognises that this should be resolved via the ongoing Duty to Cooperate engagement.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - There is one landfill in Sandwell, the former Edwin Richards Quarry
C035	925	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	15. Development Management	<p>The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council’s draft Development Management policies can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific policies identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals (as requested amendments above refer). Accordingly, we request the incorporation of cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the introductory text to this section, or more specifically in the justification texts for Policy SDM1 – Design Quality, Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards, and Policy SDM3 – Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C036	909	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	2. Spatial Strategy	<p>2.18 The Trust endorses the ‘key issues addressed in the SLP’ as including Nature Conservation; Nature Recovery Network and Biodiversity Net Gain; Provision, retention and protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows; Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness of the Black Country; Geodiversity and the Black Country UNESCO Global Geopark; Canals; The protection and enhancement of designated and undesignated heritage assets; and, Rejecting poor design.</p> <p>2.30 As such we acknowledge the approach of Balanced Green Growth in forming the basis of the Sandwell Local Plan’s Development Strategy (Policy SDS1). However, the Trust requests that our canal network be included within Figure 2 - Sandwell Spatial Map so that the contribution our network makes towards the delivery of Sandwell’s Spatial Strategy and overall Sandwell Local Plan Vision 2041 can be fully appreciated and realised by citizens and developers alike. (ACTION REQUEST)</p>	Comment	comment noted
C037	1222	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]	2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Shropshire Council supports explanation of SMBC employment land supply position in Spatial Strategy (paragraph 2.14) so far that, your employment land need is 185 hectares, there is an anticipated supply of 42 hectares and an unmet need for 143 hectares of employment land.</p>	Support	Comment noted
C038	859	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Josh Plant, Senior Promotion and Policy Planner) [209]	2. Spatial Strategy	<p>It is critical that the Council engages with neighbouring authorities and those within the GBBC HMA in order to ensure the delivery of all the borough’s housing and growth needs. The Council has not presented a Statement of Common Ground on this issue nor published a Duty to Cooperate Statement. The Council must pro-actively engage with the other authorities as a matter of urgency to agree a distribution of housing shortfall, following further work on housing evidence and Green Belt review studies, to ensure that these needs are met. This both a legal, Duty to Cooperate and soundness issue.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBC HMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell’s need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held.
C039	1223	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]	2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects as draft Spatial Strategy and draft Policy SDS1 should identify an employment land requirement for a ‘minimum of 42 hectares’ which leaves an unmet employment land need of 143 hectares.</p>	Object	Comment noted - The Council will try and meet the shortfall through Duty to Cooperate and by permissioning appropriate windfalls and redevelopment that comes forward during the plan period.

C040	904	Clowes Developments (UK) Limited [214]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	2. Spatial Strategy	<p>At paragraph 2.3 it states that the spatial strategy took account of, amongst other matters, the evidence base. Harris Lamb considers that the evidence base is deficient in that it did not include a review of the Green Belt. Nor is it evident how or indeed if the West Midlands Local Industrial Strategy (2019) was considered.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.14</p> <p>Notwithstanding the stated demand for employment land and the shortfall are both substantive and significant, they do not account for the projected loss of employment land to other uses i.e. 26 hectares. Harris Lamb also objects to the statement that the Plan allocates.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.15</p> <p>Harris Lamb supports the statement "ensuring that an adequate supply of employment land is maintained through the plan period will be essential in enabling long term balanced growth to be sustained". It then identifies "key issues to be addressed in the SLP" but it fails to include the need to secure employment land elsewhere in, and beyond, the FEMA e.g. South Staffordshire to address the substantial and significant supply shortfall.</p> <p>Balanced Green Growth, Paragraph 2.30h</p> <p>Harris Lamb supports the statement "regenerate existing employment areas and help them deliver". To enable to achieve that however new employment land needs to be identified as vacancy rates are very low, typically less than 10%, meaning that existing tenants are more likely to relocate further afield.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted on employment land need and whether the plan end date of 2041 is long enough to meet the need. The Plan does state that it will work with the other LAs in the Black Country FEMA. Additional working will be included to make the point stronger.</p> <p>The evidence used to establish the parameters for the SLP spatial strategy drew on the information used recently to inform the BCP, which included an in-depth GB assessment undertaken by LUC. This looked in detail at green belt parcels across the BC including in Sandwell. As part of this work, potential sites and locations were considered in terms of both housing and employment uses and the potential impacts on the GB of both uses were recorded and used to identify the subsequent GB allocations. Sandwell has taken forward a number of the former BCP allocations and in turn has considered the evidence relating to GB for all reasonable alternative sites in its area.</p> <p>It is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF. In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.</p> <p>In respect of employment land, the BC authorities have recently finalised a refreshed version of the EDNA and are working with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate to establish the possibility of meeting additional employment land needs outside the sub-regional borders.</p>
C041	863	Mr Kevin Priest [210]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>2.4 In March 2020 Sandwell Council declared a Climate Emergency. Council Members agreed that greenhouse gas emissions needed to be reduced to a level compatible with keeping global warming below 1.5C above pre-industrial levels. To achieve that, the Council committed to becoming carbon neutral in its own activities by 2030 and to seeing Sandwell become a carbon neutral borough by 2041.</p> <p>The plan generally talks about growth but doesn't seem to be taking strong enough, immediate action to keep emission levels down.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Council has included a number of policies designed to allow issues around climate change to be taken into account when decisions are made on planning applications. It has pursued a strategy that seeks to maximise the sustainability of its proposed development and concentrates new growth in areas where connectivity and accessibility to various modes of transport are available.</p> <p>the SLP itself is a document designed to run over a 15-year period and many of the aims and objectives it coains will be delivered over that time through the use of the new policies when planning decisions are made. Alongside this document the Council has produced a number of other strategies, such as the Climate Change Strategy and the Trees Strategy that are designed to address issues over a shorter period of time though associated action plans reviewed every few years.</p>
C042	1235	Consortium of Housebuilders and Land Promoters [240]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	2. Spatial Strategy	<p>There is no agreed strategy between the 14 GBBCHMA authorities as to how the unmet need up to 2031 will be accommodated, notwithstanding the significant scale of unmet need emerging beyond 2031. This is clear from Sandwell's own evidence, as part of this consultation it refers to confirming at a later date any likely contribution to its own shortfall, this however is only likely to address a small proportion of it.</p> <p>In the absence of this strategic level agreement, all 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be exploring all growth options in order to meet its own objectively assessed needs and those of the wider GBBCHMA, if their plan is to be considered positively prepared.</p> <p>In Sandwell's case, it is clear that not all growth options have been explored to meet its own objectively assessed needs, let alone those of the wider HMA. The plan proposes a supply of circa 38% of its total need and exacerbating the shortfall of the wider HMA by circa 18,600 homes. Under NPPF paragraph 139, Sandwell's unmet need alone represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing the borough's Green Belt boundaries, as does the scale of unmet need across the wider HMA.</p> <p>In summary, the 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be seeking to agree a strategy now for how the unmet needs up to 2031 and beyond will be comprehensively met in full. As part of this all authorities should be exploring all options for growth, including the release of Green Belt land, given the unmet need represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing Green Belt boundaries.</p>	Object	<p>DTC Note comments. Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell. In addition, given the level of need in Sandwell, allocation of green belt or additional green field sites would have little overall impact on the level of need but would have a significant and adverse impact on Sandwell's limited green belt.</p> <p>Amend to reflect the housing and employment land shortfall in the introduction to the SLP.</p>
C043	1226	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects to draft Spatial Strategy which out some key issues in paragraphs 2.17 to 2.32. Paragraph 2.18 should also address matters in relation to the Green Belt in your Borough in addition to your explanation in paragraph 2.21.</p>	Object	<p>Note comment. Amend to add reference to GB in para 2.18</p>
C044	1227	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects as it is necessary to consider further whether or not exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to your Green Belt boundary.</p>	Object	<p>Noted. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.</p>
C045	1228	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects as unmet development needs and the limited land availability in SMBC and other Black Country LPAs, is likely to require further consideration of your Green Belt boundaries to satisfy national policy</p>	Object	<p>Noted. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.</p>
C046	1229	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects as SMBC should properly include the consideration of exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt land, for development in Sandwell or within the Black Country, in addition to seeking help from other LPA as a strategic cross boundary matter.</p>	Object	<p>Noted. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.</p>
C047	1232	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>We ask you to consider whether your preferred strategy triggers exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt land</p>	Object	<p>Noted. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas. Comment noted. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF. In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the plan making process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.</p>
C048	1233	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects as need to consider amending Green Belt boundary to comply with paragraphs 142 and 143 of the NPPF to:</p> <p>a. promote sustainable patterns of development and use land which was previously developed and/or is well served by public transport (para. 142);</p> <p>b. consider whether there is any Green Belt land within their administration where it is not necessary to keep the land permanently open (para. 143);</p> <p>c. consider whether it is necessary to safeguard land between the urban area and the Green Belt to contribute towards longer term development needs (para. 143);</p> <p>c.(sic) consider how releasing Green Belt land for development might reduce your unmet development needs and improve the effectiveness of your DC process.</p>	Object	<p>Noted. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.</p> <p>A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF. In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the plan making process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.</p>
C049	1234	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Objects as a,b,c,c (sic) -preceding- is required to demonstrate whether or not exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified to release or safeguard Green Belt land for development and, whether or not it is necessary to change your Green Belt boundaries in relation to NPPF, paragraph 140. These further measures are necessary due to the ongoing uncertainty about delivery through the DTC process.</p>	Object	<p>Noted. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.</p>
C050	1126	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		2. Spatial Strategy	<p>Para 2.18 - We support this paragraph.</p> <p>Para 2.30 clause C - We support this clause.</p>	Support	<p>Support noted and welcomed</p>

C051	1230	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	Objects as further steps may help to justify the soundness of your draft Local Plan and show whether Balanced Green Growth is an appropriate strategy for your Borough.	Object	Noted The Sustainability Appraisal confirms that Balanced Green Growth is an appropriate strategy for the growth of the borough
C052	1236	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	Shropshire advice will help show how Sandwell draft Local Plan provides an appropriate strategy for your Borough. This will help to evidence compliance with the tests of soundness for plan making in national policy.	Comment	Noted. Sandwell MBC looks forward to continued engagement with Shropshire as both authorities progress their Local Plans.
C053	1239	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		2. Spatial Strategy	Shropshire Council welcomes further D2C discussions with Sandwell Council, including the matters raised within this response, following the conclusion of your current consultation	Comment	Noted
C054	1071	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	3. Assessment of Housing Growth Options	<p>2.12 It is not clear how the options tested in the SA have been identified or the reasons that alternatives were selected. This requires further clarification and justification. However, we do not consider that all reasonable alternatives have been considered or that those which have been considered are realistic. The reasonable alternatives which have been considered are also insufficiently distinct to highlight the different sustainability implications of each so that meaningful comparisons can be made.</p> <p>2.13 Options A, D and E vary between 9,044 and 12,523 dwellings (a difference of 3,479 dwellings) and would only deliver between 30-42% of the minimum local housing need calculated using the standard method. Options B, C and F vary between 23,522 dwellings and 30,206 dwellings and would deliver between 79-101% of the minimum local housing need calculated using the standard method. There is no 'mid-range' option tested which would consider the implications of a greater proportion of the minimum local housing need calculated using the standard method being met.</p> <p>2.14 Notwithstanding our concerns over the SA, it concludes that Options D and E are best performing. It does not acknowledge that Option A (which delivers a slightly larger amount of homes than Option D and E) comes in at a close third. The SA simply states that the options for providing higher levels of housing are "unlikely to be deliverable". Whilst we agree that it is unlikely for the Council to meet its minimum local housing need in full, given that Option A reflects previous rates of delivery in the Borough over the last 10 years this option appears to have been prematurely discounted and that other reasonable alternatives that could potentially deliver higher levels of growth have not been appropriately considered.</p> <p>2.15 The fact that the Council has chosen Option E over 'Option A' which would deliver a greater amount of housing and reflects the 'do nothing' scenario (i.e. simply translates forward past rates of delivery in the Borough) further demonstrates that the draft SLP is taking a backwards step in terms of housing delivery in a situation where it already has a poor record of housing delivery and risks inhibiting economic growth in the Borough over the plan period.</p> <p>2.16 The Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that the SLP is essentially seeking to deliver less homes in the next 10 years than the Borough has delivered in the previous 10 years, despite: i) the national policy objective remaining to boost significantly the supply of homes; ii) the on-going national housing crisis; iii) the scale of the unmet need; and iv) the lack of any certainty over how the unmet need would be distributed to neighbouring authorities. As such, the approach to setting the housing requirement is clearly unsound and, in the circumstances, it is imperative that the Council is doing everything it can to plan for more housing in the Borough.</p>	Comment	comment noted. The spatial strategy tested six different options and these ranged across various reasonable alternatives. The spatial strategy also set out how the Council identified and evaluated the options and why the preferred approach was chosen.
C055	1144	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		5. Climate Change	<p>Historic England are supportive of a section on Climate Change within the Plan. We enclose a link to some relevant publications considering the historic environment and climate change that may be useful to understand in the context of the Local Plan.</p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/climate-change/</p> <p>Under this section it would be useful to consider how the historic environment can contribute to the climate change agenda, which measures are appropriate in the context of the historic environment and how heritage assets need to be considered. There may also be times when climate change proposals such as solar farms or wind turbines may not be an appropriate solution if it affects the significance of heritage assets and other areas may be more suitable for this technology.</p>	Support	comments noted. Amend text to refer to potential impacts of climate change adaptation on the historic environment CC1.2j refers to impacts on the historic environment related to climate change adaptation and mitigation - add reference to proposals for climate change related development minimising or designing out impacts on the historic environment or the setting of heritage assets.
C057	637	Mr Gary Blunt [156]		5G	<p>This is not 5G and should be badged differently.</p> <p>NGA Technology is the old fibre to the cabinet which supports superfast up to 30nb speeds. Full fibre is gigabit capable.</p> <p>The HMG targets are 85% gigabit coverage by 2025 and 100% as soon after as possible this looks like 2030.</p> <p>Again you need to look at multiple providers and open access networks to make sure residents get value for money.</p> <p>Please contact WM5G for more in depth correspondence. We can support to get this written to drive growth in the area</p>	Support	Note comments. Amend and update data as at 2024. Rename policy to Digital Infrastructure. Amend / update supporting text.
C059	918	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		7. Sandwell's Housing	<p>The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council's draft Housing need and supply policies and allocated sites can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific policies identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals in Sandwell (as requested amendments above refer). However, inclusion of the canal network within relevant policy and allocation maps (ACTION REQUEST) will enable developers to identify canal-related constraints at an early stage and engage with us accordingly, ideally at pre-application stage. The Trust therefore requests on-going engagement from the Council on submitted pre-application enquiries, and also encourages developers to seek pre-application advice from us direct:</p> <p>https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consultee-role/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice (ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>See also comments on Appendix B below.</p> <p>In relation to towpath improvement aspirations the Trust has identified the Tame Valley Canal, Walsall Canal and the Old Wednesbury Canal as priority areas for upgrading over the plan period, and will seek to request Section 106/CIL monies from appropriate schemes where they arise in proximity to these stretches of the network.</p> <p>The Trust also advises that it has some specific critical assets within the Sandwell area such as Spouthouse Embankment, Titford Pools feeder, and Netherton Tunnel which will require careful assessment of allocations for impact and mitigation under the provisions of SNE6 – Canals, particularly in relation to matters of land stability and infrastructure maintenance, cross-referenced with historic coal mining activity within Sandwell.</p>	Comment	Note comments. Sandwell's canals are covered by policy SNE6 and others elsewhere in the SLP, and will be shown on the strategic transportation network map in the Reg 19 plan. Where any proposed developments are likely to have an impact on the canal network, including towpaths and structures / locations, the Council will consider the need to require applicants to provide suitable levels of mitigation through CIL / s106 as necessary and appropriate. This is however part of the development management process and will be dealt with accordingly, rather than through the auspices of the SLP directly.
C060	1220	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		7. Sandwell's Housing	Notes the proposed D2C contribution of 1,500 dwellings to the Black Country, is still currently subject to Examination in Public from Shropshire's Local Plan.	Comment	Comment noted.
C061	1266	City Of Wolverhampton Council (Michele Ross, Planning Policy Manager) [250]		7. Sandwell's Housing	<p>Given the existing housing land shortfalls, Wolverhampton will not be in a position to provide land within the emerging WLP to meet either housing needs arising in Sandwell.</p> <p>Regarding housing, it is recommended that Sandwell Council continues to engage with the work of the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area (GBBCHMA) officer group and the programme of work contained within the Statement of Common Ground as circulated by South Staffordshire Council in 2022. Clearly, given the scale of the Sandwell shortfall, a regional approach is required. Any solution should be based on an understanding of the pattern of functional and physical relationships across the GBBCHMA including migration and travel to work data so that, where practicable, needs are addressed as close as possible to where they arise.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held.
C062	1111	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		7. Sandwell's Housing	<p>Based on our review of the Regulation 18 consultation, we note that the housing and employment requirement has changed slightly since the 'Issues and Options' consultation. The draft Local Plan consultation document outlines that there is a requirement to deliver 29,773 dwellings over the plan period up to 2041. We note that the housing and employment requirement have primarily been identified based on the National Standard method on housing projections.</p> <p>While the housing demand stands at 29,773 dwellings, supply for 11,167 dwellings is expected to come through the adoption of the upcoming Local Plan, thereby leaving an unmet need for 18,606 homes. We appreciate that the Council will liaise with the neighbouring authorities to help accommodate some of Sandwell's unmet housing needs through their own housing provision. National Highways welcomes further information on this once the Council identifies the working arrangement and we look forward to understanding the impacts from these developments on the SRN in the area as you progress into Regulation 19.</p> <p>We note that a Sustainability Appraisal process has been undertaken to streamline the different housing and employment growth options and acknowledge that the allocation of sites has taken into consideration the location, availability of greenfield/ brownfield sites, and sustainability elements through a 'Balanced Green Growth' approach. We note that the new development allocations are focussed within the Regeneration Areas and Centres, which is likely to lead to a more efficient use of land and in improving the sustainable travel options.</p>	Comment	Note comments

C063	1218	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		7. Sandwell's Housing	It is expected that all potential sustainable options have been exhausted within the LPA area in attempts to limit the unmet housing need as far as possible.	Comment	Note comments
C064	1221	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		7. Sandwell's Housing	The housing requirements of all communities including travellers should be assessed and met to comply with NPPF paragraphs 60 & 62. NPPF paragraph 62, in footnote 27 references the substantive requirements of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS, 2015) to assess the needs of gypsies and travellers under the definitions in Annex 1. PPTS requires gypsy and traveller sites to be treated as a distinct type of residential need and the supply of pitches and plots to meet their needs are to be identified separately from the general housing supply.	Comment	Note comments
C065	1248	Rentplus UK Limited [244]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Jamie Roberts, Principle Planner) [243]	7. Sandwell's Housing	<p>The Black Country Housing Market Assessment 2021 (the "Black Country HMA") provides an assessment of affordable housing needs in Sandwell borough. Importantly, its table 3.7 at page 51 assesses the affordability of Rent to Buy homes alongside the time taken to save for a 10% deposit. This is a welcome level of detail that is sometimes absent from similar documents commissioned by other authorities, and is a vital illustration of the contribution that Rent to Buy homes can make towards meeting the widest possible range of housing needs.</p> <p>In Sandwell, table 3.7 presents a powerful illustration of how Rent to Buy can help households raise a 10% deposit; transforming lengthy and likely unrealistic timeframes, into an achievable goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •For a 1-bed home, it will take 2.7 years to raise a deposit at an intermediate rent, compared with 8.4 years in the private rented sector (a reduction of 5.7 years); •For a 2-bed home, it will take 2.9 years to raise a deposit at an intermediate rent, compared with 11.8 years in the private rented sector (a reduction of 8.9 years); •For a 3-bed home, it will take 4 years to raise a deposit at an intermediate rent, compared with 18.9 years in the private rented sector (a reduction of 14.9 years); <p>These timescales compare well against First Homes; Table 3.10 shows that in Sandwell it will take 8.2 years to raise a deposit for a 1-bed First Home; 11.2 years for a 2-bed First Home, and 16.6 years for a 3-bed First Home. Evidently, Rent to Buy homes can help to meet the needs of a wide range of households and this underlines the importance of a diverse tenure mix.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Black Country HMA assessment of the affordability of Rent to Buy is based on a 'generic' product that includes no gifted deposit. One of the key benefits of Rentplus is that it includes a 10% gifted deposit at the point of purchase, which means that an even wider range of households can access home ownership, supplemented by their own savings.</p> <p>Given that the Black Country HMA has considered the affordability of rent to buy homes, it is surprising that it does not seek to identify a need for such accommodation. Its table 5.4 at page 75 focuses on only the 'traditional' tenure types including shared ownership and social/affordable rent, whilst its table 5.9 identifies potential demand for First Homes. We recommend that the Black Country HMA is revised to take account of rent to buy in its overall assessment of the need for affordable housing types and tenures.</p> <p>Supporting text</p> <p>Paragraph 7.27 is right to identify the requirement at paragraph 65 of the NPPF to deliver 10% of the total number of homes on major developments to be affordable home ownership tenures. However, the final sentence of this paragraph refers only to First Homes and Shared Ownership tenures, whereas in practice any affordable home ownership tenure, including rent to buy products, can meet this need. To clarify this element of the supporting text, the final sentence of paragraph 7.27 should refer to the broader range of Annex 2 definitions instead.</p>	Comment	Noted and welcome support. Note comments and welcome support. - The Council is seeking to refresh the Black Country HMA for the Sandwell Council element. Agree that affordable home ownership includes a variety of types of tenures - Delete last sentence of paragraph 7.27 and replace with Annex 2 of the NPPF provides a definition for affordable home ownership [insert footnote https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/annex-2-glossary]
C067	1219	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		7. Sandwell's Housing	Under DTC, the 1,500 contribution from Shropshire is for the Black Country sub-region as a whole and does not distinguish between how this figure should be attributed between the four Black Country LPA areas. It would therefore be helpful to set out in your Strategy how you envisage this to be achieved and that, presumably this will be a decision reached in collaboration with the other three Black Country authorities through ABCA.	Object	Agreed - will set out apportionment agreed with BC authorities and identify figure for Sandwell
C068	1231	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		7. Sandwell's Housing	Objects: Your Authority can more clearly identify their unmet development needs to support ABCA to engage effectively in the DTC process.	Object	Full comment states approach is largely compliant with national policy. Note comment that can provide clarity on unmet development needs to support ABCA.
C069	1078	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	8. Assessment of reasonable alternative development sites	3.6The SA provides no justification for why development on land within the Green Belt was not considered as part of any of the "reasonable alternative" spatial strategy options assessed in the SA despite the release of land from the Green Belt for housing being considered as part of the SA for the draft BCP. The failure to consider Green Belt release as part of any of the "reasonable alternatives" is a fundamental flaw which must be addressed.	Object	The SA appraises the options chosen by the Council and as such does not of itself need to justify why GB was not taken forward. Sandwell's view that the green belt should not be identified for development was reiterated during the latter stages of the BCP and is now part of its approach to development, as set out in the Spatial Strategy paper. Comment noted. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF. In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.
C070	1225	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		8. Sandwell's Economy	Reiterates Shropshire Council have agreed to contribute 30 hectares to the Black Country to be distributed through the ABCA. This proposed contribution is still subject to agreement through Shropshire Local Plan's ongoing Examination in Public.	Comment	Comment noted - further Duty to Cooperate to be had with Shropshire
C071	1224	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		8. Sandwell's Economy	Objects to the relevance of the 1,206ha figure stated in Policy SEC1. This should be clarified as it currently implies an employment requirement far in excess of evidence provided in the EDNA.	Object	Comment noted - Look into rewording of the Policy
C072	871	South Staffordshire Council (Mr Edward Fox, Strategic Planning Team Manager) [87]		8. Sandwell's Economy	West Midlands Interchange A Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (West Midlands Interchange (WMI)) is situated within South Staffordshire though this serves a wider market area (including Sandwell). Through our 2022 EDNA South Staffordshire Council identified a requirement of 18.8 ha. of the WMI land to meet our labour demand requirements up to 2040. This will be subject to further analysis as part of the update to the EDNA in 2024. South Staffordshire Council has acknowledged that there is surplus employment land at WMI that the council does not require and that could be utilised to meet the unmet needs of the wider market area. Whilst we have taken a more in-depth approach to calculating our share of WMI through our local evidence, we still consider that the 2021 Stantec report1, that considered potential apportionment across the sites market areas based upon population change within each LPA area, is a reasonable basis for determining wider authorities' potential share of the site given its wider role and in the absence of sub-regional details of labour demand. The Stantec report apportions 67ha of the site towards the Black Country, with a further breakdown suggesting that 18ha of the site could be apportioned to Sandwell.	Comment	Comment noted - no action required
C073	1102	TRWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		8. Sandwell's Economy	While we have no specific policies we would change in this section, we strongly welcome policy SEC5, in terms of access to labour markets. Yet accessibility could also be captured in the Strategic Employment Areas policies and Local Employment Areas, given that Sandwell has higher levels of non-car ownership than the rest of the West Midlands, so we need to ensure that all new employment is accessible by sustainable and active travel modes, for as many people to access as possible.	Comment	Comment noted - no further action required
C074	906	Clowes Developments (UK) Limited [214]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	8. Sandwell's Economy	<p>"The Plan will allocate 1,206 hectares of occupied employment land for strategic, local or other employment provision". As it stands the SLP only allocates 26ha of new employment land.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.5g</p> <p>The proposed objectives do not include working closely with LPAs, who have a strong functional relationship with Sandwell, to identify appropriate areas of land on which to address some of the substantive and significant employment land shortfall.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - paragraph 8.4 of the Reg 18 Draft Plan states the Council with through Duty to Co-operate work those Local Authorities in the Black Country FEMA and those neighbouring Local Authorities identified as having a strong or moderate economic link with the Black Country FEMA. No further action required

C075	1267	City Of Wolverhampton Council (Michele Ross, Planning Policy Manager) [250]		8. Sandwell's Economy	<p>It is recognised that Sandwell Council have fully explored all opportunities within the Borough to maximise development capacity, including increased densities and sites in centres, whilst protecting viable employment land and premises as necessary, given the evidenced shortfall of employment development land across the Black Country Functional Economic Market Area (BC FEMA). It is accepted that it will not be possible to meet all development needs within the Borough, and that it is necessary for Sandwell to ask other authorities if they are able to contribute towards meeting Sandwell needs through the allocation of land in their Local Plans.</p> <p>In terms of employment development land, the BC EDNA concludes that the BC FEMA as a whole has a shortfall of 152ha, however contributions secured through current Statements of Common Ground between the BC FEMA authorities and Shropshire and South Staffordshire Councils have potential to provide 133.6 ha towards BC FEMA needs, which would reduce that shortfall to 18.4 ha.</p> <p>Regarding employment development land, it is recommended that Sandwell should continue to work together with the other BC authorities to close the BC FEMA employment development land shortfall through ongoing DTC activity, with a focus on those areas having a strong or moderate functional economic relationship with the Black Country (as defined in the BC EDNA), and other areas where there is evidence of a functional relationship.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - paragraph 8.4 of the Reg 18 Darft Plan states the Council with through Duty to Co-operate work those Local Authorities in the Black Country FEMA and those neighbouring Local Authorities identified as having a strong or moderate economic link with the Black Country FEMA. No further action required
C076	919	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		8. Sandwell's Economy	<p>The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council's draft Economy policies and allocated sites can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific policies identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals (as requested amendments above refer). However, inclusion of the canal network within relevant policy and allocation maps (ACTION REQUEST) will enable developers to identify canal-related constraints at an early stage and engage with us accordingly, ideally at pre-application stage. The Trust requests on-going engagement from the Council on submitted pre-application enquiries, and also encourages developers to seek pre-application advice from us direct:</p> <p>https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consultee-role/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice(ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>See also comments on Appendix C below.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - possibility of showing the network on the Policies Map - amend key transportatio diagram to show canals
C077	1112	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		8. Sandwell's Economy	<p>Based on our review of the Regulation 18 consultation, we note that the housing and employment requirement has changed slightly since the 'Issues and Options' consultation. The draft Local Plan consultation document outlines that there is a requirement to deliver 185 hectares of employment land over the plan period up to 2041. We note that the housing and employment requirement have primarily been identified based on the Economic Development Need Assessment (EDNA) respectively.</p> <p>The quantum of employment land intended to be delivered through the Local Plan is 42ha, with a shortfall of 143ha. We note that the housing and employment supply identified in the Draft Local Plan has considered the existing planning applications, sites under construction, and windfall allowance.</p> <p>We note that a Sustainability Appraisal process has been undertaken to streamline the different housing and employment growth options and acknowledge that the allocation of sites has taken into consideration the location, availability of greenfield/ brownfield sites, and sustainability elements through a 'Balanced Green Growth' approach. We note that the new development allocations are focussed within the Regeneration Areas and Centres, which is likely to lead to a more efficient use of land and in improving the sustainable travel options.</p>	Comment	Comment notes - no future action required
C078	1109	Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Mr Michael Brown, Policy Planner) [226]		8. Sandwell's Economy	<p>Given the shortfall in available employment land, Sandwell Council is encouraged to ensure that efficient use is made of the land that is available. While it may not be possible to require a minimum density as happens with housing land, there may be other ways to maximise the economic benefit from employment land.</p>	Comment	Commented noted - Because of the shortfall of employment land within Sandwell, many companies maximise their existing sites to increase floorspace.
C079	1275	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		9. Sandwell's Centres	<p>We note that the new development allocations are focussed within the Regeneration Areas and Centres, which is likely to lead to a more efficient use of land and in improving the sustainable travel options.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C080	1103	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		9. Sandwell's Centres	<p>Similar to our comments concerning residential developments, in the general policy for centres across Sandwell, public transport accessibility to differing tiered centres could further be considered, with a criteria in place to ensure that they are well served, by the core bus network. Similar public transport accessibility criteria's have been developed for other local plans – ensuring varying hierarchies of centres are served by appropriate public transport provision and could be something Sandwell Council may want to consider developing within its local plan.</p>	Comment	Comment Noted, but this is a Transport Issue, a Centres Response not required
C081	723	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Accessibility	<p>If anything, there are too many parking spaces. Some could be redeveloped for housing which would bring more custom for the shops.</p>	Comment	Centres Car Parks capacity & usage is monitored & reviewed-surplus car parks are disposed of ie Old Hill.
C082	734	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Accessibility	<p>Need to improve links to the retail park.</p>	Support	From context of previous Repts-this refers to Great Bridge Retail Park. Centre & Retail Park are separated by a canal. Planning App DC/17/60197 will improve the appearance of the link when it is completed. There is currently no work on site. However, any subsequent application/development will also be required to improve the appearance of the link through appropriate boundary treatment. SAMC also liaises with CRT on these applications which affect their land/infrastructure.
C083	741	Mr Jon Green [58]		Accessibility - Transport Proposals:	<p>Should make reference to cross city bus proposals through Cape Hill, and potential to improve the operation of the main junction.</p>	Comment	Comments noted.
C084	1246	Rentplus UK Limited [244]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Jamie Roberts, Principle Planner) [243]	Affordable Housing	<p>Rentplus recognises the Council's desire to deliver affordable and sustainable communities and believe tenure diversity has a key part to play in delivering this. Planning policies which enable innovative tenure types; which help to meet different elements of housing need; and which support the timeous delivery of much needed new homes; are an important part of meeting Sandwell's stated vision and ambitions.</p>	Comment	Note comments
C085	927	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		APPENDIX A – Nature Recovery Network and Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>The Trust seeks to maintain engagement with the Council on the evolution of BNG delivery within Sandwell in its forthcoming formative roll-out stages (2024/25) and thereafter on an implementation basis throughout the plan period (ACTION REQUEST).</p>	Comment	Comment noted - DTC work to continue via th West Midlands Aggregates Working Group
C086	653	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]		APPENDIX A – Nature Recovery Network and Biodiversity Net Gain, Black Country Local Nature	<p>This is at odds with most of the other policies which you are in parallel promoting such as BNG credits. Priority Network Restoration Zones should be the basis on Sandwell's local plan, and not computer generated nonsense like credits.</p>	Support	noted. The LNRS has been included as part of the SLP and will need to be taken into account when decisions on planning proposals are made.
C087	1082	Mr Syed Ahmed [142]	Mr Anthony Hope [135]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Promotion of two sites at Portway Hill, Rowley Regis for residential allocation. Site location plan provided as attachment.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C088	901	National Grid [79]	Avison Young (Mr Matt Verlander, Director) [77]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets. Details of the sites affecting NGET assets are provided below.</p> <p>Development Plan Document Site Reference</p> <p>SM2 (SA-199) Lion Farm, Oldbury - YJ ROUTE: 275Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: KITWELL - OCKER HILL 275kv Underground Cable route: KITWELL 275KV S/S</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Site assessments have been undertaken that should have recorded the presence of utilities - need to check to make sure these lines are properly recorded

C089	1204	Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Evidence Base</p> <p>Sequential Test</p> <p>Before the next consultation on the plan, the Council will need to decide how to present evidence that the strategic site allocations have passed the Sequential Test. It will need to be obvious how the Sandwell Local Plan has met the requirements to apply the Sequential Test strategically as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 167-171 inclusive. We specifically highlight paragraph 168;</p> <p>“The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding.”</p> <p>The Black Country Councils Strategic Level 1 Flood Risk Assessment (2020) sets out an objective of the SFRA in helping the Councils to undertake the Sequential Test i.e. Identify areas where further assessment of flood risk is needed and provide sufficient detail to enable the Sequential Test to be applied to inform allocations of land for development (page iii). One of the recommendations (page 109) is to locate new development in areas of lowest risk, in line with the Sequential Test, by steering sites to Flood Zone 1. If a Sequential Test is undertaken, and a site at flood risk is identified as the only appropriate site for the development, the Exception Test shall be undertaken.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Spatial Strategy Paper, Local Site Assessment Report including Appendix D Site Assessment Forms and the Sustainability Appraisal as we had thought one of these documents would explain how the Sequential Test has been applied and what conclusions were drawn. We acknowledge that two sites (North and South of Tamebridge Parkway Station) had been rejected due to the presence of Flood Zone 3 as part of the Local Site Assessment screening process. However, unfortunately there doesn't seem to be a clear or consistent approach to how these assessments have considered flood risk or clear conclusions as to whether this means the Sequential Test has been passed or not. There also appear to have been some missed opportunities to have incorporated the aims of the Sequential Test either within one or more of the growth strategies as a distribution of spatial growth consideration, or the Sustainability Appraisal SA Objective Framework and subsequent appraisal of sites.</p> <p>We acknowledge the difficult balancing act the Council must grapple with and the preferred growth strategy of 'balanced Green Growth' having appraised the options will likely have some positive effects. However, a number of site allocations are proposed in areas of Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) and/or Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and will now need evidence to (a) demonstrate whether they have passed the Sequential Test (there are no alternative sites at a lower risk of flooding) and (b) be assessed by a Level 2 SFRA. The Council will need to ensure this is considered and demonstrated prior to the next iteration of the Local Plan, either as an update to the Sustainability Appraisal or as a standalone document.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted. The Council is in the process of starting a revision of the current SFRA and have commissioned JBA to undertake the work. Prior to the finalisation of the Reg 19 SLP, any additional evidence from the revised SFRA will be used to establish whether any of the potential sites would be undeliverable in relation to flooding issues and the SLP can be amended accordingly if this is the case.</p> <p>All reasonable alternative sites for both housing and employment have been through detailed assessments prior to being considered for inclusion in the SLP. This assessment considered the impact of flooding and the presence of flood zones within or adjacent to the site, and under certain circumstances sites were excluded from further consideration if they failed to meet certain gateway criteria. Sites affected by flood zone 3 were excluded from further consideration. Further work will be undertaken to establish whether any of the sites identified by the EA need to be excluded or mitigation undertaken to alleviate any potential future risks. An SFRA / WCS is being undertaken prior to the submission of the SLP under Regulation 19 and its conclusions will inform the list of sites taken forward.</p>
C090	928	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>SH7 - The Boat Gauging House and adjoining land, Factory Road, Tipton – development proposals should have particular regard to the heritage assets on site in scale, form and impact on character</p> <p>SH14 - Langley Maltings, Western Road, Langley – development proposals should have full regard to adjacent heritage assets in scheme layout, design and appearance</p> <p>SH19 - Land at Horseley Heath, Alexandra Road, and Lower Church Lane, Tipton – development proposals where adjacent to the canal should have full regard to the nature conservation needs of the SLINC</p> <p>SH21 - Dudley Road East, Oldbury – development proposals where adjacent to the canal should have full regard to the nature conservation needs of the adjacent SINC</p> <p>SH30 - Land to east of Black Lake, West Bromwich - development proposals where adjacent to the canal should have full regard to the nature conservation needs of the adjacent SINC</p> <p>SH35 - Rattlechain site - land to north of Temple Way, Tividale – development proposals where adjacent to the canal should have full regard to the land contamination, water quality and land stability issues arising from this site</p> <p>SH36 - Land between Addington Way and River Tame, Temple Way (Rattlechain) – comments as SH35 above</p> <p>SH41 - North Smethwick Canalside – development proposals where adjacent to the canal should pay full regard to Smethwick-Birmingham Corridor Framework (2022) and the Rolfe Street Masterplan (2023)</p> <p>SH53-58 – various sites within the Part of Grove Lane Masterplan – comments as SH41 above</p> <p>SM1 - Chances Glass Works, Land west of Spon Lane, north of Palace Drive – development proposals should have particular regard to the heritage assets on site in scale, form and impact on character</p>	Comment	Comments noted.
C091	1080	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>4.1 We agree that the Council should consider and assess any site with the capacity to accommodate at least 10 dwellings.</p> <p>4.2 The Council's Site Assessment Report states that a "number of sites within the Green Belt were previously assessed through the Black Country Plan process. The release of Green Belt land for housing does not accord with the proposed spatial strategy for the Draft SLP. Therefore, any site within the Green Belt is considered to have gateway constraints and to not be suitable for development."</p> <p>4.3 For the reasons set out in Section 3, the Council's approach to site selection and in particular its failure to consider and fully assess the suitability of Green Belt sites for housing development is a fundamental flaw in its approach to site selection. This means that the Council will have prematurely discounted sites which are suitable for housing development, such as the site [at The Crescent, Queslett Road, Great Barr].</p> <p>4.4 This is clearly evidenced by the fact that the Regulation 18 Draft Black Country Plan proposed to allocate Green Belt a small number of sites in Sandwell for housing. These sites were assessed by the Black County Authorities, including Sandwell, as suitable for housing development in only July 2021 but have been discounted at the first stage of the Council's site assessment process as Green Belt is treated as a "gateway constraint" which means that sites are not considered suitable for development.</p> <p>4.5 For the reasons set out above, the Council's approach to site assessment and selection is unsound. It is essential that the Council explore all options to meet the housing needs of the Borough. This includes carrying out a comprehensive assessment of the suitability of all sites, including land within the Green Belt, to accommodate housing development.</p>	Object	<p>The Council does not agree with the respondent's interpretation of the approach to GB - this was a joint plan designed to address housing need across a much wider area than Sandwell alone. As such and given the fact that both Dudley and Walsall contain considerably more GB than Sandwell, it was appropriate to consider the GB as a source of additional provision across the wider BC area. At no time was the GB in Sandwell considered as a location appropriate to provide for any significant housing (or any employment) provision, reflected in the dearth of sites identified within it for such development. The subsequent decision to undertake the SLP meant that the Council had the opportunity to consider its position with regard to GB allocation. Given the dearth of GB in Sandwell and the fact that it meets the main aim of GB - preventing urban sprawl - as well as maintaining openness, and representing a permanent designation, the Council is not persuaded that exceptional circumstances that would override these elements exist. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF. In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.</p>
C092	951	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>21. Criteria 3 of [policy SDS1] sets out that "Appendices B and C show how the housing and employment land ambitions for Sandwell will be met. Those development needs that cannot be accommodated within the borough will be exported to sustainable locations in neighbouring local authority areas, following consultation." HBF would question the appropriateness of this approach, but if it is to be pursued then this should be set out as an integral part of the policy and not deferred to Appendix B and C. Surely Housing Allocations should be made as an integral part of the Plan and not in an Appendix.</p>	Comment	The inclusion of the details of allocated sites in Appendices B and C is a matter of convenience and layout and does not represent a lessening of their importance. This was also the approach adopted in the former BCP.
C093	802	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Dudley MBC would welcome further clarification in relation to Mixed Use Allocation SM2 Lion Farm, Oldbury. This represents a major allocation which is in proximity of Dudley borough and has potential cross boundary implications given its scale and current/proposed uses. The site currently provides for 6 sports pitches which have the potential to provide for cross boundary sports provision. The SLP states that appropriate uses are the retention of 6 sport pitches. The 'Further Information' text states that a net loss of the pitches could be avoided which is strongly caveated by the ability to relocate 6 pitches to the southern part of the borough. We would welcome clarification on whether the existing pitches are to be retained on site or relocated and if this would have any implications for cross boundary provision given the need to protect and enhance pitches across the Black Country. One of the Black Country Overarching Strategic Framework recommendations states the following for Football: Protect existing quantity of pitches, including lapsed and disused provision, until all demand is being met (unless replacement provision meets Sport England requirements and is agreed upon and provided).</p> <p>The SLP states that the site will provide for 200 homes and 2.3ha of employment land. In respect of the employment land provision, we would welcome clarification if this site is proposed for B class employment use in accordance with SLP Policy SEC1. The site does not appear to be included within the B class employment land totals which are set out at Appendix C to the SLP (and already total the 29ha of vacant land referenced in SLP Policy SEC1). Dudley MBC would have concerns if this site was to be utilised for any large-scale retail development and the potential impact upon our own Tier One and Tier Two centres, plus additional impacts on highways. Any cross-boundary implications in respect of highways impacts should be fully considered. We would welcome confirmation on the specific proposals for the site.</p> <p>Dudley MBC also notes the proximity of this site to the Edwin Richards Quarry site allocation (SH37). The cumulative impacts of these two allocations in terms of cross boundary infrastructure provision should be considered.</p>	Comment	Note comments - will continue to discuss such sites through Dtc

C094	803	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SH3 (SA21) 88-90 Dudley Road West - The proposed allocation for housing would lead to the loss of an existing indoor cricket facility for which para 99 of the NPPF and draft policy SHW5 would apply. No reference is made to mitigating the loss of this existing sports facility or demonstrating it is surplus in accordance with these relevant policies. Sport England therefore objects to the proposed allocation, and would recommend that either the allocation be deleted from the plan, or be revised so as to ensure the sports facility is retained, or that additional text be added to make it clear that the proposed allocation can only come forward subject to addressing the loss of the facility in line with the above policies.	Object	No replacement site identified, delete allocation
C095	804	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SH9 (SA28) The Phoenix Collegiate, Friar Park Road, Wednesbury - Notwithstanding that the site has an existing outline planning consent for residential development, this is subject to a section 106 agreement to secure mitigation for the loss of existing playing fields. The planning consent whilst still extant has not been implemented. It is important to recognise that the site contains existing playing fields, the loss of which would need to be mitigated in line with para 99 of the NPPF, draft policy SHW5 and Sport England's Playing Field Policy and Guidance. As drafted the allocation does not address this and so Sport England raises an objection to the proposed allocation. To address this, the allocation wording should reference the need to mitigate the loss of playing field.	Object	Comments noted. Add following text to allocation SH9 (final column) The loss of the playing pitch will need to be mitigated.
C096	805	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SH18 (SA55) Friar Park (STW/SMBC land), Wednesbury - Sport England recognises that the allocation does make reference to mitigating the loss of playing pitches in line with the PPOSS/Action Plan, but objects to this being subject to viability testing, since there is no relevant exception criteria for viability testing in para 99 of the NPPF, nor within draft policy SHW5, nor within Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and Guidance. To address, this we recommend that the reference to viability testing be removed.	Object	Comments noted, do not need to amend as there are policies in place with regards to playing pitch replacement. Sandwell Council will continue to engage with Sport England in relation to this matter.
C097	806	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SH34 (SA79) Brandhall Golf Course - The allocation references an existing planning application for redevelopment of the site, for which Sport England have objected. We recognise that there is no longer a need to retain the 18 hole municipal course, but take the view that mitigation should be secured to make qualitative improvements to the existing golf course facility at Warley Woods in line with the findings and recommendations of the PPOSS 2022. We understand that a planning condition has been included to secure this mitigation. To address this, we would recommend that an appropriate reference be added to the allocation regarding securing an appropriate off-site contribution towards golf.	Object	Comments noted - the planning condition is in relation to the planning application, there are policies in the Plan that refer to loss of sports facilities. - no change
C098	807	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SH40 (SA94) Langley Swimming Centre, Vicarage Road, Oldbury - This existing Leisure Centre site contains two swimming pools and a health and fitness centre. The facility closed in July 2023 when the Sandwell Aquatics Centre opened for public use. The SAC provides equitable or better facilities in both quantity and quality, and is in a suitable location, in line with para 99 of the NPPF, and so Sport England has no objection to the loss of this site to sport.	Comment	Comments noted
C099	808	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SH43 (SA166) Land off Tanhouse Avenue, Great Barr - The site includes an area of disused playing field that has previously been delineated to provide a football pitch. The proposed allocation does not reference this, and does not identify the need to mitigate the loss of the playing field in line with para 99 of the NPPF, draft policy SHW5 and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy, and so we object to this proposed allocation. To address this, either the proposed allocation should be deleted, or additional text be added to make it clear that the proposed allocation can only come forward subject to addressing the loss of former playing field in line with the above policies.	Object	The allocation does not include the disused playing field. Additional information will be added to the further information column stating that any proposal will need to allow for access to the playing field.
C100	809	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	SM2 (SA199) Lion Farm, Oldbury - The site constitutes existing playing field for which para 99 of the NPPF, draft policy SHW5 and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy apply. Sport England notes the allocation is for retention of 6 sports pitches with changing facilities and car parking (5 ha), with the remainder to be lost to a mix of residential, employment and open space uses. We note the reference that this allocation is strongly caveated by the ability to relocate 6 pitches to the southern part of the Borough, however this does not provide sufficient comfort that a proposal will come forward to provide replacement playing field that is equivalent or better quantity, equivalent or better quality, in a suitable location, and subject to equivalent or better accessibility and management arrangements to meet the relevant exception criteria of our policy. The Council's own evidence base in the PPOSS 2022 identifies shortfalls of capacity for football in Oldbury and across the Borough, both now and in the future, with a recommendation to protect and enhance the quality of the existing pitches at Lion Farm. The site is well used for adult league football in the Warley Sunday League by several local teams whose demand would likely be displaced should the site be redeveloped. Sport England are aware that finding a suitable site(s) to replace 6 pitches will be extremely challenging for the Council in light of the findings and recommendations of the PPOSS, and so in the absence of detailed deliverable proposals that demonstrate how these pitches would be replaced in line with the relevant policies referred to above, Sport England is of the view that there is significant doubt that the caveat would be reasonably met. We consider this allocation to be in direct conflict with the Council's stated ambitions, vision and objectives of the Draft Plan, particularly those that seek to improve the health and well-being of Borough's residents. As such, Sport England strongly objects to the proposed allocation which should be removed from the plan.	Object	Comment noted. Work is underway to identify replacement provision in suitable locations; if this cannot be found, the allocation will be amended or deleted in full.
C101	856	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	The inclusion of Brades Road, Oldbury as a proposed site allocation (site reference: SH38) is fully supported by Vulcan for the reasons set out in the March 2023 call for sites submission attached at Appendix 1. The site is clearly consistent with the Government agenda of brownfield first and maximising development within areas with high sustainability credentials that are accessible by a choice of means of transport. Vulcan also fully supports the inclusion of adjoining land on Dudley Road East (site reference: SH21) for the same reasons. The estimates shortfall of 18,606 homes over the period to be covered by the Sandwell Local Plan indicates very strongly that Sandwell will have to look to high density solution within the plan area. There is potential for Brades Road to come forward earlier in the plan period than 2033 and there is justification for it being identified for delivery earlier in the housing trajectory. The significant shortfall in housing provision over the plan period and the uncertainty over housing numbers to be provided out of area through 'duty to co-operate' suggests very strongly that sites that are suitable and available should be identified as coming forward earlier in the housing trajectory, where there is potential for this to happen. There is good reason to expect that delivery out of area will be skewed to the latter stages of the Sandwell Local Plan period, given that those neighbouring authorities will justifiably prioritise meeting their own housing requirements. This suggests that there is good reason to front-load the proportion of new homes delivered within the Sandwell area, where there is evidence that sites are available and deliverable. Brades Road is potentially available in the shorter-term, and earlier delivery than 2033 is possible. 13.0The key benefits that weigh heavily in favour of the proposed allocation are: -Delivery of homes on a sustainable site, helping to meet local housing need in the context of persistent past under delivery, a lack of a demonstrable five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and a generally bleak housing land supply position locally; -Brownfield regeneration of a life-expired employment site; -The potential for a masterplan-led design alongside other housing regeneration sites; -Significant public benefits through significant canal environment improvements; and -Other wider community benefits.	Support	Comments noted.
C102	934	Chance Heritage Trust [56]	Iceni Projects (Katie Inglis, Associate Director) [215]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	CHT considers that the emerging policy in this regard accords with Paragraph 122 and 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) by adapting the policy position to reallocate land and setting a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the heritage assets on the Chance Glassworks site, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation. The Chance Heritage Trust wish to see the sensitive, heritage-led regeneration of the Chance Glassworks Site remain a priority for Sandwell Council throughout the Local Plan process. The proposals will continue to be shaped by extensive engagement with the Local Planning Authority and other key stakeholders.	Comment	Comments noted.

C103	935	Chance Heritage Trust [56]	Iceni Projects (Katie Inglis, Associate Director) [215]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>CHT consider that the proposed employment allocation in the draft Local Plan does not provide sufficient flexibility to bring about the regeneration of the site and a bespoke and flexible policy allocation to realise the potential of the site should be provided in the emerging Local Plan to celebrate the heritage assets and uphold the heritage aims identified in Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>As outlined below, the adopted policy has not worked in bringing about the regeneration of these assets, and the proposed draft policy would be more restrictive and less favourable, potentially significantly limiting the deliverability of the site. The Council must recognise that a shift in policy is imperative to thwart the ongoing decay to safeguard this unique site for future generations.</p> <p>To make the Soho Foundry regeneration project feasible and deliverable, the site should be afforded a bespoke allocation for flexible uses which is not limited by the industrial development of the wider site.</p> <p>CHT are considering several options comprising a mixture of leisure, tourism, education and conference facilities, along with employment. This aligns with the Sandwell Regeneration Strategy 2022-2027 which identifies Soho Foundry as a priority location to be "revived for modern uses", with an expected delivery date of 2027.</p> <p>This letter outlines the site and its surroundings, provides an overview of the emerging proposals for its redevelopment, and then responds to several of the Policies within the consultation document relevant to the regeneration of the site.</p> <p>Figure 1: Soho Foundry and Mint site, Smethwick (see attachment)</p> <p>a. Site Context</p> <p>The Soho Foundry and Mint is located on Foundry Lane in Smethwick, close to the canal/railway line. The Foundry was constructed in 1775 for the manufacture of steam engines and was of pivotal importance to the industrial revolution and evolution of mass production techniques. It was closely associated with the pioneering endeavours of Boulton, Watt and Murdoch and subsequently the site became the home to a new mint building in 1860. Both the Foundry and Mint are Grade II* listed buildings. Whilst the Foundry and Mint buildings are now unused and have a temporary roof covering to protect their structures, the wider site was acquired by W&T Avery in 1895 who continue to operate from the adjoining buildings.</p> <p>In terms of designations, the site comprises a Scheduled Monument by virtue of the significant areas of archaeological survival that are known to still exist within the site, including the bases of up to six furnaces and associated major tunnels and flues. The site also contains two listed structures - the Former Soho Foundry at Grade II* level, and the Towpath Bridge at Grade II. The listed buildings are in varying states of deterioration and disrepair (included on the Heritage at Risk Register 2023) which needs to be arrested imminently to avoid irreparable damage being sustained. The site is part of the Black Country UNESCO Global Geopark, designated in 2020 in recognition of the international importance of its natural and cultural heritage which helped to shape the industrial revolution and the world.</p> <p>The site is highly significant nationally and internationally for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Becoming the first purpose-built steam engine manufactory in the world. 	Object	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Soho Foundry was subject to a Site Assessment which concluded that there is an opportunity for new employment development (mixed use) within the site possibly using an existing access from Foundry Lane. Due regard would need to be given to the high level of statutorily protected structures within the site.</p> <p>It is accepted that the future of the site is somewhat dependent on introducing a high quality, mixed use heritage led, regeneration programme. However, the proximity of established, viable, albeit low value employment uses, precludes residential development. The site is poorly connected to local services and the presence of adverse noise and air quality conditions would create a poor residential environment.</p> <p>The continued allocation of this site and the wider area for employment, would protect existing businesses and prevent loss of jobs. It will also continue to accommodate relocation of displaced businesses arising from the residential land use allocation around the Rolfe Street area.</p> <p>The site is not considered suitable for gypsy and traveller use as it does not meet selection criteria.</p>
C104	1081	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Promotion of site at The Crescent, Queslett Road, Great Barr for residential allocation.</p> <p>5.1 The site extends to approximately 0.45Ha. It is located immediately adjacent to the built up edge of Great Barr. It is approximately 800m to the east of the Scott Arms District Centre.</p> <p>Availability</p> <p>5.8 The site is vacant land owned entirely by the landowner who is keen to promote the site for development. Assuming that the site is identified as a proposed allocation in the emerging Sandwell Plan and release from the Green Belt, the landowner would put the site onto the market quickly, with the aim of selling it to a developer/ housebuilder to enable it to deliver housing within the first five years of the plan period.</p> <p>5.9 The existing access via The Crescent is also within the same landownership.</p> <p>5.10 There is no legal ownership impediments to development. Accordingly, the site is available now in NPPF terms.</p> <p>Suitability</p> <p>5.11 The site is immediately adjacent to the urban edge of Great Barr with housing to the south and west. The site is within walking distance of the Scott Arms District Centre and is 300m from the Scott Arms Medical Centre. It is also within 650m of Whitecrest Primary School.</p> <p>5.12 It is within 400m of bus stops on Queslett Road, to the west, which provide frequent bus services (No. 5 and 881 services) to Sutton Coldfield and West Bromwich (roughly every 10-20 minutes). It is approximately 2.2km from the nearest railway station (Hamstead) which provides regular services to Walsall and Wolverhampton.</p> <p>5.13 It is, therefore, clearly in a highly suitable and sustainable, location for further housing growth in the District.</p> <p>*Full Ecological and Heritage Appraisal submitted as part of rep*</p> <p>5.42 We disagree with the conclusions of the Green Belt Study. The site does not in our view make any contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is contained to the west by existing development. To the east it is contained by the M6 which sits on a raised highway embankment and provides a clear defensible boundary which is readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. The site forms part of a wider parcel which is contained on all sides by major highway infrastructure (i.e. the M6, A4041 and A34). The M6 in particular prevents urban sprawl of Great Barr. The site does not, therefore, play any role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of urban areas. • The site plays no role in terms of preventing neighbouring towns from merging with one another. To the north of the Queslett Road there is other open land to either side of the M6 which maintains a gap of at least 600 metres between the eastern boundary of the site and built up edge of Pheasey. To the south of the Queslett Road existing housing already extends to the east of the site up to the M6 and beyond, effectively joining up the neighbourhoods to either side of the M6. • Whilst the site is not built up, it is fringed by existing vegetation and boundary treatments along the southern boundary of the site. As a result of the relationship of the site with existing built 	Comment	<p>The site has been assessed and not taken forward as it had hard constraints - Green Belt and also Registered Park and Garden.</p>

C105	1120	Palmer Timber Limited [230]	Miss C Buchanan [202]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>5215: LAND AT GRANVILLE WORKS, STATION ROAD, CRADLEY HEATH, WEST MIDLANDS, B64 6PW. SANDWELL LOCAL PLAN (SLP) DRAFT REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION</p> <p>We are writing to provide you with our comments on the current consultation document on behalf of our client Palmer Timber Limited and the above site in their ownership.</p> <p>. We have reviewed the Draft regulation 18 consultation document and we welcome the opportunity to submit comments to the above consultation.</p> <p>The above site is located off Station Road, Cradley Heath and is a large employment/ industrial site of approximately 2.96 hectares. The site has been in employment related uses for well over one hundred years, during which time the company has been expanding into the land which was purchased, with a significant amount still available for further development.</p> <p>In the current adopted Sandwell Site Allocations and Delivery DPD (SAD) the site has a designation as a residential site (H13.7). the land surrounding the site has a designation of a SLINC 92. [see attachment for extract of SAD policies map] [see attachment for extract from SAD - table showing Area 13.7 - Haden Hill]</p> <p>We consider the current designation remains wholly appropriate for the site and the surrounding land.</p> <p>However, we note in the current consultation document the above site has a proposed designation of Local Employment Area and as a wildlife corridor.</p> <p>[see attachment for extract from SLP interactive draft policies map] [see attachment for extract from Policy SEC3 and Policy SNE1]</p> <p>Policy SEC3 - Local Employment Area Proposed Local Employment Area designation - Current Housing site allocation</p> <p>We are disappointed to see the housing designation has been removed from the site as we consider the site has ongoing potential to accommodate residential development. The site is surrounded by existing residential development to the east, west and south and therefore is in a location which is suitable to support additional residential development.</p> <p>We do not consider there is the requirement for the site to be removed from the Local Plan as having potential to accommodate residential development during the emerging plan period.</p> <p>The circumstance of the site that warranted its allocation for residential housing in the current adopted plan remain unchanged and therefore the site should retain its designation as a potential residential site.</p>	Object	The site is considered suitable for employment use. The applicant has submitted planning application proposals for further investment in the employment uses of the site. Therefore it is considered that the site is not available for residential development and the site is proposed to remain as SEC3 Local Employment Land.
C106	1182	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>3.26 Looking into more detail at some of the proposed allocations, as recognised by the Council when looking at Appendix B of the SLP, they are also not without their constraints and limitations, further demonstrating that the indicative capacity could be further reduced, resulting in an even lower number of housing allocations. For example: •SH2 (SA 12) Land adjacent to Asda, Wolverhampton Road, Oldbury is proposed for 62 homes, but it has access issues which need to be overcome in order to be deliverable, questioning the suitability of this allocation.</p>	Comment	Comments noted.
C107	1183	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>3.26 Looking into more detail at some of the proposed allocations, as recognised by the Council when looking at Appendix B of the SLP, they are also not without their constraints and limitations, further demonstrating that the indicative capacity could be further reduced, resulting in an even lower number of housing allocations. For example: •SH26 (66) Lower City Road, Oldbury is proposed for 73 homes but has constraints including land remediation and site assembly issues, there also only appears to be interest from some land owners looking to bring the site forward, so also potential ownership issues to overcome, questioning the suitability and availability of this land to support an allocation.</p>	Comment	Comments noted
C108	1184	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>3.26 Looking into more detail at some of the proposed allocations, as recognised by the Council when looking at Appendix B of the SLP, they are also not without their constraints and limitations, further demonstrating that the indicative capacity could be further reduced, resulting in an even lower number of housing allocations. For example: •SH25 (SA 65) Bradleys Lane / High Street, Tipton proposed for 189 homes however, this site also has site assembly and land contamination issues to be overcome, it also requires the current owners to find a place to relocate their business before development can come forwards, again questioning the suitability and availability of this land to support an allocation.</p>	Comment	Comments noted.
C109	1185	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>3.26 Looking into more detail at some of the proposed allocations, as recognised by the Council when looking at Appendix B of the SLP, they are also not without their constraints and limitations, further demonstrating that the indicative capacity could be further reduced, resulting in an even lower number of housing allocations. For example: •SM2 SA199 Lion Farm Oldbury, is proposed for a mix of uses, including the provision of 200 homes. However, it relies on relocation of 6 sports pitches to the south of borough, which is arguably not a minor feat. This brings into question the availability and achievability of the land to support an allocation.</p>	Comment	Comments noted
C110	1186	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>3.26 Looking into more detail at some of the proposed allocations, as recognised by the Council when looking at Appendix B of the SLP, they are also not without their constraints and limitations, further demonstrating that the indicative capacity could be further reduced, resulting in an even lower number of housing allocations. For example: •SM1 SA 91 Chances Glass Works, is proposed for a mix of uses including 276 homes, this is a heritage led regeneration project given its recognised constraints which are a Grade II listed building, Scheduled Ancient Monument and Galton Valley Conservation Area, the complexity of such a project brings into question the timescales and the potential delivery of the proposed housing numbers, given the statutory protections given to these heritage constraints, again questioning the suitability and achievability of this site to support an allocation.</p>	Comment	Comments noted
C111	1199	Monarchi Developers Limited [66]	Monarchi Developers Limited (Mr Simon Hawley, Director - Planning) [65]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Land at St Brades Close, Tividale Our clients land at St Brades Close should be allocated for residential developments to support housing delivery. It is in a highly sustainable location, immediately adjoining an existing residential area. It is in close proximity to Oakham Primary School and the Portway Lifestyle Centre. There are a variety of services and facilities located on the A4123 – New Birmingham Road, to the north east that are within easy walking distance. Indeed, Oldbury Town Centre is approximately 1 mile from the site. Oldbury Town Centre provides a variety of services and facilities as well as employment opportunities. The extent of the site being promoted for development means that there will be no functional harm to the area of public open space in this location. Indeed, the area is in private ownership in any event. The topography in the area is challenging. As a consequence the Representor has commissioned DTA Transport Consultants to undertake an assessment of the access to the site and the ability to deliver roads of an adoptable standard as part of any residential development. The results of this work are attached at Appendix 2. DTA have concluded that a safe and convenient access to the site and a scheme can be serviced by roads of adoptable quality. Ecology surveys have been undertaken to support the promotion of the site. It will be ensured that any development on the site achieves a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. The Representor has been in discussions with neighbouring landowners regarding the opportunity to enhance the wider sites ecological resource. As part of the development of this site ecological improvement and a management plan can be established for the wider area helping to safeguard and enhance its ecological potential. There is the opportunity to create vehicular access from public roads to a smaller car park in close proximity to the site, making the wider site more accessible to the elderly and disabled to enjoy the benefits of the BBCWT land that currently is challenging to access. This is a significant social benefit. Antisocial behaviour on site has been prevalent for many years, including substantial littering (including shopping trolleys to the east side adjoin A4123), people driving scrambler bikes and quad bikes across the site along with underage drinking, dog fouling amongst other issues. There was a fire on the site in 2022 that needed to be extinguished by the fire service. A closer presence of local homeowners and greater pedestrian access to the area would lead to heightened the natural surveillance of the wider site helping to reduce such incidents. My client would work with the Council to ensure that all technical matters addressed and that the site will appropriately deliver biodiversity net gain. If the site is allocated for development it will be deliverable in the short term and deliver market and affordable housing in a highly sustainable location</p>	Comment	The site will assessed using the site selection methodology.
C112	1284	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	<p>Proposed housing allocations</p> <p>The PCCWM requests that the following police sites are considered for residential allocation in the draft Sandwell Local Plan. All sites are owned by the PCCWM.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oldbury Police Station 2. Wednesbury Police Station 3. Smethwick Police Station 4. Windmill House, Smethwick 	Comment	The sites will assessed in line with the site selection methodology.

C113	1285	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	APPENDIX B - Sandwell Site Allocations	In relation to the housing allocations proposed, the inclusion of ERQ (site ref. SH37) is strongly supported. The proposed allocation suggests a capacity of c.526 dwellings in the Plan period; with a further c.100 dwellings in the post-Plan period (total site capacity c.626 dwellings). This proposed quantum of development at ERQ is considered to be sensible, conservative and achievable at this time.	Support	Note and welcome support
C114	929	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		APPENDIX C - Employment	SEC1-10 - Brandon Way/ Albion Road - development proposals where adjacent to the canal should have full regard to the land stability issues of the canal	Comment	Comment noted
C115	1121	Palmer Timber Limited [230]	Miss C Buchanan [202]	APPENDIX C - Employment	<p>5215: LAND AT GRANVILLE WORKS, STATION ROAD, CRADLEY HEATH, WEST MIDLANDS, B64 6PW.</p> <p>We are writing to provide you with our comments on the current consultation document on behalf of our client Palmer Timber Limited and the above site in their ownership.</p> <p>. We have reviewed the Draft regulation 18 consultation document and we welcome the opportunity to submit comments to the above consultation.</p> <p>The above site is located off Station Road, Cradley Heath and is a large employment/ industrial site of approximately 2.96 hectares. The site has been in employment related uses for well over one hundred years, during which time the company has been expanding into the land which was purchased, with a significant amount still available for further development.</p> <p>In the current adopted Sandwell Site Allocations and Delivery DPD (SAD) the site has a designation as a residential site (H13.7). the land surrounding the site has a designation of a SLINC 92. [see attachment for extract from SAD policies map] [see attachment for extract from SAD - table Area 13.7 - Haden Hill] We consider the current designation remains wholly appropriate for the site and the surrounding land.</p> <p>However, we note in the current consultation document the above site has a proposed designation of Local Employment Area and as a wildlife corridor. [see attachment for extract from SLP interactive draft policies map] [see attachment for extract from SLP - Policy SEC3 and Policy SNE1] Policy SEC3 - Local Employment Area</p> <p>Proposed Local Employment Area designation - Current Housing site allocation</p> <p>We are disappointed to see the housing designation has been removed from the site as we consider the site has ongoing potential to accommodate residential development. The site is surrounded by existing residential development to the east, west and south and therefore is in a location which is suitable to support additional residential development.</p> <p>We do not consider there is the requirement for the site to be removed from the Local Plan as having potential to accommodate residential development during the emerging plan period.</p> <p>The circumstance of the site that warranted its allocation for residential housing in the current adopted plan remain unchanged and therefore the site should retain its designation as a potential residential site.</p> <p>The site is a brownfield site in a sustainable location which offers excellent potential as a future residential site.</p> <p>My client, in correspondence with the Council, highlighted that the site is in employment use currently, however, the business is under constant review and the current view on the site may be subject to change over the medium-long term.</p>	Object	The site is considered suitable for employment use. The applicant has submitted planning application proposals for further investment in the employment uses of the site. Therefore it is considered that the site is not available for residential development and the site is proposed to remain as SEC3 Local Employment Land.
C116	1277	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		APPENDIX C - Employment	21. Criteria 3 of [policy SDS1] sets out that "Appendices B and C show how the housing and employment land ambitions for Sandwell will be met. Those development needs that cannot be accommodated within the borough will be exported to sustainable locations in neighbouring local authority areas, following consultation." HBF would question the appropriateness of this approach, but if it is to be pursued then this should be set out as an integral part of the policy and not deferred to Appendix B and C. Surely Housing Allocations should be made as an integral part of the Plan and not in an Appendix.	Comment	The inclusion of the details of allocated sites in Appendices B and C is a matter of convenience and layout and does not represent a lessening of their importance. This was also the approach adopted in the former BCP.
C117	687	Mr John Davison [192]		APPENDIX D – West Bromwich Masterplan and Carter's Green Framework Plan	Enthusiastic to see this support for the area. The new development is well suited for inclusion of swift bricks. This will mean nest sites for birds that rely on buildings that have probably been nesting in the old buildings that are being improved or removed.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C118	930	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		APPENDIX E - Strategic Waste Sites	The Trust notes the identification of the existing Strategic Waste Sites within the Black Country authorities, (rather than just Sandwell) and raises no additional comments subject to statutory consultation on any forthcoming planning applications on any of these sites within our notified areas, and assessment in line with the emerging Policy SNE6 - Canals (for any sites within Sandwell) if applicable.	Comment	Comment noted
C119	931	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		APPENDIX F - Minerals	The Trust notes the identification of existing Key Mineral Infrastructure sites and raises no additional comments subject to statutory consultation on any forthcoming planning applications on any of these sites within our notified areas, and assessment in line with the emerging Policy SNE6 – Canals, for sites within Sandwell, if applicable.	Comment	Comment noted
C120	932	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		APPENDIX G – Site allocations - changes	The Trust notes the changes in allocations, largely from housing to employment uses, and raises no additional comments subject to statutory consultation on any forthcoming planning applications on any of these sites within our notified areas, and assessment in line with the emerging Policy SNE6 - Canals.	Comment	Comments noted
C121	1075	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	APPENDIX I – Sandwell Local Plan Housing Trajectory	2.25The Council's housing trajectory can be found at Appendix I of the Plan. It does not provide a breakdown of the different sources of supply. It is not, therefore, clear when each draft housing allocation is expected to come forward or the number of completions anticipated over time. As a result there is no detail provided to support the assumptions made in the trajectory in terms of the timescales in which each site is likely to come forward for development and the rates that they will be built out and whether these are realistic. Instead, we can only assume that the Council has based its assumptions on these matters on the very limited site specific information contained in its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which was published in 2022. However, the number of dwellings anticipated to be delivered in each year in Appendix I of the SLP is inconsistent with the trajectory at Appendix 3 of the SHLAA. It is, therefore, impossible to reach conclusions on whether the draft allocations are deliverable and developable, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF and if the Council would be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land on adoption and maintain a supply throughout the plan period.	Comment	Comment noted. Table 5 - Housing Land Supply - sources; details the source of supply of housing sites and the time period they are expected to be delivered. Appendix B details the anticipated delivery timescale for each site with the year when delivery of the site is expected to be completed.
C122	1280	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		APPENDIX I – Sandwell Local Plan Housing Trajectory	63.Criteria 3 indicates that regular monitoring will be undertaken annually of housing delivery, but this does not tally with the Monitoring Framework at the end of the Plan. It should also be possible to see from Housing Trajectory how much reliance is being made on windfalls, or from when. To be both justified and effective the Housing Trajectory should include break down the housing numbers into different sources of supply. HBF are of the view that any allowance for windfall should not be included until the fourth year of a housing trajectory, given the likelihood that dwellings being completed within the next three years will already be known about (as they are likely to need to have already received planning permission to be completed within that timeframe).	Comment	Table 5 sets out the different sources of supply including Windfall allowance. Windfall allowance is not included in the first 5 years.

C123	810	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		APPENDIX J - Sandwell Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (extract)	<p>Sport England notes that appendix J seeks to extract the headline findings and recommendations of the PPOSS Strategy and Action Plan (parts 4 & 6).</p> <p>We have two concerns with the approach taken. Firstly, the Local Plan will have a much longer timespan than the PPOSS. The PPOSS will need to be reviewed and replaced within 3-5 years in order to maintain a robust and up to date evidence base in line with para 98 of the NPPF and in accordance with Sport England's Playing Fields Guidance. As such the extracted data in Appendix J is likely to become out of date in due course given that lifespan of the Development Plan, once adopted.</p> <p>Secondly, there is a danger that by extracting some information from the PPOSS document, and summarising or para-phrasing parts of it that the reader is mis-directed to the relevant evidence. Whilst the first table entitled "Pitch Sports - Quantitative headline findings" replicates the respective table in the PPOSS, the table entitled "Recommendations for future provision" is a much edited version of the relevant section of the PPOSS report, and thereby includes certain findings and recommendations and omits others. We have concern that by cherry picking certain recommendations from the PPOSS that this mis-represents the recommendations as a whole.</p> <p>We would recommend that Appendix J be removed so that the reader is instead referred to the PPOSS itself which is included as part of the Council's evidence base on the website.</p>	Comment	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Delete Appendix J and any consequential references</p>
C124	888	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	APPENDIX M – Glossary	<p>The PCCWM requests that definitions be provided of the following which are referred to in the draft Sandwell Local Plan.</p> <p>'Secured by Design –</p> <p>Secured by Design (SBD) is the official police security initiative that is owned by the UK Police Service with the specific aim to reduce crime and help people live more safely. The Police seeks to improve the physical security of buildings using products, such as doors, windows, locks and walling systems that meet SBD security requirements. In addition, the Police include proven crime prevention techniques and measures into the layout and landscaping of new developments, such as maximising natural surveillance and limiting excessive through movement.</p> <p>Through SBD, the Police work closely with builders, developers, local authorities and registered housing associations to incorporate police crime prevention standards from initial concept and design through to construction and completion. West Midlands Police have specially trained Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOs) who offer police designing out crime and Secured by Design advice free of charge.</p> <p>Park Mark –</p> <p>The Safer Parking Scheme is a national standard for UK car parks that have low crime and measures in place to ensure the safety of people and vehicles. Each car park undergoes a rigorous assessment by specially trained police assessors and a Park Mark is awarded to each car park that achieves the challenging standards.</p> <p>A Park Mark is awarded to parking facilities that have met the requirements of a risk assessment conducted by the Police, meaning the operator has put in place measures that deter criminal activity and anti-social behaviour.'</p>	Comment	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Amend Glossary as requested.</p>
C125	722	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Aspirations	<p>The route along Victoria Street from Great Western Street Metro stop to the town centre needs to be made more inviting to attract visitors. Relocation of businesses not appropriate in a town centre should be encouraged allowing redevelopment for high density quality housing.</p>	Comment	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has produced a Masterplan for Wednesbury which seeks to guide the development of the town over the next 10-15 years - https://www.sandwell.gov.uk/WednesburyTCMasterplan</p>
C126	1016	Birmingham City Council (Mr Ian Macleod, Director of Planning, Transport & Sustainability) [68]		Balanced Green Growth	<p>The Spatial Strategy sets out the options explored (paras 2.19-2.30) to minimise the shortfalls experienced including consideration green belt and greenfield sites. The Borough has very few large open spaces and very little green belt land (mainly in Sandwell Valley) and, due to its built-up nature, these areas are important to biodiversity, health and wellbeing. The City Council therefore agrees with the development choices being made within the draft Plan, and the constraints experienced within Sandwell, which has resulted in this significant shortfall.</p> <p>Through evidence provided for its new Local Plan, Birmingham City Council has also identified an initial estimated shortfall of 78,415 homes across the city for the proposed Plan period of 2022-2042. The City Council still has further work to do to identify further potential sources of housing land supply and will ensure that opportunities within its administrative area will be truly maximised prior to any shortfall being exported to other areas. It is also important that Sandwell, like Birmingham, continues to strive to accommodate as much housing and employment as possible to meet its own needs by making effective use of land and maximising densities.</p> <p>However, even with proactive measures to increase supply in place, it is still highly likely that shortfalls will remain in both local authority areas going forward. It is therefore essential for close working to continue between the two authorities and across the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA to try and address the shortfalls as much as possible across the wider HMA area.</p>	Support	<p>Comment noted on employment land. Note and welcome support on other issues.</p>
C127	864	Mr Kevin Priest [210]		Balanced Green Growth	<p>Balanced green growth pg 45</p> <p>"promote the use of zero- and low-carbon designs, building techniques, materials and technologies in all new development" When will these be introduced? It can't mention an aim without giving an intended introduction date, hardly a smart target.</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. Balanced green growth is a reference to the development strategy that has been adopted by the Council to deliver sustainable development while protecting the environment of the borough; as such, it is not a target but will be delivered through the policies and proposals set out in the SLP, which will have their own targets and objectives, and which will be monitored for their effectiveness. This can start effectively once the SLP is adopted and its policies are endorsed.</p>
C128	1255	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Balanced Green Growth, Figure 2 - Sandwell Spatial	<p>... we acknowledge the approach of Balanced Green Growth in forming the basis of the Sandwell Local Plan's Development Strategy (Policy SDS1). However, the Trust requests that our canal network be included within Figure 2 - Sandwell Spatial Map so that the contribution our network makes towards the delivery of Sandwell's Spatial Strategy and overall Sandwell Local Plan Vision 2041 can be fully appreciated and realised by citizens and developers alike. (ACTION REQUEST)</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. To be included on transportation key diagram</p>
C129	1000	Ms Harpreet Chahal [218]		Bearwood	<p>Also please sort out Bearwood Road where the main shops are it has been a dumb for years. Start planning some efficient community centres and efficient shops instead of whats already there like too many charity shops, too many cafes, too many inefficient private shops please. West Bromwich town centre is very similar too.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted. The intention of the new SLP is to encourage the creation of balanced and sustainable local centres, providing a range of facilities and retail opportunities. However, the market will also dictate what type of shops appear in particular centres and the SLP will have no control over this aspect.</p>
C130	651	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]		Biodiversity net gain	<p>Fundamentally object to BNG. You cannot allow destruction of habitat under the fake guise of "creating" it somewhere else. This is a phoney policy and one created for shilling for developers to usurp green space. It is a fraud to pretend they are then enhancing it somewhere else when this process will be manmade and interfere what is already there.</p> <p>Sandwell should have no desire to protect fens pool nature reserve. That site has been mismanaged by Dudley council and the CRT for years through anglers destroying the site.</p>	Object	<p>Noted. BNG is a statutory national requirement and the Council is bound by legislation to observe it.</p>
C131	664	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Biodiversity net gain	<p>Section 4.21: Suggest revising the third paragraph for clarity. Sealed surfaces don't provide any BNG units, true, but this paragraph reads like a site with sealed surfaces is exempt from BNG requirement (which isn't the case).</p> <p>Sections 4.27 & 4.28: Sensitive lighting plans can't be included with optional enhancement measures (like insect hotels, hedgehog gates). They are often a mitigation measure to ensure important linear habitats for bats are retained post-development. This could should be taken out of this list.</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. It is not currently clear to the Council what steps can be taken to identify suitable BNG requirements on sites with a zero score under the current matrix. Amend references to lighting to retain in justification but remove from list in paragraph 4.28</p>
C132	1159	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Cape Hill	<p>para 9.161 - Are there any proposals within the Plan to address this?</p>	Comment	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Policy SHE1 (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets and their setting.</p>

C133	998	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Delivery, Monitoring, and Implementation	<p>Delivery, Monitoring, and Implementation</p> <p>111. HBF notes that we are in the midst of a Housing Crisis. Housing delivery is therefore a key challenge facing Sandwell Borough. To address the housing crisis the Council needs to allocate enough sites to meet the housing requirement and provide choice and flexibility in supply. This will require the allocation of a mix and range of sites in a variety of locations. The policies in the Plan with then near careful monitoring to ensure they are delivering the housing. The Sandwell Local Plan must ensure the delivery of new housing to meet both open market and affordable housing needs.</p> <p>112. HBF note that the Issue and Options consultation document suggested that that Council was of the view that Sandwell was so constrained it may only be able to provide 9,492 against an identified need of 30,300 new dwellings between 2021 and 2041, less than a third of what is needed. The Reg 18 consultation version is now seeking providing 11,167 homes against a requirement of 29,773 homes by 2041. HBF is unclear of the reasoning and justification for this change.</p> <p>113. The issue of housing is critically important and needs urgently addressing through the plan-making process. HBF believes that the Council needs to explore any and all options to meet the housing need and requirement of Sandwell. This must include full consideration of the current Housing Crisis and if it results in the 'exceptional circumstances' that would require the need for a Green Belt review. A plan that seeks to meet only third of the need does not deliver is simply not good enough and does represent an effective use of the plan-led system.</p> <p>114. HBF suggest more flexibility is needed within the plan, so that it is able to respond to any changing circumstances. HBF do not support the inclusion of policies within a Local Plan that merely triggers a review of the Local Plan if monitoring shows housing delivery is not occurring as expected. Such a policy does nothing to address the housing crisis or undersupply of homes. There are other more effective and immediate measures that could be introduced into policy that would enable the Council to address housing under deliver, much more quickly than would be possible through the production of another plan, or plan review.</p> <p>115. It is important that houses are brought forward, and the matter addressed as soon as possible, if under delivery is observed. HBF would suggest, as a minimum, explicit reference should be made within the Plan's policy to the potential to bring forward supply earlier. However, as the housing need and requirement figures for the Plan are minimum (not maximum) figures the Council could also specifically identify reserve sites, particular sites that could/would be brought forward sooner to address any under delivery whatever the reason for that under performance. This could be a shortfall in market housing permissions granted and/or completions, affordable housing permissions granted and/or completions and any failure against the Housing Delivery Test or local plan monitoring. More is needed on how and when monitoring will be undertaken and more is needed on what action(s) will be taken when if monitoring shows under delivery of housing.</p>	Comment	<p>111. Noted</p> <p>112. The supply of housing land in the borough fluctuates depending on site specific circumstances, such as the grant of planning permission. The main reason why the housing requirement has increased by circa. 1,600 homes is to include a level of 'aspirational' growth within the plan period, fluctuating levels of windfall development and including for the conversion of vacant floorspace within town centres. 'Aspirational' growth refers to the delivery of housing identified within masterplans and development frameworks for West Bromwich, Carters Green and Smethwick. The aspirational growth will take significant public sector support to be delivered and consequently has been treated separately to the remainder of the housing supply. The Council has sought to maximise the supply of housing land in preparing the draft Plan.</p> <p>The council has sought to maximise the supply of housing land in preparing the draft Plan. It is informed by a rigorous evidence base, including the Black Country Brownfield Land Study (commissioned by WMCA and prepared by Chilmark Consulting). The Brownfield Land Study considers that the Black Country authorities had maximised the allocation of brownfield land within the draft Black Country Plan, and that the only means to noticeably increase housing land supply within the urban area would be to increase proposed housing densities within the Strategic Centres (which includes West Bromwich in Sandwell). The draft SLP has sought to do this by accounting for 'aspirational' growth with allocations in West Bromwich and Carters Green and including for the conversion of vacant floorspace within town centres. Notwithstanding that paragraph 145 of the Dec 2023 NPPF clarifies that there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be revised or changed when plans are being prepared or updated, the Council intends to provide further evidence at Reg.19 stage as to why the SLP does not propose the release of Green Belt land for housing.</p> <p>114. The Council continues to support housing delivery through a range of means. This includes applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development and preparing an Action Plan where housing delivery is below 75% in accordance with the Housing Delivery Test. The Council's Regeneration Team is supporting the delivery of £2.9 billion regeneration pipeline over the next five years and has been successful in securing significant government funding to support regeneration and house building. The Council regularly engages with the industry to understand current issues delaying house building. The Council would be grateful to continue an ongoing dialogue with the HBF to understand what practical steps could be taken by the Council to support housing delivery.</p> <p>115. The Council has sought to maximise the identification of housing supply in the draft SLP. Evidence suggests that there are no reserve sites within the borough to be identified. This is in the context of there being insufficient employment land to meet demand over the plan period and consequently strong protection being given to existing employment land; and the clarification at paragraph 145 of the Dec 2023 NPPF that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be revised when plans are being prepared. Nevertheless, there is limited Green Belt land in the borough that could feasibly be delivered due to environmental designations and land within Sandwell Valley Country Park. Consequently the release of Green Belt land would be expected to make very little difference to the forecast level of unmet housing need over the plan period. The Council intends to provide further evidence at Reg.19 stage as to why the SLP does not propose the release of Green Belt land for housing.</p>
C134	926	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	Delivery, Monitoring, and Implementation	<p>The Trust requests opportunity to engage with the Council on an on-going basis throughout the plan period to secure the benefits to the canal network envisaged by the Plan's suite of policies (ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Trust notes that use, delivery and monitoring of Section 106 and CIL payments is not included within the policy wording and queries its absence (ACTION REQUEST).</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. The Council will engage with CRT and other stakeholders throughout the plan period to secure the benefits to the canal network envisaged by the Plan's suite of policies. The Council would be grateful if CRT can continue to share data relating to usage and improvements to the canal network.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to publish an Infrastructure Funding Statement on an annual basis which sets out delivery and monitoring information on Section 106 and CIL payments. It is not considered necessary to repeat this requirement within the Delivery and Monitoring section in the SLP.</p> <p>The council intends to include an additional policy on Infrastructure Provision within the regulation 19 version of the SLP</p>
C135	997	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Delivery, Monitoring, and Implementation	<p>119. HBF suggest that the monitoring framework at the end of the Plan needs to be expanded. The Council will need to monitor the delivery of housing and publish progress against a published Housing Trajectory Housing monitoring should be undertaken on a site-by-site basis. Therefore, the detailed housing trajectory including for specific sites should be inserted included within the Plan.</p> <p>120. HBF note that as we are in the midst of a housing crisis, it is very important that the Council ensures that the Local Plan delivers all the housing that is being planned for. Sandwell should also monitor the delivery of any unmet need by neighbouring authorities and actively participate in local plan consultations and examinations to ensure the need for other authorities to meet their need is robustly supported in neighbouring Local Plans.</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. The Monitoring Framework states that the net additional dwellings completed will be monitored each year. The Council will monitor the delivery of housing during the life of the plan in line with the supply set out in Table 5. Amend 1st Housing Indicator from Net additional dwellings completed (including conversions) to Annual Sandwell net housing completions. Amend target from Delivery against total supply at policy SHO1 - 588 dwellings per annum to Phased housing targets for Sandwell as set out in Table 5.</p> <p>Sandwell is within the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area. The Council continues to work alongside the other LPAs in the HMA to monitor the supply of housing land in the HMA and to identify a way to address the identified shortfall of housing land. Regular Position Statements have been published by the working group. The Council intends to continue to participate in the working group. The Council will continue to respond to local plan consultations for neighbouring authorities, and will continue to challenge its neighbours to meet their housing needs in full and offer contributions to meeting the unmet needs of Sandwell, the wider Black Country and Birmingham where appropriate.</p>
C136	977	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Delivery, Monitoring, and Implementation	<p>63. Criteria 3 [policy SHOU1] indicates that regular monitoring will be undertaken annually of housing delivery, but this does not tally with the Monitoring Framework at the end of the Plan. It should also be possible to see from Housing Trajectory how much reliance is being made on windfalls, or from when. To be both justified and effective the Housing Trajectory should include break down the housing numbers into different sources of supply. HBF are of the view that any allowance for windfall should not be included until the fourth year of a housing trajectory, given the likelihood that dwellings being completed within the next three years will already be known about (as they are likely to need to have already received planning permission to be completed within that timeframe).</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. The Council will monitor the delivery of housing during the life of the plan in line with the supply set out in Table 5. Amend 1st Housing Indicator from Net additional dwellings completed (including conversions) to Annual Sandwell net housing completions. Amend target from Delivery against total supply at policy SHO1 - 588 dwellings per annum to Phased housing targets for Sandwell as set out in Table 5.</p>
C137	868	South Staffordshire Council (Mr Edward Fox, Strategic Planning Team Manager) [87]	Development Strategy	<p>The Borough Council state that given the finite supply of land available for development it is unlikely that this shortfall can be met within Sandwell itself and therefore it is the intention to seek to export this shortfall through Duty to Co-operate arrangements. Given that Sandwell is situated within a Housing Market Area (HMA) geography primarily composed of net exporting metropolitan authorities and rural shire authorities comprising significant amounts of green belt it is unclear how readily this surplus requirement will be absorbed through duty to cooperate arrangements within the HMA. Whilst recognising the highly constrained nature of the land supply in the Borough, South Staffordshire considers that Sandwell should continue to seek to maximise delivery within its own administrative boundaries. As the plan making process proceeds forwards, continued efforts to increase capacity through site regeneration, housing renewal schemes, increased densification and the release of town centre sites should be ongoing with the aim of reducing the net requirement to be exported to other authorities.</p>	Comment	<p>Comments noted.</p>
C138	718	Mr Greg Ball [25]	DUDLEY PORT AND TIPTON	<p>Support the aspiration in paragraph 3.36</p> <p>"Further opportunities exist to build upon the existing infrastructure, making the canals and greenspace a destination, linking to wider attractions such as the Dudley Canal Trust, Black Country Museum and Dudley Zoo, and joining up with Tipton High Street." My representation 696 sets out an enhancement to a cycle route that would provide a pleasant and convenient canalside link between Tipton High Street and railway station to the attractions listed above.</p>	Support	<p>Noted. The Council has secured £20 million levelling up funding from Government to build new homes and improve the public realm in Tipton. Please visit the website for further information - https://regeneratingsandwell.co.uk/sandwell_projects/tipton-town-centre-regeneration/ Close by, the Council and Black Country Transport are delivering multi-modal transport improvements along the A461 between Great Bridge and Dudley Port, and in the future to Dudley Town Centre. The project is delivering new segregated and shared surface cycle routes- https://www.sandwell.gov.uk/news/article/351/work-starts-on-a461-highways-improvements</p>
C139	654	Mr Greg Ball [25]	DUDLEY PORT AND TIPTON	<p>Although the Vaughan Trading Estate and Rattlechain developments will bring benefits, this area is beset by traffic problems, lack of public transport along the A457 and poor access for pedestrians and cyclists to the canal cycleway. Heavy rain causes flooding across the A457 near the Vaughan Estate. Distribution developments should not be allowed, and the developments must make a contribution to addressing these problems. The Rattlechain site should give access to the Canal and Sheepwash open space..</p>	Comment	<p>The highway and transportation impacts of the SLP will be assessed comprehensively, and each major planning application will be expected to submit a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Each planning application will be assessed on its own merits.</p> <p>The A457 is within Flood Zone 1 which means it has a low probability of flooding from rivers and the sea.</p> <p>Comments regarding access from Rattlechain to the Canal and Sheepwash Open Space is noted. Policy STR5 seeks to create coherent networks for cycling and walking by encouraging new developments to link to existing walking and cycling networks, and to extend networks from the canal network to serve new developments.</p>
C140	646	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]	DUDLEY PORT AND TIPTON	<p>3.34 OBJECT. The public purse should NOT pay for remediation of privately owned land. Rattlechain is not suitable for housing and is not sustainable to deliver it. The same owners of the Coneygree site were the ones for failed to bring forward the Rattlechain site- namely Mintworth. The polluter has not paid! You fail to identify that yet know this, so what confidence in the residential proposals? A planner in Sandwell previously identified the sewage works site tied to rattlechain as "a crap site for residential"- what confidence of soundness in this daft plan for 2023!</p>	Object	<p>The Rattlechain site was subject to a Site Assessment which concluded that subject to the resolution of constraints of ground contamination, environmental concerns, and policy issues the development for residential purposes would be suitable.</p> <p>The site has a willing landowner promoting the site for residential development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is capable of being sufficiently remediated to support residential development.</p> <p>The proposed residential allocation will continue the residential allocation from the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</p>
C141	1015	Birmingham City Council (Mr Ian Macleod, Director of Planning, Transport & Sustainability) [68]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>Thank you for consulting with Birmingham City Council on your Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18). Overall, Birmingham City Council is supportive of the approach taken within the Draft Local Plan and the following points provide further comment and detail on specific strategic and cross-boundary issues.</p> <p>As previously stated, the City Council has had a strong working relationship with Sandwell alongside the other Black Country Authorities regarding planning matters for many years, particularly as the two authorities share a considerable joint boundary. This has been recently illustrated by the successful adoption of the Smethwick to Birmingham Corridor Framework SPD which will help to maximise mutually beneficial development opportunities across the boundary along that corridor. In addition, the two local planning authorities continue to work closely alongside the other local authorities which make up the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area (HMA), to identify ways in which housing and employment land shortfalls can be met across the wider HMA since such shortfalls emerged (following the adoption of the Birmingham Development Plan in 2017).</p> <p>Birmingham is currently progressing its own Local Plan with consultation on the Preferred Options document due to be carried out during Summer 2024. Consultation on the Issues and Options for the Birmingham Local Plan identified further significant potential housing and employment land shortfalls for the City, and this is likely to continue to be reflected when consultation on the Preferred Options is carried out.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted</p>

C142	1104	Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Mr Michael Brown, Policy Planner) [226]		Duty to Co-operate	<p>It is recognised that Sandwell's geography provides particular challenges as regards meeting identified housing and employment land needs within its own boundaries. The shortfalls identified are significant, and the impact on other authorities within the Housing Market Area are expected to be considerable. As a general principle, Sandwell Council is encouraged to fully explore all reasonable options in order to meet as much of its own identified need as possible.</p> <p>The South Warwickshire authorities note that any overspill of unmet housing or employment needs brings with it a need for additional infrastructure in the areas accommodating this overspill, in order to meet the needs of residents and businesses. As such, it is anticipated that any future considerations regarding accommodating overspill within the South Warwickshire area will also need to address these additional infrastructure needs.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.</p> <p>Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.</p>
C143	1119	Bromsgrove District Council (Mr Mike Dunphy) [229]		Duty to Co-operate	<p>Officers of the Council note the content of the draft Local Plan and in particular those issues highlighted in the Duty to Cooperate letter received on the 17th August 2023, namely meeting unmet housing need, meeting unmet employment need, as well as some transport issues.</p> <p>Officers of the Council have read the Balanced Green Growth strategy which Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council has developed and acknowledge that this strategy currently leaves a shortfall of 18,606 homes and 143 hectares of employment land. It is also noted that the expectation remains that some of this shortfall will be met under the Duty to Cooperate across the Housing Market Area and the Functional Economic Market Area.</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council remains committed to the Duty to Cooperate and will continue to engage in discussions. Redditch BC is an authority which is constrained by Green Belt and any significant future development for either housing or employment needs will require removing land from the Green Belt. With the current uncertainties around the role that Green Belt land is expected to play for future development needs, caused by the as yet unconfirmed reforms to the NPPF originally announced in December 2022, officers of the Council are unable to comment further at this stage as to the validity or otherwise of the approach taken by Sandwell MBC with this draft Local Plan.</p> <p>As stated above the Council will continue to engage under the Duty to Cooperate and in due course will welcome further discussions on the approach taken by Sandwell MBC and we look forward to investigating further any cross boundary infrastructure requirements required.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.</p> <p>see also rep ID 1244</p>
C144	1179	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>To further help to address the shortfall, Sandwell are proposing to utilise the Duty-to- Cooperate with neighbouring authorities within the same Housing Market Area, or with which Sandwell has a physical or functional relationship. The details of which are to be provided in the Draft Plan Statement of Consultation – which is to be elaborated upon further at the Publication Stage of the plan. This is despite the fact that Birmingham City Council has already said that it does not have enough space to meet its own housing need and might not have enough space to meet its own employment land needs.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.</p>
C145	1192	Bloor Homes [231]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>The level of unmet need arising within HMA is one such area where the Duty to Cooperate should be employed in order to determine where this unmet need should be directed.</p> <p>Having regard to the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area there are 14 authorities within it which include Birmingham, the four Black Country authorities and 9 other surrounding authorities. In light of the shortfall arising in Birmingham, Dudley and Sandwell this effectively leaves 11 remaining authorities where the need could be distributed.</p> <p>... n light of the Council's need and the significant shortfall that the Council is faced with, Bloor urge the Council to enter into constructive and productive discussions with the other HMA authorities, including Bromsgrove, to seek agreement on how and where this unmet housing need is going to be delivered. Meeting the housing needs of the HMA cannot be achieved on an authority by authority basis and that a joined up approach that crosses administrative boundaries will be required if there is to be any chance of meeting the HMA's housing needs both in terms of quantum and the required mix, including affordable homes.</p> <p>It is our view that the focus for addressing the shortfall in Sandwell should be those authorities closest to them. Bromsgrove and South Staffordshire are the closest authorities with a meaningful ability to address the shortfall and with land available adjacent to the conurbation. The Bromsgrove plan review is still at an early stage and there is still plenty of scope to hold meaningful discussions to provide land to meet the needs arising in Sandwell</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.</p>
C146	1196	Folkes [233]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>The level of unmet need arising within HMA is one such area where the Duty to Cooperate should be employed in order to determine where this unmet need should be directed.</p> <p>Having regard to the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area there are 14 authorities within it which include Birmingham, the four Black Country authorities and 9 other surrounding authorities. In light of the shortfall arising in Birmingham, Dudley and Sandwell this effectively leaves 11 remaining authorities where the need could be distributed.</p> <p>... The outcome of the above is that there is a significant unmet housing need arising principally from Birmingham and Sandwell, with Walsall and Wolverhampton likely to add to this, and at the current time there is no agreement or clear strategy between the 14 HMA authorities as to where or how this unmet need is to be met. Furthermore, in the few authorities that have the ability to assist in meeting the overspill, full opportunity of the land available around the conurbation to assist with meeting the housing overspill is not being taken.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.</p>
C147	1198	Monarchi Developers Limited [66]	Monarchi Developers Limited (Mr Simon Hawley, Director - Planning) [65]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>If the housing shortfall figure identified in Policy PG1 of the BDP and the emerging shortfalls in both the Dudley and Sandwell Preferred Options are added together it totals 57,582 dwellings. If the shortfall arising in Dudley and Sandwell is added to the emerging shortfall identified in the Birmingham Issues and Options this increases to 98,097 dwellings. As noted above, this has the potential to increase even further when any shortfall arising in Wolverhampton and Walsall is added.</p> <p>Having regard to the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area there are 14 authorities within it which include Birmingham, the four Black Country authorities and 9 other surrounding authorities. In light of the shortfall arising in Birmingham, Dudley and Sandwell this effectively leaves 11 remaining authorities where the need could be distributed.</p> <p>Turning to each of the remaining authorities Redditch Borough is effectively built up to its boundary and already has to look to its adjoining neighbour, Bromsgrove, in order to accommodate its housing need. It would be unable to accommodate any further unmet need. Similarly, Tamworth had to look to its adjoining neighbours of Lichfield and North Warwickshire in order to meet its current housing requirement in its adopted Local Plan. It too would be unlikely to be able to accommodate any unmet need.</p> <p>Cannock Chase's capacity is restricted due to environmental constraints including the Cannock Chase SAC and AONB. A small part of Stratford-upon-Avon District falls within the Housing Market Area whilst North Warwickshire have previously committed to delivering 3,790 dwellings to meeting Birmingham's needs up to 2031 in its adopted Local Plan (2021).</p> <p>Solihull's Local Plan is currently at examination and is on hold awaiting publication of the updated Framework and currently proposes approximately 2,000 dwellings to meet the needs of Birmingham. If the Plan progress towards adoption in its current form there would be no scope to seek any increase in the size of the contribution from Solihull until such time as they commenced a further review. This effectively leaves Lichfield, South Staffordshire and Bromsgrove as the three remaining authorities that would be able to make any meaningful contribution to meeting housing needs arising in the wider HMA.</p> <p>Lichfield has recently withdrawn its Local Plan and is now preparing a new Local Plan, whilst Bromsgrove had commenced a review of its Local Plan having undertaken Issues and Options consultation in 2018 with no programme for when the Preferred Options Local Plan is intended to be published for consultation. South Staffordshire have also consulted on a Pre-submission version of its Local Plan concluding in December 2022 that makes a contribution of just 4,000 dwellings to the overall shortfall. Sandwell should, therefore identify additional sites for housing within its own administrative area.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.</p>

C148	1215	Redrow Homes [239]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Duty to Co- operate	<p>The strategy as presented leaves a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the Council's administrative area. This is a substantial number of homes and represents a substantial number of people and families that will go without homes should a definitive solution not be found.</p> <p>Redrow would like to implore Sandwell Council to engage with the other authorities within the HMA to find a location to secure the delivery of these 18,606 dwellings. As will be demonstrated below, the housing shortfall has reached critical levels across the HMA and the onus is on the authorities where the housing need cannot be met to secure the support of the authorities with land available, including Green Belt land, to assist.</p> <p>Meeting the needs of all part of the population</p> <p>The pressure to find a definitive solution to address the housing shortfall, is only further emphasised by the fact that the delivery of affordable housing on those sites within the Sandwell administrative area will fall woefully short of the affordable housing need identified. The Black Country Housing Market Assessment Report (March 2021) identified a need for 4,605 social rented properties and 1,913 shared ownership dwellings (accounting for nearly 24% of the total housing requirement). The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell and Dudley will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it.</p> <p>Supporting Economic Growth</p> <p>Delivering the right number of homes, in the right location is an important component in fostering economic growth. For Sandwell, this means securing the delivery of homes as close to and / or in locations well connected to Sandwell as possible. The obvious location being South Staffordshire, when you account for the adjoining authorities not having the capacity to assist with meeting Sandwell's need. It is Redrow's view that the starting point should be sites on the edge of the conurbation to provide homes close to where the demand arises and that can provide a range of homes, including more executive homes for the owners of new businesses.</p> <p>Shortfall in housing land across the HMA</p> <p>The shortfall of land for housing is not unique to Sandwell and is a long-established concern within the HMA.</p> <p>Total shortfall</p> <p>If the housing shortfall figure identified in Policy PG1 of the BDP and the emerging shortfalls in both the Dudley and Sandwell Preferred Options are added together it totals 57,582 dwellings. If the shortfall arising in Dudley and Sandwell is added to the emerging shortfall identified in the Birmingham Issues and Options this increases to 98,097 dwellings. As noted above, this has the potential to increase even further when any shortfall arising in Wolverhampton and Walsall is added.</p> <p>Having regard to the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area there are 14 authorities within it which include Birmingham, the four Black Country authorities and 9 other surrounding authorities. In light of the shortfall arising in Birmingham, Dudley and Sandwell this effectively leaves 11 remaining authorities where the need could be distributed.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.
C149	1244	Bromsgrove District Council (Mr Mike Dunphy) [229]		Duty to Co- operate	<p>Officers of the Council have read the Balanced Green Growth strategy which Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council has developed and acknowledge that this strategy currently leaves a shortfall of 18,606 homes and 143 hectares of employment land. It is also noted that the expectation remains that some of this shortfall will be met under the Duty to Cooperate across the Housing Market Area and the Functional Economic Market Area.</p> <p>Redditch Borough Council remains committed to the Duty to Cooperate and will continue to engage in discussions. Redditch BC is an authority which is constrained by Green Belt and any significant future development for either housing or employment needs will require removing land from the Green Belt. With the current uncertainties around the role that Green Belt land is expected to play for future development needs, caused by the as yet unconfirmed reforms to the NPPF originally announced in December 2022, officers of the Council are unable to comment further at this stage as to the validity or otherwise of the approach taken by Sandwell MBC with this draft Local Plan.</p> <p>As stated above the Council will continue to engage under the Duty to Cooperate and in due course will welcome further discussions on the approach taken by Sandwell MBC and we look forward to investigating further any cross boundary infrastructure requirements required.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall. see also rep ID 1119
C150	1272	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		Duty to Co- operate	<p>While the housing demand stands at 29,773 dwellings, supply for 11,167 dwellings is expected to come through the adoption of the upcoming Local Plan, thereby leaving an unmet need for 18,606 homes. We appreciate that the Council will liaise with the neighbouring authorities to help accommodate some of Sandwell's unmet housing needs through their own housing provision. National Highways welcomes further information on this once the Council identifies the working arrangement and we look forward to understanding the impacts from these developments on the SRN in the area as you progress into Regulation 19.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.
C151	1118	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		Duty to Co- operate	<p>For any developments which have an impact on neighbouring Local Authorities (LA) National Highways advises a joined-up approach in which National Highways, Sandwell and the other LAs attend joint meetings with the future developer or applicants. This will ensure that the interests of all parties are protected, and a combined solution is derived.</p> <p>National Highways will actively work with Sandwell MBC to develop and draft a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) to deal with any strategic cross boundary issues as the Local Plan progresses.</p>		Comment noted - Sandwell will continue to work in co-operation with stakeholders and neighbouring authorities to address cross-boundary and wider issues, including those that relate to the strategic and local highways network
C152	827	Heyford Developments [205]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Duty to Co- operate	<p>The level of unmet need arising within HMA is one such area where the Duty to Cooperate should be employed in order to determine where this unmet need should be directed. Having regard to the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area there are 14 authorities within it which include Birmingham, the four Black Country authorities and 9 other surrounding authorities. In light of the shortfall arising in Birmingham, Dudley and Sandwell this effectively leaves 11 remaining authorities where the need could be distributed.</p> <p>...</p> <p>In light of the Council's need and the significant shortfall that the Council is faced with, Heyford Developments urge the Council to enter into constructive and productive discussions with the other HMA authorities, including South Staffordshire, to seek agreement on how and where this unmet housing need is going to be delivered. Meeting the housing needs of the HMA cannot be achieved on an authority by authority basis and that a joined up approach that crosses administrative boundaries will be required if there is to be any chance of meeting the HMA's housing needs both in terms of quantum and the required mix, including affordable homes.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.
C153	943	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Duty to Co- operate	<p>Duty to Cooperate</p> <p>4. HBF note that following the collapse of Black Country Plan, Sandwell has had to undertake its own calculations for the housing need and requirement and must robustly test how much of this can be met within Sandwell and how much (if any) is an unmet need. The Council will then need to work with neighbouring authorities to identify how that unmet need will be redistributed and prepare a Statement of Common Ground on this issue. The Council should also prepare a Duty to Cooperate Statement.</p> <p>5. Currently there is not enough information available for HBF to come to a view as to whether or not Sandwell has met, and is meeting, the Duty to Cooperate. The Council will need to evidence its ongoing work with the other neighbouring authorities within the HMA. This will need to be evidenced with more than words of good intentions and be supported with a clear Plan of how all the housing needs of Sandwell will be met. We hope this evidence will be forthcoming, and in light of the known issue around housing numbers and unmet need, it is essential that does.</p> <p>6. HBF's main concerns around Duty to Cooperate relate to ensuring the required amount of housing is delivered in reality. This is particularly important because the current Plan indicates a significant amount of unmet need. The issue of fully meeting housing needs within Sandwell remains. Our more detailed comments on this issue can be found in response to Policy SDS1.</p> <p>7. HBF suggest that the Council prepare a signed Statement of Common Ground between the Council with each of the neighbouring authorities setting out if and how they will contribute to meeting Sandwell's unmet needs. Such statements will be essential as the Plan progresses. HBF notes the Council's stated intention to be proactive and pro-growth. However, the issue of potential unmet need requires clearly evidenced and ongoing cooperation. This will be essential to show that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.
C154	996	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Duty to Co- operate	<p>116. There arises a need to address issues that are wider-than-local matters in a joined-up manner under the Duty to Cooperate. The HBF notes that Sandwell was closely involved in the production of the Black Country Plan (BCP), alongside the other three Black Country councils, but that work on the joint BCP officially ceased in October 2022. The HBF notes that the BCP website says "it is with regret that we are unable to reach agreement on the approach to planning for future development needs within the framework of the Black Country Plan". The statement on the website continues that "Local Plans for the four Black Country Councils will now provide the framework for the long-term planning of the Black Country. The Black Country Plan 2039 work programme will end, and we will now transition to a process focused on Local Plans. The issues of housing and employment land need will now be addressed through individual Local Plans for each of the authorities. The Councils will co-operate with each other and with other key bodies as they prepare their Local Plans." This suggests compliance with the Duty to Cooperate may be a key challenge for meeting the legal requirements of plan-making in Sandwell.</p> <p>117. HBF suggest that there is a need for housing monitoring to be undertaken across the wider region. If other areas are providing housing to meet Sandwell's need, Sandwell will need to be monitoring this delivery to ensure its needs are being met. However, HBF firmly believe Sandwell should be doing more to address its own needs, including Green Belt release.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.

C155	1017	Birmingham City Council (Mr Ian Macleod, Director of Planning, Transport & Sustainability) [68]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>Through evidence provided for its new Local Plan, Birmingham City Council has also identified an initial estimated shortfall of 78,415 homes across the city for the proposed Plan period of 2022-2042. The City Council still has further work to do to identify further potential sources of housing land supply and will ensure that opportunities within its administrative area will be truly maximised prior to any shortfall being exported to other areas. It is also important that Sandwell, like Birmingham, continues to strive to accommodate as much housing and employment as possible to meet its own needs by making effective use of land and maximising densities.</p> <p>However, even with proactive measures to increase supply in place, it is still highly likely that shortfalls will remain in both local authority areas going forward. It is therefore essential for close working to continue between the two authorities and across the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA to try and address the shortfalls as much as possible across the wider HMA area.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need.
C156	1021	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>Thank you for inviting comments on the Draft Sandwell Local Plan Review: Stage 2. Overall, we support this plan with many of the proposals referenced, fully assisting with the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) goals and aspirations to create a more prosperous and better connected West Midlands which is fairer, greener and healthier and those within the agreed Core Strategy of the new West Midlands statutory Local Transport Plan (WMLTP5), the draft Six Big Moves and work on the Area Strategies. We especially welcome the positive ambition for improving transport across Sandwell, which outlines new opportunities within the coming years, and its bold intent for improving the transport system.</p> <p>This version of the Sandwell Local Plan has also addressed many of our issues highlighted in the Issues and Options stage, or in previous responses to the Black Country Plan and this is very welcomed.</p> <p>Many of the transport proposals referenced will assist in delivering wider economic growth aspirations including providing over 185 hectares of employment land and 29,773 new homes by 2041 (but appreciating the shortfalls in meeting these figures) together with continuing to help reduce transport impacts on people and places including supporting decarbonisation. We would therefore like to continue this strong partnership working in delivering on both WMLTP5 outcomes and in shaping the transport elements contained within the Sandwell Local Plan.</p>	Support	Support noted - Council will continue to work with TFWM
C157	1265	City Of Wolverhampton Council (Michele Ross, Planning Policy Manager) [250]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>It is welcome that good progress has been made with the SLP under the current Plan system, that it is underpinned by work undertaken to prepare the Black Country Plan (BCP), particularly the shared evidence base and associated policy development, and that the SLP timetable is aligned with the emerging WLP and Plans for other neighbouring authorities. This is important given the need to progress a regional solution to addressing unmet housing and employment land needs, a significant proportion of which originate in Sandwell.</p> <p>It is recognised that Sandwell Council have fully explored all opportunities within the Borough to maximise development capacity, including increased densities and sites in centres, whilst protecting viable employment land and premises as necessary, given the evidenced shortfall of employment development land across the Black Country Functional Economic Market Area (BC FEMA). It is accepted that it will not be possible to meet all development needs within the Borough, and that it is necessary for Sandwell to ask other authorities if they are able to contribute towards meeting Sandwell needs through the allocation of land in their Local Plans.</p> <p>The current Wolverhampton position on housing and employment land need and supply is set out in the Wolverhampton Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2022, the Black Country Economic Development Needs Assessment (BC EDNA) 2023 and the Draft BCP (2021). On the basis of the December 2022 consultation version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Leader of the Council committed to excluding any green belt land from development allocations in the emerging Wolverhampton Local Plan (WLP).</p> <p>Taking into account potential capacity on non-green belt land in the Draft BCP, and an extended Plan period to 2042, the WLP is likely to generate a shortfall of around 11,500 homes and 50 ha of employment development land.</p> <p>In terms of employment development land, the BC EDNA concludes that the BC FEMA as a whole has a shortfall of 152ha, however contributions secured through current Statements of Common Ground between the BC FEMA authorities and Shropshire and South Staffordshire Councils have potential to provide 133.6 ha towards BC FEMA needs, which would reduce that shortfall to 18.4 ha.</p> <p>Given the existing housing and employment development land shortfalls set out above, Wolverhampton will not be in a position to provide land within the emerging WLP to meet either housing needs arising in Sandwell, or employment development land need arising in the BC FEMA.</p> <p>Regarding housing, it is recommended that Sandwell Council continues to engage with the work of the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area (GBBCHMA) officer group and the programme of work contained within the Statement of Common Ground as circulated by South Staffordshire Council in 2022. Clearly, given the scale of the Sandwell shortfall, a regional approach is required. Any solution should be based on an understanding of the pattern of functional and physical relationships across the GBBCHMA including migration and travel to work data so that, where practicable, needs are addressed as close as possible to where they arise.</p> <p>Regarding employment development land, it is recommended that Sandwell should continue to work together with the other BC authorities to close the BC FEMA employment development land shortfall through ongoing DTC activity, with a focus on those areas having a strong or moderate functional economic relationship with the Black Country (as defined in the BC EDNA), and other areas where there is evidence of a functional relationship.</p> <p>The City Council is a member of the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (WMRTAB) which helps member authorities to meet their DTC obligations regarding strategic waste management. WMRTAB has submitted responses to the Sandwell Local Plan consultation on behalf of the member authorities which cover technical issues regarding strategic waste management.</p>	Comment	Support noted and welcomed. Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. Sandwell will also continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities to try to meet its employment land shortfall.
C158	1286	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]	Duty to Co-operate	<p>The Draft SLP notes that there is significant movement of waste into and out of Sandwell as follows:</p> <p>'13.20 The BCWS waste projections also considered net waste imports. Around 1.35 million tonnes of waste were received at permitted waste sites (including landfill sites) and operational incinerators in Sandwell in 2021 (BCWS Table 2.10). The total imports into Sandwell originating from the West Midlands Region was 746 tonnes, representing 68% of the total waste received.</p> <p>[N.B. WMRTAB notes paragraph 2.8.7 of the updated Black Country Waste Study for Sandwell states that 'The total imports into Sandwell originating from the West Midlands region (excluding the waste originating in Sandwell) was 746,000 tonnes' and so the '746' value included in paragraph 13.20 shown above is an error.]</p> <p>13.21 More than 80% of the waste received at permitted waste facilities in Sandwell (excluding incinerators) in 2021 by tonnage originated within the former West Midlands region (BCWS Appendix J, Table J4). However, the originating authority of 29.5% of this waste is not known. 15% of the waste is recorded as originating from within the Black Country, and 15% from Birmingham.</p> <p>13.22 Similarly, more than 80% of the waste received at permitted sites in England which was recorded as having originated in Sandwell in 2021 (by tonnage) did not travel beyond the former West Midlands region. Outside the West Midlands, the East Midlands, Southwest and East of England were the three largest importers of waste into Sandwell, importing 9% of total waste.</p> <p>13.23 In 2021 nearly 608kt of waste originating in Sandwell were exported to permitted sites in England and Wales.'</p> <p>The distribution of waste arising in Sandwell to authorities in the West Midlands is set out in Figure 2.3 of the updated Black Country Waste Study for Sandwell (2023) 2 which is set out below: (See attached Letter)</p> <p>In light of the above, WMRTAB notes that meaningful dialogue between Sandwell and other Waste Planning Authorities is likely to be important to ensure it meets its obligations under the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The Sandwell Duty to Cooperate (DTC) Statement (published November 2023),3 paragraph 61 'Effect of new development on waste disposal', notes that 'The Council has been involved in waste discussions through the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (RTAB), a body set up to support and promote cooperation between Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) and others. The Council sent DTC letters out to those Waste Planning Authorities where waste movements were above the agreed thresholds for waste movements. Letters were set out on the 19th April 2023 and were followed up on the 25th May 2023. Staffordshire, Dudley and Walsall Councils consider the matter to be significant enough to warrant a SoCG, whereas Cheshire East and Chester Council would like further discussions on the matter'.</p> <p>It is understood that engagement related to ensuring compliance with the DTC is ongoing and that application of the WMRTAB Duty to Cooperate protocol has revealed that there are very few waste movements to WPAs which exceed the 20% threshold for movement to one authority and there are no movements within the last year that exceed the 40% threshold. At this stage WMRTAB notes that whilst a DTC statement4 has been prepared this does not set appear to out the purpose of the DTC correspondence that has taken place so far and whether there were any outcomes, particularly in terms of whether the Local Plans of other areas allowed for, or would allow for, the meeting of any future unmet waste management capacity requirements that currently exist or might exist in the future in Sandwell. The inclusion of such information is not essential, however WMRTAB wish to draw attention to the Planning Inspectorate 'Procedure Guide for Local Plan Examinations' which includes the following (with emphasis added):</p>	Comment	Noted. Sandwell will continue to engage with relevant bodies in relation to waste matters as part of the Duty to Cooperate. An updated Duty to Cooperate Statement will be published at Regulation 19 stage and will provide updated information about ongoing DTC discussions.
C159	739	Mr Jon Green [58]	Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development	Support, as long as 'edge of centre' would cover things like New Square shopping centre in West Brom, which has had a detrimental impact on the high street. development that is adjacent to a centre should complement it, not take away all trade.	Support	Noted. New Square shopping centre is within West Bromwich Town Centre and the Primary Shopping Area. It is acknowledged that the retail focus has shifted away from the High Street following the opening of New Square. The West Bromwich Masterplan seeks to respond to the changing nature of retail, and promotes a diversification of uses within the town centre including significant residential development.
C160	921	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	Figure 13 - Transport Key Diagram	The Section contains a number of policies in relation to transportation, including the promotion of active and sustainable travel through modal shift. The canal network can provide robust opportunities for promotion of these agendas and the Trust welcomes the inclusion of the canal network within sub-section 3 of Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking. However, the Trust requests inclusion of the canal network within Figure 13 - Transport Key Diagram, overlaying with cycle and walking networks, to enable its role in the delivery of sustainable transport and modal shift to be more readily identified in conjunction with the implementation of Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking (ACTION REQUEST).	Comment	Amend to include canal network on transportation key diagram

C161	751	Miss Helen Davies [203]		Figure 13 - Transport Key Diagram	There appears to be parts of the KRN missing from Figure 13. This may be due to the mapping layers used but we would like clarification that the KRN is correctly designated on Sandwell's highway network. Page 17, paragraph 34 (last bullet point) should be changed to say "Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension via Dudley – this will create a direct public transport route from Wednesbury to the Wolverhampton to Walsall Birmingham New St rail line at the Dudley Port interchange". On page23 (section 61) this should read "West Coast Main Line".	Comment	Noted. The KRN network drawing will be revised for the Regulation 19 SLP.
C162	652	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]		Figure 2 - Extract from report - location of high and medium value sites for BNG	Object to the choice of these sites and the evidence on which they are based which appears very flimsy. You cannot measure biodiversity or "bank" it. What a stupid term and one created by office based idiot table top planners, and this policy appears to favour relocation of biodiversity away from the original Sandwell Nature Recovery Network map, which includes our area.	Object	Noted. BNG is a statutory national requirement and the Council is bound by legislation to observe it. The work on identifying potential BNG habitat sites was undertaken in an attempt to retain increased environmental and habitat value in Sandwell as possible, to avoid it being lost to sites outside the borough - national credits can be bought by developers where no other options are available and can / will be used to fund projects outside the West Midlands in some cases.
C163	736	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Flood Risk	This is us we live in a high rise and due to the incompetence of sandwell council we are now a flood risk. All 3 blocks of flats where I live flood every time it rains that's 90 flats in 3 blocks that's 270 tenants effected every time it rains and sandwells solution to the problem is flood sacs that they ran out of and they dont offer them to everyone as every tenant is treated and told something different to everyone else.	Comment	Comment noted. Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C164	1133	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Green and Blue Infrastructure	Section on Green and Blue Infrastructure from page 74 onwards - We would welcome a reference to the historic environment as a component of green and blue infrastructure and the role heritage plays in this area. If you have any questions we are happy to answer.	Comment	Comment noted. No information has been provided on the specific role that the historic environment can play in green and blue infrastructure terms. The purpose of this policy is to require the provision of GBI and to support its current existence - while some elements of GBI will cross over with elements of the historic environment, the built historic environment is not the focus of the policy. Amend Policy to reflect registered parks and gardens
C165	1180	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Green Belt	3.16The council by their own admission have submitted a strategy which falls substantially short of providing a strategy which meets their OAN, which should be seen as a minimum requirement within the extract above. Even in meeting the substantially short figures there is a reliance on maximising out housing densities, in an era where development pressures to deliver supporting features beyond just housing – BNG, sustainability measures etc often restrict this capability. The duty-to-cooperate is also proposed to be utilised to account for this unmet need, but there is no clear strategy or commitment from neighbouring authorities that this would be achievable in part or as a whole. This is therefore not a sustainable approach to development and will inevitably result in the very purpose of the SLP – being to promote growth in planned manner, falling away, likely resulting in mass speculative development, in order for housing needs to be met. 3.17Wain Estates are of the view that exceptional circumstances for reviewing Sandwell's Green Belt boundaries. A further review of the Green Belt is therefore necessary in order to assess how the boundaries should be amended to maximise the potential for the most sustainable sites. 3.31In light of the above, Wain Estates are of the view that exceptional circumstances exist in terms of both the scale of unmet need and the likely under delivery of the proposed supply. It is therefore essential that Sandwell reviews its Green Belt boundaries, to ensure it meets its housing needs in the least sensitive locations. 3.32It is well evidenced that greenfield land will deliver much quicker than brownfield land, where issues of land assembly and remediation severely delay the delivery of housing. It should also be acknowledged that removing land from the Green Belt can also be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and the accessibility of remaining Green Belt land as well as providing improvements to Green Infrastructure (GI) provision. Overall, the Council must "turn on all taps of supply" if it is to meet its housing needs.	Object	Note comments. The evidence used to establish the parameters for the SLP spatial strategy drew on the information used recently to inform the BCP, which included an in-depth GB assessment undertaken by LUC. This looked in detail at green belt parcels across the BC including in Sandwell. As part of this work, potential sites and locations were considered in terms of both housing and employment uses and the potential impacts on the GB of both uses were recorded and used to identify the subsequent GB allocations. Sandwell has taken forward a number of the former BCP allocations and in turn has considered the evidence relating to GB for all reasonable alternative sites in its area. Further work is also now being undertaken to revisit proposed GB allocations to confirm their suitability or otherwise and any amendments will be addressed in the Reg 19 version of the SLP. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.
C166	1105	Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Mr Michael Brown, Policy Planner) [226]		Green Belt	It is acknowledged that the Green Belt in Sandwell protects a relatively limited area of valuable open space within a heavily urbanised area. As such, it is agreed that it would not be appropriate to seek to release Green Belt land for development in Sandwell.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C167	1242	Redrow Homes [239]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Green Belt	The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell and Dudley will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it.	Comment	The latest version of the NPPF continues to allow flexibility for local authorities to determine their own approach to the use / allocation of GB to meet housing needs. Given that the Council remains of the view that GB in Sandwell remains highly vulnerable to development pressures and also continues to fulfill the main purposes of GB designation, and that the work done on GB for the BCP remains valid, it does not intend to undertake a formal review of GB boundaries. potential GB allocations have been considered as part of the reasonable alternatives under the SA, and work is ongoing to look at all potential allocations to ensure nothing has been missed, but it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside .
C168	917	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Health and Wellbeing	This section contains a number of policies in relation to Health Impact Assessments (SHW1), Healthcare Infrastructure (SHW2), Air Quality (SHW3), Open Space and Recreation (SHW4), Playing Fields and Sports Facilities (SHW5), and Allotments (SHW6). Given our request above that the canal network's contribution to the broader well-being agenda be explicitly included with the wording of Policy SNE6 - Canals in Sandwell, the Trust requests the incorporation of cross- referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the introductory text to this section, for example after para 6.11. (ACTION REQUEST).	Comment	Amend to include cross reference to SNE6 in para 6.14h
C169	728	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Heating and hot water systems	5.33 These are suggestions and plans for new builds, existing building especially high rises have had there gas pipes removed, using old storage heaters, exist on economy 7 so can only use storage heaters at night and the new water tanks that are replacing old cast iron tanks are made of copper and have a dual compartments that does not retain the hot water like the old tanks did.	Comment	Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C170	756	Mr Mark Davies [32]	Iceni Projects (Miss Lydia Frimley, Assistant Planner) [31]	Housing Allocations	Alongside this short summary we have submitted a representation to Sandwell's Local Plan email that provides further details.	Support	Comment noted.
C171	644	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]		Housing Allocations	SH35 (SA85) SH36 (SA86) Unsustainable and threat to biodiversity and Sheepwash Nature Reserve wildlife corridor with canal. Rattlechain lagoon contains tens of tonnes of white phosphorus and is not fully remediated with unstable ground and sediment. Unthinkable of building homes on this site. Equally the former Duport's tip requires significant and unsustainable remediation unsuited to development due to disgraceful dumping of foundry sand- unstable after 30 years of tipping. This site never came forward from the 2011 plan and should be removed. Rhodia/Solvay claimed a period of at least 25 years of monitoring in 2013 when undertaking limited remediation.	Object	The Rattlechain site was subject to a Site Assessment which concluded that subject to the resolution of constraints of ground contamination, environmental concerns, and policy issues the development for residential purposes would be suitable.
C172	667	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Housing Allocations	SH18 - Friar Park, Wednesbury. Would object to allocation as it is a SLINC. Also surrounded by PSIs, which would need assessment against the Local Wildlife Site assessment criteria before planning permission can be granted if they're going to be affected SH35 - Rattlechain site - land to north of Temple Way, Tividale. S This site is a PSI and would need assessment against the Local Wildlife Site assessment criteria before planning permission can be granted SH43 - Land off Tanhouse Avenue, Great Barr. Site is a SLINC, adjacent to SINC. We would object to this allocation	Comment	The site has a willing landowner promoting the site for residential development. The landowner has confirmed that the site is capable of being sufficiently remediated to support residential development.
C173	753	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Housing Allocations	SH53 i object to the building of 7-14 storey accommodations as we already have 3 high rise blocks of 14 storeys already, putting in new ones will only compete with the existing blocks of flats and will block out any remaining sunlight not blocked by the new hospital.	Object	The proposed residential allocation will continue the residential allocation from the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.
C174	754	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Housing Allocations	SH61 i object to the building on the handi coach site as it has already been identified that the ground underneath is contaminated and that the new housing estate next door is besieged with flood problems when it rains.	Object	Comment noted
C175	757	Mr Mark Davies [32]	Iceni Projects (Miss Lydia Frimley, Assistant Planner) [31]	Housing Allocations	In relation to the Soho Foundry and Mint, Smethwick, it is recommended that a site specific mixed-use allocation is provided for these important and significant heritage assets, to enable the best viable use of these assets to be developed, to help secure the significant heritage regeneration aims of the Chance Heritage Trust and the removal of the site as a Local Employment Area, enabling these to come forward for a range of business, tourism, leisure and/or heritage education uses that would foster the public enjoyment of these assets. See submitted stand-alone representations from the Chance Heritage Trust for further information.	Object	Comment noted. Soho Foundry has been subject to a Site Assessment (please see the Site Assessment report) which has determined that the site is suitable only for continued employment use.

C176	1067	Mukarram Sattar [222]	West Waddy Archadia (WWA) (Ifi Maniar, Planning Director) [221]	Housing Allocations	<p>Promotion of 192-200 DUDLEY ROAD, OLDBURY, BIRMINGHAM, B69 3DS to be allocated for residential led mixed use development ,</p> <p>The site consists of a number of commercial buildings, including a petrol station, car repair and services, a hand car wash, hardstanding area and two-storey dwellings. One of the dwellings is separated from the rest of the site by a track used to access the properties on Payton Close and Brades Road. The commercial buildings on the site fall within sui generis use class, with the residential dwellings falling within Use Class C3. The site measures approximately 0.58 hectares.</p> <p>The site is located in a highly sustainable location and meets the criteria for high density development of 45+ dwellings per hectare as set out in emerging Policy SH03.</p> <p>Based upon the analysis of housing densities undertaken by the Council, the redevelopment of the site could accommodate a minimum 50-80 flats above the commercial units on the ground floor, subject to architectural design and proposed number of bedrooms. These figures should be used as an approximate indication only.</p> <p>Our clients control the land the subject of this representation, which is considered suitable, available, achievable and appropriate for housing development. The site would assist meeting an immediate need for providing local housing as well as meeting the district wide need. Given that the site has no statutory restrictive designations, allocating this land would make effective use of previously developed land. It provides for a sustainable approach to the planning of the settlement. The allocation of this site achieves all three sustainable dimensions as mentioned above. For these reasons we consider that the site should be allocated for a mixed use housing-led development in the emerging new Local Plan (2041).</p> <p>There are no restrictive covenants or other obstructions to development and the development would be able to proceed within 0-5-year framework given the immediate availability of the subject site.</p> <p>See full submission for further details.</p>	Comment	This site will be assessed in line with the site selection methodology.
C177	1210	Oldbury (Smethwick) Limited [238]	Planning Prospects Ltd (Mr Chris Dodds, Associate Director) [163]	Housing Allocations	<p>Policy SH01 and residential allocation SH55 "Cape Arm / Cranford Street"</p> <p>Policy SH01 (Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth) sets out that sufficient land will be provided to deliver at least 11,167 net new homes over the period 2022 – 2041 and includes 6,951 homes from "Housing Allocations that the Plan considers can be delivered over the Plan period. Appendix B of the draft Plan sets out details of Sandwell's proposed allocation sites and first lists each of the Housing Allocations, including Allocation SH55 "Cape Arm / Cranford Street" which is shown as a 2.13 ha brownfield site with a potential yield of 170 homes at a net development density of 80 dwellings per hectare (dph) over an indicative net developable area of 2.13 ha. Appendix B sets out that the Anticipated Delivery Timescale (completion year) for this allocated site is 2030.</p> <p>Our client, Oldbury (Smethwick) Ltd, a subsidiary of Pall Mall Investments, are the owners of approximately 1.78 ha of land within Allocation SH55. They intend to put forward a residential development proposal for this land and have sought the Council's pre-application advice to inform their latest proposals for up to 90 homes (under reference PA/22/00618).</p> <p>As such, our client remains generally supportive of the continued allocation of this site for residential development within the draft Sandwell Local Plan – following its allocation for residential use in the adopted Sandwell Site Allocations Document (2012) and subsequent draft allocation in the now defunct Black Country Plan.</p> <p>However, the representations made here, and to other draft policies of the draft Sandwell Local Plan, make some initial observations and suggested amendments to the draft policies to ensure they optimize the market attractiveness, viability and deliverability of development for our client's site in particular. Our comments seek to ensure that the emerging policies are flexible enough to ensure that the anticipated, and allocated, residential regeneration of our client's land can be achieved.</p> <p>Whilst our client welcomes the continued residential allocation of the site under SH55, as it will enable them to bring forward residential development of the site when the current temporary use (facilitating the construction of the Midland Metropolitan Hospital) ceases, they have several comments / observations on the draft site allocation as follows:</p> <p>The gross site area is shown to be 2.13 ha of brownfield land. Our client assumes that this includes both our client's land, which at 1.78ha forms the significant majority of the allocation, and the small parcel of land that originally formed part of the site but that is now in the control of the NHS trust by virtue of Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to facilitate the construction of the neighbouring Midland Metropolitan Hospital. The draft Local Plan Proposals Map also suggests that a small parcel of land on the southern side of the Cape Arm is also included within this allocation.</p> <p>The table provided at Appendix B suggests the indicative development capacity is 170 homes and indicates a development density of 80 dph across a net developable site area of 2.13 ha. By way of background, the former BCP draft allocation indicated a development density of 38dph at this site, equating to an indicative capacity of 70 dwellings (over the former site area of 1.85ha). Our client highlighted that this was at the lower end of the range of development densities that could be achieved at this site, and indicated that its own masterplan / site layout work had indicated an achievable site capacity (at that time) of 80 to 90 homes at a density of approximately 43 to 50 dph.</p> <p>On this basis, our client submitted an indicative proposal for up to 90 dwellings (or around 50 dph) as part of a pre-application submission to the Council, demonstrating that this level and nature of development represented a viable proposal (at that time) and one that would have been most attractive to the market, and ultimately one that could have been deliverable here.</p> <p>The latest draft allocation at a density of 80 dph is significantly higher (60% higher) than the density considered deliverable by our client. It is also significantly higher than the other residential allocations in the draft Local Plan, including SH01, SH02, SH03, SH04, SH05, SH06, SH07, SH08, SH09, SH10, SH11, SH12, SH13, SH14, SH15, SH16, SH17, SH18, SH19, SH20, SH21, SH22, SH23, SH24, SH25, SH26, SH27, SH28, SH29, SH30, SH31, SH32, SH33, SH34, SH35, SH36, SH37, SH38, SH39, SH40, SH41, SH42, SH43, SH44, SH45, SH46, SH47, SH48, SH49, SH50, SH51, SH52, SH53, SH54, SH56, SH57, SH58, SH59, SH60, SH61, SH62, SH63, SH64, SH65, SH66, SH67, SH68, SH69, SH70, SH71, SH72, SH73, SH74, SH75, SH76, SH77, SH78, SH79, SH80, SH81, SH82, SH83, SH84, SH85, SH86, SH87, SH88, SH89, SH90, SH91, SH92, SH93, SH94, SH95, SH96, SH97, SH98, SH99, SH100, SH101, SH102, SH103, SH104, SH105, SH106, SH107, SH108, SH109, SH110, SH111, SH112, SH113, SH114, SH115, SH116, SH117, SH118, SH119, SH120, SH121, SH122, SH123, SH124, SH125, SH126, SH127, SH128, SH129, SH130, SH131, SH132, SH133, SH134, SH135, SH136, SH137, SH138, SH139, SH140, SH141, SH142, SH143, SH144, SH145, SH146, SH147, SH148, SH149, SH150, SH151, SH152, SH153, SH154, SH155, SH156, SH157, SH158, SH159, SH160, SH161, SH162, SH163, SH164, SH165, SH166, SH167, SH168, SH169, SH170, SH171, SH172, SH173, SH174, SH175, SH176, SH177, SH178, SH179, SH180, SH181, SH182, SH183, SH184, SH185, SH186, SH187, SH188, SH189, SH190, SH191, SH192, SH193, SH194, SH195, SH196, SH197, SH198, SH199, SH200, SH201, SH202, SH203, SH204, SH205, SH206, SH207, SH208, SH209, SH210, SH211, SH212, SH213, SH214, SH215, SH216, SH217, SH218, SH219, SH220, SH221, SH222, SH223, SH224, SH225, SH226, SH227, SH228, SH229, SH230, SH231, SH232, SH233, SH234, SH235, SH236, SH237, SH238, SH239, SH240, SH241, SH242, SH243, SH244, SH245, SH246, SH247, SH248, SH249, SH250, SH251, SH252, SH253, SH254, SH255, SH256, SH257, SH258, SH259, SH260, SH261, SH262, SH263, SH264, SH265, SH266, SH267, SH268, SH269, SH270, SH271, SH272, SH273, SH274, SH275, SH276, SH277, SH278, SH279, SH280, SH281, SH282, SH283, SH284, SH285, SH286, SH287, SH288, SH289, SH290, SH291, SH292, SH293, SH294, SH295, SH296, SH297, SH298, SH299, SH300, SH301, SH302, SH303, SH304, SH305, SH306, SH307, SH308, SH309, SH310, SH311, SH312, SH313, SH314, SH315, SH316, SH317, SH318, SH319, SH320, SH321, SH322, SH323, SH324, SH325, SH326, SH327, SH328, SH329, SH330, SH331, SH332, SH333, SH334, SH335, SH336, SH337, SH338, SH339, SH340, SH341, SH342, SH343, SH344, SH345, SH346, SH347, SH348, SH349, SH350, SH351, SH352, SH353, SH354, SH355, SH356, SH357, SH358, SH359, SH360, SH361, SH362, SH363, SH364, SH365, SH366, SH367, SH368, SH369, SH370, SH371, SH372, SH373, SH374, SH375, SH376, SH377, SH378, SH379, SH380, SH381, SH382, SH383, SH384, SH385, SH386, SH387, SH388, SH389, SH390, SH391, SH392, SH393, SH394, SH395, SH396, SH397, SH398, SH399, SH400, SH401, SH402, SH403, SH404, SH405, SH406, SH407, SH408, SH409, SH410, SH411, SH412, SH413, SH414, SH415, SH416, SH417, SH418, SH419, SH420, SH421, SH422, SH423, SH424, SH425, SH426, SH427, SH428, SH429, SH430, SH431, SH432, SH433, SH434, SH435, SH436, SH437, SH438, SH439, SH440, SH441, SH442, SH443, SH444, SH445, SH446, SH447, SH448, SH449, SH450, SH451, SH452, SH453, SH454, SH455, SH456, SH457, SH458, SH459, SH460, SH461, SH462, SH463, SH464, SH465, SH466, SH467, SH468, SH469, SH470, SH471, SH472, SH473, SH474, SH475, SH476, SH477, SH478, SH479, SH480, SH481, SH482, SH483, SH484, SH485, SH486, SH487, SH488, SH489, SH490, SH491, SH492, SH493, SH494, SH495, SH496, SH497, SH498, SH499, SH500, SH501, SH502, SH503, SH504, SH505, SH506, SH507, SH508, SH509, SH510, SH511, SH512, SH513, SH514, SH515, SH516, SH517, SH518, SH519, SH520, SH521, SH522, SH523, SH524, SH525, SH526, SH527, SH528, SH529, SH530, SH531, SH532, SH533, SH534, SH535, SH536, SH537, SH538, SH539, SH540, SH541, SH542, SH543, SH544, SH545, SH546, SH547, SH548, SH549, SH550, SH551, SH552, SH553, SH554, SH555, SH556, SH557, SH558, SH559, SH560, SH561, SH562, SH563, SH564, SH565, SH566, SH567, SH568, SH569, SH570, SH571, SH572, SH573, SH574, SH575, SH576, SH577, SH578, SH579, SH580, SH581, SH582, SH583, SH584, SH585, SH586, SH587, SH588, SH589, SH590, SH591, SH592, SH593, SH594, SH595, SH596, SH597, SH598, SH599, SH600, SH601, SH602, SH603, SH604, SH605, SH606, SH607, SH608, SH609, SH610, SH611, SH612, SH613, SH614, SH615, SH616, SH617, SH618, SH619, SH620, SH621, SH622, SH623, SH624, SH625, SH626, SH627, SH628, SH629, SH630, SH631, SH632, SH633, SH634, SH635, SH636, SH637, SH638, SH639, SH640, SH641, SH642, SH643, SH644, SH645, SH646, SH647, SH648, SH649, SH650, SH651, SH652, SH653, SH654, SH655, SH656, SH657, SH658, SH659, SH660, SH661, SH662, SH663, SH664, SH665, SH666, SH667, SH668, SH669, SH670, SH671, SH672, SH673, SH674, SH675, SH676, SH677, SH678, SH679, SH680, SH681, SH682, SH683, SH684, SH685, SH686, SH687, SH688, SH689, SH690, SH691, SH692, SH693, SH694, SH695, SH696, SH697, SH698, SH699, SH700, SH701, SH702, SH703, SH704, SH705, SH706, SH707, SH708, SH709, SH710, SH711, SH712, SH713, SH714, SH715, SH716, SH717, SH718, SH719, SH720, SH721, SH722, SH723, SH724, SH725, SH726, SH727, SH728, SH729, SH730, SH731, SH732, SH733, SH734, SH735, SH736, SH737, SH738, SH739, SH740, SH741, SH742, SH743, SH744, SH745, SH746, SH747, SH748, SH749, SH750, SH751, SH752, SH753, SH754, SH755, SH756, SH757, SH758, SH759, SH760, SH761, SH762, SH763, SH764, SH765, SH766, SH767, SH768, SH769, SH770, SH771, SH772, SH773, SH774, SH775, SH776, SH777, SH778, SH779, SH780, SH781, SH782, SH783, SH784, SH785, SH786, SH787, SH788, SH789, SH790, SH791, SH792, SH793, SH794, SH795, SH796, SH797, SH798, SH799, SH800, SH801, SH802, SH803, SH804, SH805, SH806, SH807, SH808, SH809, SH810, SH811, SH812, SH813, SH814, SH815, SH816, SH817, SH818, SH819, SH820, SH821, SH822, SH823, SH824, SH825, SH826, SH827, SH828, SH829, SH830, SH831, SH832, SH833, SH834, SH835, SH836, SH837, SH838, SH839, SH840, SH841, SH842, SH843, SH844, SH845, SH846, SH847, SH848, SH849, SH850, SH851, SH852, SH853, SH854, SH855, SH856, SH857, SH858, SH859, SH860, SH861, SH862, SH863, SH864, SH865, SH866, SH867, SH868, SH869, SH870, SH871, SH872, SH873, SH874, SH875, SH876, SH877, SH878, SH879, SH880, SH881, SH882, SH883, SH884, SH885, SH886, SH887, SH888, SH889, SH890, SH891, SH892, SH893, SH894, SH895, SH896, SH897, SH898, SH899, SH900, SH901, SH902, SH903, SH904, SH905, SH906, SH907, SH908, SH909, SH910, SH911, SH912, SH913, SH914, SH915, SH916, SH917, SH918, SH919, SH920, SH921, SH922, SH923, SH924, SH925, SH926, SH927, SH928, SH929, SH930, SH931, SH932, SH933, SH934, SH935, SH936, SH937, SH938, SH939, SH940, SH941, SH942, SH943, SH944, SH945, SH946, SH947, SH948, SH949, SH950, SH951, SH952, SH953, SH954, SH955, SH956, SH957, SH958, SH959, SH960, SH961, SH962, SH963, SH964, SH965, SH966, SH967, SH968, SH969, SH970, SH971, SH972, SH973, SH974, SH975, SH976, SH977, SH978, SH979, SH980, SH981, SH982, SH983, SH984, SH985, SH986, SH987, SH988, SH989, SH990, SH991, SH992, SH993, SH994, SH995, SH996, SH997, SH998, SH999, SH1000.</p>	Comment	Due to the location of the site overlooking the canal arm and having a positive relationship with the hospital, it is considered that the estimated capacity and density is achievable. - no change.
C178	1108	Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Mr Michael Brown, Policy Planner) [226]		Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	<p>However, it is suggested that the baseline densities are in some cases inappropriately low, given the existing development pattern. It would be expected that many of Sandwell's historic Victorian terraces would have densities well in excess of 40 dph, which demonstrates that family housing can be successfully accommodated while optimising densities.</p> <p>It is also anticipated that calculating the appropriate density for an application site could be complicated and subject to challenge from applicants. There is potential ambiguity existing around whether a particular facility should be used to determine accessibility, what mode of transport to use, and what distances could be reasonably covered by that mode of transport. It would be clearer and simpler if the Council included on its policies map zones where different minimum densities would apply. For example using buffer distances from public transport and town centres.</p>	Comment	Comments noted. It is noted that there may be areas where different densities could be appropriate, a new Design Code Supplementary Plan will set out where higher densities may be appropriate. It is proposed to amend the policy to - 3. All developments of ten homes or more should achieve the minimum net density set out below, except where this would prejudice historic character and local distinctiveness as defined in Policy SHE2: a. 100 dwellings per hectare where Table 6 accessibility standards for very high-density housing are met and the site is: i. located within a Strategic or Town Centre detailed at Table 10; ii. identified for very high-density housing within a masterplan and/or design brief agreed with the council; or iii. considered suitable for very high-density housing in accordance with guidance in the council's Design Code.
C179	1107	Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Mr Michael Brown, Policy Planner) [226]		Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	The principle of establishing minimum densities for new housing, based on location and proximity to services and public transport, is supported.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C180	719	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Housing renewal	3.54 The upgrade to our specific block of flats has caused nothing but wet misery to tenants living within them. It would be interesting for sandwell council to give an exact figure as to how many individual tenants and flats within these blocks that have suffered from flooding, damp and mould(and still living with these conditions) since the upgrades were done and lets not forget the cladding that was put on to make them look pretty, falls off in high winds and is being held together with a clamp and wood.	Comment	Comment noted Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C181	1217	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		Introduction	identify strategic cross-boundary matters for Sandwell & Shropshire Council, with matters of detail for further consideration and recognises the significance of these matters for the West Midlands region	Support	Comment noted
C182	1014	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		Introduction	Community Engagement in Planning: We advocate for meaningful community engagement in the planning process, ensuring that local residents and stakeholders have a say in the development of the transport network to address specific community needs and concerns.	Comment	Comment noted.
C183	1216	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		Introduction	Supports DTC engagement expressed through draft Shropshire Plan, ABCA, now discontinued Black Country Plan and the Draft Sandwell Local Plan.	Support	Support noted and welcomed
C184	1245	Rentplus UK Limited [244]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Jamie Roberts, Principle Planner) [243]	Introduction	<p>In this context, Rentplus notes and welcomes the Council's corporate vision for the Borough:</p> <p>"It's where we call home and where we're proud to belong - where we choose to bring up our families, where we feel safe and cared for, enjoying good health, rewarding work, feeling connected and valued in our neighbourhoods and communities, confident in the future, and benefiting fully from a revitalised West Midlands."</p>	Comment	Support noted and welcomed

C185	750	Miss Helen Davies [203]	Introduction	TfWM strongly welcomes reference to the importance of regional transport links. We must point out however, that our 'West Midlands Local Transport Plan 5 Core Strategy: Reimagining Transport in the West Midlands' has now been approved, and while other elements of the suite of Local Transport Plan 5 (WMLTP5) documents have yet to be approved including our Six Big Moves and Area Strategies, these should all be approved by the end of 2024. Once all elements of the WMLTP5 are endorsed by the WMCA Board, Movement for Growth will be superseded by the WM LTP5.	Comment	Noted. The SLP will continue to refer to plans and strategies that have been adopted at the time of publication.
C186	1024	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Introduction	In the introduction section of the transport chapter (11), there appears to be parts of the KRN missing from Figure 13. This may be due to the mapping layers used but we would like clarification that the KRN is correctly designated on Sandwell's highway network. When describing the road network across Sandwell, it should be noted that the WMCA have recently begun a review of the Key Route Network (KRN) and subject to approval, the following changes will be implemented and will affect Sandwell. These being: •The removal of the B4171 Birmingham Road from its junction with A4100 Henderson Way (Rowley Regis) to its junction with A459 Castle Hill (Dudley) •NEW KRN: Sandon Road from its junction with A4030 Bearwood Road (Smethwick) to its junction with A4040 Barnsley Road (Birmingham) Furthermore, on page 17, paragraph 34 (and last bullet point) should be changed to say "Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension via Dudley – this will create a direct public transport route from Wednesbury to the Wolverhampton to Birmingham New St rail line at the Dudley Port interchange". Additionally, on page 23 (section 61) this should read "West Coast Main Line" and not West Coast Mainline as is currently the case.	Comment	Noted. The KRN network drawing will be revised for the Regulation 19 SLP. The revision will capture all changes that are approved at the time of publication.
C187	1087	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Introduction	In the introduction section of the transport chapter (11), there appears to be parts of the KRN missing from Figure 13. This may be due to the mapping layers used but we would like clarification that the KRN is correctly designated on Sandwell's highway network. Furthermore, on page 17, paragraph 34 (and last bullet point) should be changed to say "Wednesbury to Brierley Hill Metro Extension via Dudley – this will create a direct public transport route from Wednesbury to the Wolverhampton to Walsall Birmingham New St rail line at the Dudley Port interchange". Additionally, on page 23 (section 61) this should read "West Coast Main Line" and not West Coast Mainline as is currently the case.	Comment	Noted. The KRN network drawing will be revised for the Regulation 19 SLP.
C188	674	Dr Michael Hodder [48]	Justification	4.131 Should be reworded to say that "Scheduled monuments in Sandwell currently consist of:"	Comment	Comment noted. Amend wording as suggested.
C189	636	Mr Gary Blunt [156]	Justification	The stats here are wrong. On 6/11/23 Sandwell has 51.58% coverage of full fibre, it has 92.28% gigabit coverage. UK coverage is 58% FF coverage and 78% gigabit. Please contact WM5G and myself if you want to source the most updated data.	Support	Amend and update data as at 2024
C190	649	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]	Justification	You are not justifying what you claim to be protecting or creating. The opportunities map clearly showed the Rattlechain area South of Sheepwash to be such an opportunity, and yet proposals of housing would destroy any chance of this, as well as detract from the reserve at Sheepwash with further encroachment.	Comment	Comment noted
C191	1018	Birmingham City Council (Mr Ian Macleod, Director of Planning, Transport & Sustainability) [68]	Justification	The Development Strategy includes a section on how Sandwell has carried out its Duty to Co-operate obligations in the preparation of the Local Plan so far (Paras. 3.12-3.19). Given the development pressures and the housing and employment land shortfalls being experienced in the Borough (and those within Birmingham), it is crucial that Sandwell continues to work closely with the City Council as well as the other surrounding local authorities which make up the HMA, to identify and implement an agreed approach to tackle how such shortfalls are to be accommodated to ensure the soundness of both Local Plans. The City Council agrees that Sandwell has worked openly and constructively with neighbouring authorities to help provide as much certainty as possible about how and where its full housing and employment land needs will be delivered as set out within this section. It supports the commitment to ongoing engagement with its neighbours, building on the partnership approach developed across the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area. This commitment also extends to working with neighbours to bring forward land for employment and housing that sits adjacent to existing administrative boundaries and working in partnership to ensure infrastructure needs are met in full across administrative boundaries. As mentioned above, given that Sandwell shares a considerable joint boundary with Birmingham and the successful adoption of the joint SPD for the Smethwick to Birmingham Regeneration Corridor, this commitment is particularly welcomed to bring forward much need development and regeneration opportunities to this part of the conurbation.	Support	Comment noted. Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. .
C192	676	Dr Michael Hodder [48]	Justification	4.134 this section needs rewording. It should read: " Desk-based assessment should include the results of a search of the HER, information taken from the Heritage List for England, and any other relevant sources. It should determine the nature, extent and significance of archaeological remains and identify the need for, and scope of, any further evaluation that might be necessary prior to consideration of development proposals". There should be a reference in the text to Historic England Guidance and the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' standards and guidance, which define different types of archaeological work,	Comment	Comment noted. Amend text to paragraph as suggested. Include footnote to other relevant guidance.
C193	953	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Justification	Policy SDS6- Green Belt 24.HBF strongly disagree with the conclusion in para 3.84 which says: "It is the Council's view that there are no exceptional circumstances in Sandwell that would justify amending current boundaries and releasing any areas of green belt for new development. While there is an identified shortfall of land suitable for housing and economic development, this of itself does not outweigh the need to maintain the openness and permanence of the green belt within Sandwell, especially given the densely developed and urban character of most of the rest of the borough. HBF would argue that the current housing crisis and the inability of Sandwell meet its own needs (the Plan is looking to plan for only a third of the identified housing need) provide just such exceptional circumstances to necessitate a Green Belt review, which must include the consideration of both employment and housing sites. 25.NPPF (para 20) is clear that "Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development". Para 11 of the NPPF states that "all plans should promote a sustainable pattern of development that seeks to: meet the development needs of their area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects". 26.HBF cannot see how a plan that provides for only a third of its housing requirement standard method baseline (and HBF argue the housing requirement itself should be higher) can meet the requirements to be positively prepared and set out a clear long term vision for the area which is the purpose of plan-making. NPPF para 60 clearly states that "to support the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay." 27.HBF believes the Council's inability to meet their own housing need in the midst of a housing crisis is a factor that constitutes the exception circumstances that justify Green Belt release. 28.HBF support ambitious growth aspirations in Sandwell. HBF highlight the need to consider the interaction between employment and housing. An increase in the number of jobs can it itself generate a requirement for additional housing, and failure to provide housing can have negative impacts on the economic and social wellbeing of the area. The Plan must recognise and reflect this reality. 29.The Plan need to ensure there is a sufficiency of Housing Land Supply (HLS) to meet the housing requirement, ensure the maintenance of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) and achieve Housing Delivery Test (HDT) performance measurements. HBF cannot see how achieving these aims is possible without Green Belt release. It is noted that this may in turn also effect the spatial strategy for the Local Plan. 30.HBF also suggest the Council should give explicit consideration to whether BNG development is acceptable within the Green Belt and/or if Green Belt boundaries need to be revised accommodate schemes that deliver off-site BNG, and possibly even on-site biodiversity gains.	Object	Comments noted. The latest version of the NPPF continues to allow flexibility for local authorities to determine their own approach to the use / allocation of GB to meet housing needs. Given that the Council is of the view that GB in Sandwell remains highly vulnerable to development pressures and also continues to fulfill the main purposes of GB designation (preventing urban sprawl - as well as maintaining openness, and representing a permanent designation), and that the work done on GB for the BCP remains valid, it does not intend to undertake a formal review of GB boundaries. Potential GB allocations have been considered as part of the reasonable alternatives under the SA, and work is ongoing to look at all potential allocations to ensure nothing has been missed, but it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside. The Council is not persuaded that exceptional circumstances that would override these elements exist. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF . In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.
C194	970	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Justification	Policy SHW1– Health Impact Assessments 54.HBF is unclear why the Health Impact Assessment is seeking to assess if a development "will provide a range of housing types and tenures that meet the needs of all sectors of the population including for older people and those with disabilities requiring varying degrees of care; extended families; low-income households; and those seeking to self-build as set out in Policies SHO3, SHO4 and SHO5". This matter is already adequately addressed in the specific housing policies and should not need to be repeated in a HIA.	Comment	Comments noted. The reiteration of the need for an HIA and the use of a detailed policy to establish what is required and the types of development it should address is in accordance with national guidance. This states that planning policies should enable and support healthy lifestyles especially where this would address local health and wellbeing needs; it also emphasises that the level of detailed supporting information provided to local planning authorities should be relevant, necessary and material. Reference to a variety of house types emphasises the need to ensure that these aspects are taken into account for all forms of residential development and as a fundamental part of the design stage of the project. This is not only on the basis of meeting the need for varying house types as a housing requirement but also in terms of the advantages it will provide for the health and wellbeing of all sections of the community in Sandwell. The emphasis on a range of house types here is different to that proposed elsewhere in the SLP; here it is looking at meeting the potential physical / emotional needs of specific user groups rather than being a broader consideration of sizes, numbers of bedrooms etc. looking to fulfil a more numbers-based target.

C195	1073	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Justification	2.21 Paragraph 7.5 of the draft SLP states that "existing allocations likely to gain permission after 2025" have been subject to a density uplift. The SHLAA provides an indication of which sites a density uplift was applied for the purpose of that document. However, it is not clear whether the same sites have been subject to a 'density uplift' for the purpose of calculating the proposed supply set out in Table 5 of the SLP. Whilst the density uplifts appear to broadly align with the proposed minimum densities identified in draft Policy SHO3, further justification is required to demonstrate that such high densities are realistic and deliverable in Sandwell, noting the requirements of other draft development management policies and the high proportion of homes to be delivered on brownfield sites which are often present challenges in viability terms.	Comment	Confirm that density uplifts have been applied to the same sites in regards of Table 5 and will ensure clarity in Reg 19 Plan. There are examples that net densities of over 40 dph have been delivered in Sandwell.
C196	639	Mrs Erica Hughes [164]		Justification	All new development, housing or otherwise, should be on brownfield sites. It's simply not good enough to say green belt land is protected when Sandwell hardly has any. No development should take place on greenfield sites at all for the health and well being of current and future residents. There are plenty of brownfield sites if you get more proactive. I walk past unused brownfield sites all the time - don't be lazy find them. 100% of development should be on brownfield sites and no green field sites should be destroyed. Also finding how to comment was very difficult.	Object	Note comments. 97% of new development identified in the SLP will take place on brownfield and previously-developed sites. A small number of greenfield sites have been identified and under very specific circumstances will provide opportunities to deliver additional housing and employment in sustainable locations. There remains a High level of demand in particular for employment land, so it has not been possible to identify more brownfield sites for housing without displacing currently active and profitable companies, who would find it difficult to relocate. This would result in higher levels of local unemployment and the loss of economic growth opportunities within the borough. During the preparation of the BCP, work was undertaken to look at whether there were any available brownfield sites that the Black Country authorities, including Sandwell, had missed and whether the approach to development on such sites could be changed - the work demonstrated that all available and reasonable brownfield sites had been identified and with very few caveats, it would not be reasonable or possible to deliver more housing on brownfield sites. Where sites may become vacant during the lifetime of the SLP, their redevelopment for housing or employment uses will of course be considered at that time.
C197	638	Mr Gary Blunt [156]		Justification	You need to outline the point that digital connectivity is a must for all new developments. Society can not operate effectively without the right technology. The only way to remove the digital divide is to increase its reach and make it affordable for all.	Support	Noted. Amend Introduction (para 12.1) to emphasise the importance of high-quality digital infrastructure.
C198	1079	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Justification	3.7 The Spatial Strategy Paper (2023) attempts to justify the Council's change in approach to the Green Belt by noting that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Sandwell has very little green belt" • "the areas of undeveloped and open land it does contain are extremely important to the Borough's environment and the health and wellbeing of its population"; • "the important role it plays in preventing coalescence with adjoining towns and settlements within and beyond Sandwell's boundaries and the importance of maintaining open land within the borough." and • "the status of Sandwell Valley as green belt and the importance of existing parks and open spaces to local communities and environments it would be neither reasonable nor appropriate to consider them as locations for additional housing". 3.8 The only other justification provided is at Paragraph 7.8 of the Spatial Strategy Paper (2023) which states that the Government "gave a broad indication recently (2023) that it does not expect local authorities to designate green belt sites to meet housing need, even if there is a shortfall. Green belt (and other open space sites) in Sandwell are also subject to constraints such as nature conservation designations, historic or archaeological interest, high landscape value, flooding and similar issues". 3.9 However, the revised NPPF is yet to be published and it is not yet known exactly what changes it will contain. Whilst the Council asserts that all of its Green Belt land is of such importance that it is not reasonable or appropriate to consider it as an option for housing development, the Council provides no evidence to back up its statements or justify the change in approach from that taken by in draft BCP. 3.10 The Council's proposed spatial strategy and approach to the Green Belt would result in the majority of the housing needs generated in Sandwell being directed to neighbouring authorities, including authorities with their own Green Belt constraints. The draft SLP risks failing to take into account the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and inconsistency with national policy.	Object	Noted. The Sandwell Local Plan has been prepared and will be examined in accordance with the December 2023 NPPF. Paragraph 145 states that "once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated". The Council has explored all options to maximise housing land supply within the urban area.
C199	712	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Justification	3.6 Why was West Bromwich chosen as the boroughs main strategic centre, when it has no train station and the tram line misses many of the surrounding areas that fall within the borough and the resent changes and losses to the bus routes in and out of West Bromwich also cut out or drastically reduce the number of times they frequent these areas, Blackheath, Smethwick, Warley, Langley etc. Why should West Bromwich get the economic and housing growth, when other areas within the borough are equally as deserving and have better transport links. Who made this decision.	Comment	WB is the main strategic centre as it is the largest centre, with the most convenience and especially the most comparison shopping facilities. Although it does not have a train station it has a Metro facility an adjacent bus station, on the line of a former rail line which is currently being expanded, and is a 12-to 15 minute interval metro service, and is nearby to Junction 1 of the M5 meaning it has excellent transport links. It also has several higher order facilities such as a main Library, new Leisure Centre and significant education facilities. Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C200	983	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Justification	79. HBF do not recognise this interpretation of the NPPF [that a minimum of 10% affordable housing must be secured and could be Sandwell's baseline] or the approach to Viability in plan-making being suggested by [Aspinall Verdi]. NPPF and PPG are clear that if whole plan viability testing shows a contribution for affordable housing is not viable, then Local Plan policy should not seek to impose one. The policies need amending to ensure they reflect the viability realities of delivering development in Sandwell. To meet the tests of soundness the plan must be viable and deliverable. It is simply not possible to ignore evidence which shows the policies in the Plan would make development unviable.	Object	Objection noted. Policies relating to the delivery of affordable housing have been revised to establish a tiered approach with varying levels of affordable housing provision depending on values and whether land is greenfield/brownfield. This responds to the conclusions of the Viability Appraisal of the Local Plan which can be found in evidence. Para 66 of the NPPF (2023) requires major residential developments to provide at least 10% of total homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area. The Sandwell Housing Market Assessment concludes that more than 10% of housing needed should be affordable types.
C201	984	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Justification	80. HBF have further concerns about some of the other detail in the [Aspinall Verdi] Viability Assessment as it has not considered a number of key costs and requirements. For example, HBF information suggests that complying with the current new part L is costing £3500 per plot. The Future Homes Standard Part L in 2025 is anticipated to cost up to £7500+ per plot. There will also be the addition of the Building Safety Levy that is coming in pay for cladding. This will be a per plot basis around the UK, and initial values are around £1500- £2500 per plot. These costs appear to have not been considered in the viability appraisal. 81. Other factors that need to be taken into account include increasing the costs of materials and labour due to inflation and the costs of mandatory BNG, which are still emerging as the off-site market is yet to be established. Although the initial price of statutory credits is now known this national fallback option has been deliberately highly priced to discourage their use. Whilst this intention is understandable, at present the lack of functioning local markets for off-site credits causes viability problems because HBF members experience to date suggests that any scheme that needs to rely on statutory credits becomes unviable. HBF have numerous concerns about the whole plan viability study, including the omission of some key policy costs. For example, a realistic and evidenced allowance for mandatory BNG needs to be included within the viability assessment of the Local Plan. 82. The costs of BNG should have been considered as part of the planning obligations and should be specified as a single specific item, no rolled into any total policy costs. There are significant additional costs associated with biodiversity net gain, which should be fully accounted for in the Council's viability assessment, some of which are unknown at this time. It is important that BNG does not prevent, delay or reduce housing delivery. As this is an emerging policy area and the market for off-site provision, and statutory credits are not yet known, any figure used for BNG costs will need to be kept under review as BNG implementation progresses and a greater understanding of actual costs become available. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment should clearly set out how it considered the implications of mandatory BNG and how it arrived at the most up to date BNG costs information available to use.	Object	Objection noted Comments will be taken on board and costs will be revisited as part of viability work as SLP progresses to Regulation 19 stage. In respect of BNG the Government has advised that the cost of BNG should not have any adverse impact on site viability and AV have taken the requirement for BNG into account in their work.
C202	684	Mr John Davison [192]		Justification	Paragraph 11.21 is clunky. This should mention WALKING (that is how people reach a bus stop) and also mention TAXIS.	Comment	Noted.
C203	1027	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	Paragraph 11.17 should also reference and fully reflect the new West Midlands LTP Core strategy. And likewise, paragraph 11.20 should reference the Bus Service Improvement Plan which outlines a number of positive bus measures being introduced over the next few years to increase patronage and deliver on modal share targets. While several measures in this local plan are clearly moving in a positive direction towards achieving this ambition, only by continuing to work in partnership, in areas like local plans/transport plans, we can collaboratively be "bolder" in the actions we take to support and drive behaviour change and respond to those difficult challenges, which in turn will then deliver on shared local, regional and national ambitions using a range of transport, land use and wider public policy levers. While we fully agree that the impacts of Covid 19 have had significant impacts on patronage levels and taking several years to recover, which is talked about in the opening paragraph for this policy, we would welcome some statistics on this and the tone to be framed in a more positive manner, to not diminish the importance of public transport and the opportunities which lie ahead for us. But appreciating that bus services have been particularly impacted by rising fuel and inflationary costs as well as driver shortages and threatening their operational costs and viability. But with continued funding through the transport levy, from our local authority partners we remain positive in delivering a strong public transport network.	Comment	Noted. The SLP will continue to refer to plans and strategies that have been adopted at the time of publication. The Council will be reviewing its climate change evidence and policies prior to the next stage of consultation. The SLP seeks to support and promote the availability and use of public transport.
C204	1028	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	Whilst we further appreciate indirect references to our KRN Action Plans, elements of these are now considered (in parts) outdated, and we would welcome a greater emphasis placed on good partnership working with TFWM to deliver on these elements.	Comment	Noted. Sandwell welcomes continued joint working with TFWM
C205	1029	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	We further welcome reference to Park and Ride facilities where appropriate, but noting TFWM should be involved in any conversations regarding any development work which explores new Park and Ride locations, to ensure they are strategically located, take advantage of the links between the SRN and KRN, and help to reduce the number of private vehicle journeys.	Comment	Noted. Future new park and ride sites will only be developed in accordance with the adopted West Midlands Park and Ride strategy.
C206	1030	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	It would also be helpful to have reference to Strategic Road Network Designated Routes for Unplanned Events (DRUEs). These routes could be indicated within Figure 13 and referenced in paragraph 11.31.	Comment	Noted

C207	1031	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	Finally, we welcome reference to coaches and their role in providing affordable long-distance connectivity. However, there is no policy or action detailing the promotion of coaches which we feel should be included.	Comment	Noted. Additional policy to be considered.
C208	1034	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	In paragraph 11.23 the RTCC is the Regional Transport Coordination Centre and not the Regional Transport Control Centre, so please alter this.	Comment	Noted. Correct wording
C209	1035	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	In paragraph 11.24 reference is further made of providing "fast" public transport. Whilst this was likely intended to suggest that public transport could compete with private transport in terms of journey time, we would not encourage the use of this word. The Regional Road Safety Partnership is working toward Vision Zero and a safe system approach and believes all road users have a responsibility to use the network safely, so more appropriate wording like "reliable", "dependable" or "consistent" public transport is recommended.	Comment	Noted. Consider amended wording
C210	1036	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	Finally, in paragraph 11.27 it mentions collaboration of all four authorities in their role as LHAs in managing the network efficiently. Presumably this is referring to the four Black Country Authorities, but we would also welcome the importance of Sandwell working collaboratively with its neighbouring Local Highway Authorities such as Birmingham City Council and National Highways.	Comment	Noted
C211	1039	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Justification	Provision of secure cycle parking at new developments is also important with infrastructure being aligned to LTN1/20 and Manual for Streets 2 guidance. The justification section could also provide more details of the risk exposure to cyclists and pedestrians, especially where the KRN provides facilities for fast, high-volume traffic. Providing near miss data (especially at junctions or where collisions involve cyclists and pedestrians) as well as undertaking spatial analysis (which appreciates the top deciles of areas of deprivation) will further be important, as these account for over 50% of all Killed and Seriously Injured in the region, with a reasonable proportion occurring in Sandwell. This data will then help justify a policy for these issues and TFWM can support in obtaining this data insight.	Comment	Noted
C212	641	Mr Donald Payne [165]		Justification	I fully support this. Section 11.38 is particularly important but suitable sites for transhipment to/from road & rail need to be identified and secured. Having worked on the canals in the past I am not convinced that the narrow canal network which we have is a viable mode of transport	Comment	Noted
C213	642	Mr Donald Payne [165]		Justification	In addition to cycling and walking the needs of PsRM such as myself need to be taken into consideration. Sandwell is very good at providing drop-kerbs, for instance but there are considerable improvements which could be made to canal towpaths and accessibility to them from the roads etc.. The New Main Line canal forms part of a National Cycle Route but is virtually impassable to a mobility scooter because of numerous shallow steps at bridges. Also many other canal towpaths have very poor surfaces.	Comment	Noted. Sandwell will continue to work with the Canal and River Trust to improve accessibility to canal towpaths in the borough. For example please see the Towns Fund projects on the Regenerating Sandwell website.
C214	643	Mr Donald Payne [165]		Justification	Although I very rarely use public car-parking I am aware that there is an issue with the charging methods used by some private operators. Parking payment meters/machines should be capable of taking payments by cash as well as by card and not just via a smarphone.	Comment	Noted. This is outside of the Local Plan process.
C215	1084	Dr Baljit Bhandal [224]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Justification, Duty to Co-operate	The outcome of [the inability of LAs within the HMA to accommodate the level of housing need across the HMA] is that there is a significant unmet housing need arising principally from Birmingham and Sandwell, with Walsall and Wolverhampton likely to add to this, and at the current time there is no agreement or clear strategy between the 14 HMA authorities as to where or how this unmet need is to be met. Furthermore, in the few authorities that have the ability to assist in meeting the overspill, full opportunity of the land available around the conurbation to assist with meeting the housing overspill is not being taken. It is clear from the above that the emerging position across the HMA is one where there is a significant housing need that exists, but where certain authorities, such as Sandwell, cannot currently meet its needs in full. Dr Baljit Bhandal contend that these needs must be met by the HMA authorities in the next round of plans that are now being prepared. If this need is not met in full, it risks giving rise to a number of significant knock on effects on the delivery and provision of housing across the greater Birmingham area. These impacts include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Worsening affordability as demand outstrips supply, •Worsening delivery and provision of affordable housing, •Economic impacts on the working age population as those adults who are able to work may not have suitable accommodation to live in thus resulting in increased commuting distances, worsening impacts on congestion and air quality, and •The inability to attract workers into the HMA could have significant repercussions for the wider economy if the right type of houses are not available for those wanting to live and work in the conurbation. In light of the Council's need and the significant shortfall that the Council is faced with, Dr Baljit Bhandal urge the Council to enter into constructive and productive discussions with the other HMA authorities, including Dudley MBC, to seek agreement on how and where this unmet housing need is going to be delivered. Meeting the housing needs of the HMA cannot be achieved on an authority by authority basis and that a joined up approach that crosses administrative boundaries will be required if there is to be any chance of meeting the HMA's housing needs both in terms of quantum and the required mix, including affordable homes. It is our view that the focus for addressing the shortfall in Sandwell should be those authorities closest to them. Dudley, South Staffordshire and Bromsgrove are the closest authorities with a meaningful ability to address the shortfall and with land available adjacent to the conurbation. Dudley is still at a relatively early stage in the reviewing the Black Country Core Strategy and there is still plenty of scope to hold meaningful discussions to provide land to meet the needs arising in Sandwell.	Comment	Comment noted
C216	944	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Justification, Duty to Co-operate	Duty to Cooperate 4. HBF note that following the collapse of Black Country Plan, Sandwell has had to undertake its own calculations for the housing need and requirement and must robustly test how much of this can be met within Sandwell and how much (if any) is an unmet need. The Council will then need to work with neighbouring authorities to identify how that unmet need will be redistributed and prepare a Statement of Common Ground on this issue. The Council should also prepare a Duty to Cooperate Statement. 5. Currently there is not enough information available for HBF to come to a view as to whether or not Sandwell has met, and is meeting, the Duty to Cooperate. The Council will need to evidence its ongoing work with the other neighbouring authorities within the HMA. This will need to be evidenced with more than words of good intentions and be supported with a clear Plan of how all the housing needs of Sandwell will be met. We hope this evidence will be forthcoming, and in light of the known issue around housing numbers and unmet need, it is essential that does. 6. HBF's main concerns around Duty to Cooperate relate to ensuring the required amount of housing is delivered in reality. This is particularly important because the current Plan indicates a significant amount of unmet need. The issue of fully meeting housing needs within Sandwell remains. Our more detailed comments on this issue can be found in response to Policy SDS1. 7. HBF suggest that the Council prepare a signed Statement of Common Ground between the Council with each of the neighbouring authorities setting out if and how they will contribute to meeting Sandwell's unmet needs. Such statements will be essential as the Plan progresses. HBF notes the Council's stated intention to be proactive and pro-growth. However, the issue of potential unmet need requires clearly evidenced and ongoing cooperation. This will be essential to show that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held.
C217	1070	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Justification, Duty to Co-operate	2.9 There is currently insufficient information available to determine whether the Council has complied with the Duty to Co-operate. The Council's Duty to Co-operate Statement acknowledges that there is on-going uncertainty over how unmet needs would be redistributed and met. It is essential that the Council works with neighbouring authorities on how its unmet need will be redistributed and prepares a SoCG confirming how neighbouring authorities will contribute to unmet need. 2.10 Otherwise the draft SLP essentially defers tackling the issue of its housing needs. Doing so is inappropriate and in direct conflict with the provisions of the NPPF. The NPPF requires the Local Plan to address strategic cross-boundary issues and to be underpinned by one or more Statements of Common Ground on relevant issues. Critically, it also requires strategic cross-boundary matters to be "dealt with rather than deferred".	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held.
C218	1020	Birmingham City Council (Mr Ian Macleod, Director of Planning, Transport & Sustainability) [68]		Justification, Duty to Co-operate	In summary, Birmingham City Council is supportive of the approach being taken by Sandwell in developing its Local Plan and will also continue to support on-going collaborative working across the HMA and economic market area in addressing wider housing and employment needs. Given that Sandwell and Birmingham are both anticipating potentially large shortfalls in housing and employment land in their Local Plans, it is therefore important that the two local authorities continue to work closely, as well as with surrounding local authorities in the HMA, to identify and implement an agreed approach to tackle how such shortfalls are to be accommodated to ensure the soundness of both Plans. In addition, it will be necessary to promote and encourage further work across these wider market areas to provide a strategic approach to the supply and delivery of housing and employment needs in future years to mitigate for the potential unmet needs across the conurbation. As stated in previous correspondence but worth repeating, this may require and include further studies across the wider West Midlands area as well as Statements of Common Ground with, and between, relevant local authorities as a roadmap for meeting shortfalls through potential local plan allocations elsewhere. We look forward to continued engagement with you through Duty to Cooperate arrangements as both Local Plans progress towards adoption.	Support	Support noted and welcomed
C219	1139	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas	Para 4.114 - Consider the wording in this paragraph and also needs reference to the setting of heritage assets as well as an understanding of the context in which they are in and any relationships they may have with other heritage assets within the area/ heritage landscapes etc. When considering a suite of policies for the historic environment, it is important to ensure that all the policies are consistent and that all assets are fully supported.	Comment	Comment noted. Policy refers specifically to the setting of historic buildings and structures - does not need to be included in introduction. Policy SHE1(4) specifically references the setting of listed buildings. This is also addressed in SHE2.

C220	1138	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas	We welcome a specific section on the historic environment and specific policies for the historic environment. We welcome the introductory paragraphs to the interesting, rich and varied history of the Black Country and the need to protect this and the value placed on heritage led regeneration.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C221	755	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Management of Hot Food Takeaways	Policy is welcome but policy should cover the issue of noise from fume extractors.	Support	Note and welcome support. The policy generally addresses issues around adverse impacts and specifically mentions noise in terms of adjacent residential property in part 2. This reference could be included elsewhere in the policy for completeness. Amend policy wording to refer to noise impacts / mitigation.
C222	916	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCC1 – Increasing efficiency and resilience	This section contains a number of policies in relation to Increasing efficiency and resilience (SCC1), Energy Infrastructure (SCC2), Managing Heat Risk (SCC3), Flood Risk (SCC4), Sustainable drainage and surface water management (SCC5), and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards (SCC6). The Trust notes that retrofitting is only briefly mentioned in Section 5, para 5.15, of the justification text to Policy SCC1 – Increasing efficiency and resilience, namely: ‘where possible and appropriate, the retrofitting of residential and other properties to achieve higher standards of energy and water efficiency will be encouraged and supported.’ The Trust considers that for a high proportion of heritage property stock, as well as modern up to the early 21st century stock (prior to BREEAM standards), retrofitting will be the substantial mainstay for making a property energy efficient and sustainable. The design and installation of solar panels, heat source pumps and triple glazing etc., their position on a building or location on site can be significantly detrimental, and risks degrading a building that makes a positive contribution through its architectural attributes or local distinctiveness. Accordingly, we request that para 5.15 be augmented to reflect this reality and to require that development proposals ensure that the chosen approach considers any consequential visual impacts on the canals’ setting, heritage significance, or amenity value. (ACTION REQUEST). Reference is also drawn to advice contained within Historic England Advice Notes, in particular that to be found within the HEAN on Heat Pumps within Historic Buildings (2023) (https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/latest-guidance/)	Comment	Amend para 5.15 to refer to the need to take into consideration the character and appearance of historic assets when retrofitting is being undertaken.
C223	1145	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCC1 – Increasing efficiency and resilience	We welcome clause j). It could relate to heritage assets more widely.	Support	Comment noted
C224	837	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SCC1 – Increasing efficiency and resilience	... To provide clarity for applicants, draft policy CC1 should include assessment criteria against which the local planning authority can determine whether a development compliant with its climate change and energy policies in the context of local requirements and site-specific circumstances. Whilst the sentiment of maximising opportunity and minimising impact where possible is in the spirit of the guidance provided by the Framework, it does not make for a development plan policy that is easily applied to individual development proposals. The policy is arguably not sound in the absence of prescriptive, unambiguous assessment criteria.	Object	Noted. CC1 is intended to provide a more strategic framework for the following policies, which contain more detailed requirements. It clearly links to those other policies in the plan that contain more information and is intended to set a general context for decisions to be made. Move CC1 to form part of strategic development policy chapter
C225	960	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SCC1 – Increasing efficiency and resilience	Policy SCC1 – Increasing efficiency and resilience 46. The HBF supports the Government’s intention to set standards for energy efficiency through the Building Regulations. The key to success is standardisation and avoidance of individual Council’s specifying their own policy approach to energy efficiency, which undermines economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers and developers. The Councils do not need to set local energy efficiency standards in a Local Plan policy because of the higher levels of energy efficiency standards for new homes set out in the 2021 Part L Interim Uplift and proposals for the 2025 Future Homes Standard, which are currently out for consultation. 47. HBF also draws the Council’s attention to the recent Ministerial Statement on this issue which says “the Government does not expect plan-makers to set local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned buildings regulations. The proliferation of multiple, local standards by local authority area can add further costs to building new homes by adding complexity and undermining economies of scale.” See https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2023-12-13/HCWS123	Comment	Noted. Once new Building Regulation legislation is adopted, that will take precedence over any relevant policy in the SLP. Until such time the Council will retain appropriate policies on climate change mitigation and adaptation. Ministerial statement noted - also see S.1(1) of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 (as amended by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023), which states that: A local planning authority in England may in their local plan and any supplementary plan,...include policies imposing reasonable requirements for— (a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development; (b) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy from sources in the locality of the development; (c) development in their area to comply with energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of building regulations. Seek advice on representation from Building Regs BR response - This out for consultation and we don't have a date yet. AD L is a document the government like to update on a regular basis.
C226	1146	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure	Clause 4 is useful. It may need to be stated that development which causes harm will be resisted or other solutions sought.	Comment	Comment noted
C227	738	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure	Support. Should be a rigorous viability test to avoid developers from avoiding the requirement	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C228	714	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure	Part 1-4 of Policy SCC2 relates to decentralised energy networks and district heating provision. While FCC supports measures to promote renewable energy provision, we object to these policy clauses due to the lack of evidence to support the requirements set out. Part 6 sets out further detailed information that will need to be provided in relation to Part 5. We object to the need for these requirements because Part L of the Building Regulations and the Future Homes Standards will appropriately cover this issue.	Object	Noted. Once new Building Regulation legislation is enacted, that will take precedence over any relevant policy in the SLP. Until such time the Council will retain appropriate policies on climate change mitigation and adaptation. S.1(1) of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 (as amended by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) states that: A local planning authority in England may in their local plan and any supplementary plan,...include policies imposing reasonable requirements for— (a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development; (b) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy from sources in the locality of the development; (c) development in their area to comply with energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of building regulations. Seek advice on reps from Building Regs
C229	962	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure	51. The Council’s proposed policy approach is unnecessary seeks to go beyond the 2021 Part L Interim Uplift and the Future Homes Standard without justification. It is the Government’s intention to set standards for energy efficiency through the Building Regulations. The key to success is standardisation and avoidance of individual Council’s specifying their own policy approach to energy efficiency, which undermines economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers and developers. 52. The Council should be aware that the long awaited consultation on the Future Homes standard was published on Dec 13th 2023 and consultation closes in 6 March 2024. The consultation documents can be found online at https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/the-future-homes-and-buildings-standards-2023-consultation	Object	Noted. Once new Building Regulation is enacted, that will take precedence over any relevant policy in the SLP. Until such time the Council will retain appropriate policies on climate change mitigation and adaptation. Seek advice on representation from Building Regs
C230	961	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure	Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure 48. HBF is concerned about mandatory requirements to connect to district heating networks. HBF considers that it is important that this is not seen as a requirement and is instead implemented on a flexible basis. Heat networks are one aspect of the path towards decarbonising heat, however, currently the predominant technology for district-sized communal heating networks is gas combined heat and power (CHP) plants. Over 90% of district networks are gas fired. As 2050 approaches, meeting the Government’s climate target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to net zero will require a transition from gas-fired networks to renewable or low carbon alternatives such as large heat pumps, hydrogen or waste-heat recovery but at the moment one of the major reasons why heat network projects do not install such technologies is because of the up-front capital cost. The Council should be aware that for the foreseeable future it will remain uneconomic for most heat networks to install low-carbon technologies. This may mean that it is more sustainable and more appropriate for developments to utilise other forms of energy provision, and this may need to be considered. 49. Government consultation on Heat Network Zoning also identifies exemptions to proposals for requirements for connections to a heat network these include where a connection may lead to sub-optimal outcomes, or distance from the network connection points and impacts on consumers bills and affordability. 50. Furthermore, some heat network consumers do not have comparable levels of satisfaction as consumers on gas and electricity networks, and they pay a higher price. Currently, there are no sector specific protections for heat network consumers, unlike for people on other utilities such as gas, electricity or water. A consumer living in a building serviced by a heat network does not have the same opportunities to switch supplier as they would for most gas and electricity supplies.	Comment	Noted. The Government is supportive of heat networks and the Council is considering options for possible introduction within the borough. The main scheme the Council is currently looking at would utilise heat derived from an Energy from Waste facility. The most recently updated guidance (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/heat-network-zoning-overview/heat-network-zoning-overview) demonstrates a clear commitment to the delivery of heat network zones. We await further clarification around the zoning process. Paragraphs 5.25 to 5.31 refer. Exemptions based on viability, feasibility etc. are included in the Policy and reiterated in the justification. The flexibility requested from HBF appears to be included in policy point 1 & 3, in the form of including options for exemption. The phrase ‘not suitable’ in part 1 provide an option for the council to agree it is not cost effective for residents or that it is not the best option from a carbon perspective, depending on the receipt of robust evidence to demonstrate this. Heat networks are not always the best option from a cost/carbon point of view and such unsuitability can be taken into account. Point 5.31 of justification also points out “Heat Networks can also be future-proofed for transition to other fuels” It’s true there has been less satisfaction from some heat network consumers compared with those on gas/electricity networks. Government is working to provide increased consumer protection which will be introduced as part of heat networks regulatory framework
C231	838	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SCC2 – Energy Infrastructure	Draft policy SCC2 sets out that: ‘Any development including ten homes or more, or non-residential floorspace of 1,000m2 or more must include opportunities for decentralised energy provision within the site, unless it can be demonstrated that the development is not suitable, feasible or viable for district heat or decentralised energy networks.’ Paragraph 16 of the Framework (2023) is clear that development plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous. Draft policy SCC2 is not clear in respect of on what grounds applicants will be able to demonstrate that development is not suitable, feasible or viable for district heat or decentralised power networks. Draft policy SCC2 needs to provide clear direction in this regard. It is also without justification why the threshold for compliance is ten units/1,000 sq. m and why there are no further thresholds at greater unit numbers/floorspace, which would allow for proportionate consideration of proposals relative to scale. The draft policy should be revised to remove ambiguity and introduce additional trigger thresholds to ensure that it is sound in the context of being clear and positively prepared.	Object	Noted. The intention is to provide developers with the flexibility to make a case for a lack of viability / feasibility . The requirement is for developers to link to heat networks unless they can demonstrate there is a clear and robust reason not to do so - this is for the developer to identify, not for the LPA to suggest. The thresholds relate to major vs minor developments and any suggested additional thresholds have not been identified.

C232	1147	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCC3 – Managing Heat Risk	Clause 2, consider the potential impacts for the historic nature of canals and ensure that this is protected and conserved.	Comment	Comment noted. This is effectively covered in the historic environment section / policies.
C233	839	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SCC3 – Managing Heat Risk	Draft policy SCC2 (Energy Infrastructure) sets minimum thresholds for development proposals to which the policy applies. Policy SCC3 is drafted such that it applies to all development proposals without distinction. Whilst all development proposals can be subject to design materials choices in the context of managing heat risk, it is potentially only on larger development sites where there is the potential for layout and orientation choices to have a bearing on heat risk. Similarly, the cooling hierarchy set out in the draft policy is not necessarily appropriate or applicable to all development proposals. Paragraph 16 of the Framework (2023) is clear that development plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous. Draft policy SCC3 should be revised such that it is clear for which size/scale of development the draft policy can be reasonably applied and include a clear indication of on what grounds applicants will be able to demonstrate that expectations cannot be viably or reasonably met, including in context with the cooling hierarchy. Added clarification is necessary to ensure that the draft policy is sound in the context of it being clear, positively prepared and fit for purpose in seeking to managing in the most effective way heat risk from new development.	Object	Note Comment. Amend wording to establish that the policy will apply to new buildings used for residential, employment or educational purposes. In terms of residential properties, this will apply to all schemes where there is the potential to address issues around orientation in a positive way. Disagree that only larger sites will need to address heat risk - all sites will potentially be able to manage the orientation and design used for most forms of development occupied by people. The requirement is for developers to demonstrate there is a clear and robust reason not to address the requirements of the policy - this is for the developer to identify, not for the LPA to suggest. Part O of the amended building regs - addresses the need to promote passive ventilation over mechanical ventilation policy based on one in the London Plan (Policy 5.9 heating and cooling)
C234	1257	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCC3 – Managing Heat Risk	The Trust welcomes mention of the canals as a potential component of heat risk management within Policy SCC3 – Managing Heat Risk, and associated text within para 5.43.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C235	969	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]		Policy SCC4 – Flood Risk	– Flood Risks, identifies waste (and mineral) facilities as the only types of development where all such proposals would require a flood risk assessment and surface water drainage strategy as outlined below: ‘7. All new developments in the following locations should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and surface water drainage strategy that sets out how the development will provide a betterment in flood risk terms i.e., help to reduce flood risk both on and off site:… •Where the site is a minerals or waste development;’ While proposals for certain types of waste facilities may need such assessment, WMRTAB suggest that the Draft SLP check whether this blanket approach is justified. The Reg 18 Sandwell Local Plan – Reg 18 Consultation Spatial Strategy Paper (published November 2023), Corporate Plan Objectives includes the objectives as set out in paragraph 3.6 below. ‘Para 3.6 The objectives summarised below for the Core Strategy sought to deliver the Vision by 2026 and promoted: - i. Sufficient waste recycling and waste management facilities in locations’ WMRTAB suggest that the text regarding the year 2026 above needs to be re- checked as the SLP period is until 2041.	Comment	Comment noted - We will be reviewing the SFRA
C236	1258	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCC4 – Flood Risk	Given the increasing susceptibility of the historic canal network to climate change stress the Trust welcomes the inclusion of ‘there is an extensive canal network throughout the Sandwell area, including culverts and feeder streams’ within 5.48 of the justification text to Flood Risk Policy SCC4. Given this we request that Canal and River Trust are listed within the bodies to be consulted on site-specific requirements within sub-section 16 of SCC4 and that citizens and developers can access our open source mapping data to identify our assets here: https://data-canalrivertrust.opendata.arcgis.com/ (ACTION REQUEST).	Comment	Note request for CRT to be added in to list of consultees in policies SCC4 and SCC5. Amend policy to refer to taking canals into account when flooding is considered that might affect them.
C237	775	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SCC4 – Flood Risk	The supporting justification text references the primary sources of fluvial flood risk within Sandwell which need to be addressed and considered. This includes the River Stour which crosses into Dudley borough. Dudley MBC supports these references.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C238	1148	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCC4 – Flood Risk	It would be useful to incorporate a clause on the historic environment within this policy and the specific considerations for the historic environment.	Comment	Noted. Add additional sentence to justification requiring schemes to take account of the historic environment.
C239	840	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SCC4 – Flood Risk	Draft policy SCC4 (13) should be clear on what basis the proposed distance limitations on development that is proximate to an ordinary watercourse are derived. It should also include detailed justification for the proposed limitations, and how the policy text as drafted relates to any local byelaws set under the Land Drainage Act 1991.	Comment	The policy wording was included in the Black Country Plan, from which this policy is taken. It was suggested by consultants undertaking the SFRA for the BCP, who were asked to provide an update to the original Black Country Core Strategy policy on flooding and water. The suggested policy wording as proposed by the consultants can be found in the SFRA included on the BCP evidence base webpage. Amend policy to introduce flexibility through reference to EA / LLFA
C240	841	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SCC5 - Sustainable drainage and surface water management	Paragraph 169 of the Framework states that: ‘Major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate’. The draft text to Policy SCC5 states that ‘All new developments should incorporate SuDS and all development proposals should provide details of adoption, ongoing maintenance, and management of SuDS’. The proposed policy SCC5 requirement that all new development incorporate SuDS is inconsistent with the Framework and should be amended to meet the test of soundness. Paragraph 167(c) of the Framework (2023) states the requirement for development proposed in an area at risk of flooding incorporate sustainable drainage systems is also subject to a caveat ‘...unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate’. This should be reflected in the draft development plan policy.	Object	Amend SCC5 to require major developments to incorporate SuDS unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate, and to expect other schemes to do so wherever possible and deliverable The policy wording was included in the Black Country Plan, from which this policy is taken. It was suggested by consultants undertaking the SFRA for the BCP, who were asked to provide an update to the original Black Country Core Strategy policy on flooding and water. The suggested policy wording as proposed by the consultants can be found in the SFRA included on the BCP evidence base webpage
C241	1259	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCC5 - Sustainable drainage and surface water management	The Trust also considers that a similar list of bodies to be consulted should be included within the policy text for Policy SCC5 - Sustainable drainage and surface water management, and that Canal and River Trust be listed within them given the risk of polluting ground and surface water to our network, and other watercourse, from the ‘legacy of contaminated land created by heavy industry and extractive activities in Sandwell’ identified in para 5.56 (ACTION REQUEST). The Trust reiterates its issues and Options stage advice in relation to flood risk and surface water management, “Subject to the Trust’s owner agreement to technical and commercial details, surface water can potentially be sustainably discharged to the canal network. Water levels in the canal network are managed by the Trust using control structures such as weirs and sluices to maintain a suitable depth for navigation by boats, but also to try to avoid water levels becoming too high in periods of heavy rainfall where runoff from hard surfaces can lead to excess water passing into the canals. Given this, surface water discharge to canals can be a highly effective way of managing local surface water flood risk and may allow development of sites that would otherwise not be viable due to concerns with alternative site drainage options. SuDS adjacent to or connecting to canals will need to be maintained to ensure they function as they were designed to and do not cause pollution or excess flows. In the interests of local flood risk management and the protection of water quality, where a site proposes SuDS, this system should be designed in a way that if it were to fail the canal would not be inundated with water. In many areas canals will also provide developers with opportunities to dispose of surface water drainage, noting that drainage to surface water bodies, such as canals is higher up the drainage hierarchy than discharge to sewers and drains. With the right investment they could also play a role in some places in mitigating flood risks. Accordingly, canals as an option for surface water drainage should be listed within forthcoming drainage policies provided that SuDS and appropriate pollution control and mitigation measures are built into the development scheme.”	Comment	Note request for CRT to be added in to list of consultees in policies SCC4 and SCC5. Amend policy to refer to taking canals into account when flooding is considered that might affect them.
C242	1149	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCC5 - Sustainable drainage and surface water management	It would be useful to incorporate a clause on the historic environment within this policy and the specific considerations for the historic environment.	Comment	Noted. Add additional sentence to justification requiring schemes to take account of the historic environment.
C243	715	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards	Part 3 of Policy SCC6 states that major developments creating ten or more homes must incorporate the generation of energy from renewable or low carbon sources sufficient to off-set at least 20% of the estimated residual energy demand of the development on completion. We object to this requirement because it is not evidenced. The NPPF (para 34) states that Development Plan Policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan. The emerging plan is not currently supported by documentation which assesses the viability of the proposal in conjunction with the other proposed Policy requirements.	Object	A viability report is being undertaken and will be used to assess the policies prior to submission. S.1(1) of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 (as amended by the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023) states that: A local planning authority in England may in their local plan and any supplementary plan,...include policies imposing reasonable requirements for— (a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development; (b) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy from sources in the locality of the development; (c) development in their area to comply with energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of building regulations.
C244	1260	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards	... the Trust welcomes inclusion of our network within Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards sub-section 5 and justification text para 5.61 in relation to the potential for use of our network for water-source heat pumps.	Comment	Comment noted.

C245	842	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards	The supporting text to draft policy SSC6 (paragraph 5.59) discusses the requirement that major developments achieve a 31% carbon reduction improvement upon the Part L requirement of The Building Regulations 2010 (as amended). The supporting text (paragraph 5.62) also includes the caveat, in respect of all new development contributing towards renewable and low carbon energy generation, that it is not practical to provide more than 20% renewable energy generation within a new development.	Comment	note comment. The 31% refers to the carbon emissions improvement compared to 2010 building regs. The 20% refers to 20% of the kwh energy used by the building (heating and appliances) – which is not the same thing as carbon emissions.
C246	1205	Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]		Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards	We support the BREEAM standards for non-residential developments of 1,000 sqm gross or more to achieve BREEAM Very Good or Excellent including full credits for category Wat 01 (water efficiency).	Comment	Noted and support welcomed
C247	1150	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards	We would recommend re-phrasing to state protects the significance of the historic environment, heritage assets including their setting or similar wording.	Comment	Noted. The policy already refers to the need to maintain and safeguard the historic environment; not clear how changing this to "protect" would strengthen the policy further. Amend to include reference to HE policies
C248	964	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards	Policy SCC6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and BREEAM Standards 53. HBF is concerned about any policies which mandate on-site renewable energy generation. HBF considers that it is important that this is not seen as a requirement and is instead implemented on a flexible basis. HBF recognises that there may be potential for renewable energy generation on-site, however, it may be more sustainable and efficient to use larger scale sources rather than small-scale, it is also noted this policy also takes no account of the fact that over time energy supply from the national grid will be decarbonised.	Object	Noted. The policy is intended to be flexible and includes at part 6 a recognition that in some cases development viability / feasibility may require a different approach.
C249	874	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	Sandwell's Local Plan Vision 2041 includes the following: 'Sandwell's town centres thrive by day and by night, with an expanded range of retail, leisure and socialising opportunities as well as acting as the foci for new residential developments, community activities and social enterprises. They are safe, welcoming and accessible locations during both day and night, designed to encourage positive public interactions and minimise antisocial behaviour.' Strategic Objective 15 supports Sandwell's towns and local centres as places for economic, residential and cultural activity with good access to services, in ways that protect their heritage, character and identity vision is echoed in other policies, for example, paragraph 3.20 confirms that Sandwell is committed to the regeneration of its towns and employment areas and has adopted its Sandwell Regeneration Strategy 2022-27 that sets out exactly how this will be achieved. The strategy contains a vision for this process, which includes reference to creating 'exciting, busy, and green centres where people meet throughout the day, with a thriving cultural and night-time economy'. The strategic approach for the Borough's economic and regenerative growth is set in Policy SDS2 (para 3.21) and Policy SCE1 'Sandwell's Centres' (paragraph 9.9) that confirms that the Council will support the evening economy, as well as reference to creating evening/ night-time offers in individual policies relating to all the Town Centres, e.g. Policy SWB1 'West Bromwich Town Centre' etc. However, the PCCWM considers it prudent to include more detail in Policy SCE1 to cover specific issues in relation to the evening economy, to ensure development proposals, particularly in dense areas such as town centres, promote safe and accessible neighbourhoods, helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime. The PCCWM considers it vital that a proposed expansion of the evening economy should include reference to town centres being safe and secure environments to enable the attainment of that vision. Such a policy should also consider supporting the use of the 'Secured by Design' scheme in relation to crime prevention. The aim/ vision should be to reduce crime, the fear of crime, anti-social behaviour and potential disturbance to existing businesses and people. If crime, or the fear of crime is not addressed, people will not feel safe, are unlikely to use the entertainment/night-time facilities, with potential of an economic spiral of decline. Bars, restaurants and shops will close and be boarded up, resulting in less people being attracted to the area, leading to the closure of more premises and companies going out of business. Such a policy would deliver economic, social and environmental sustainability, meeting the objectives of Policy SDS2 'Regeneration Areas' and others. Without a specific policy, the objectives and the vision set out in the draft Local Plan is not met. The PCCWM notes that Policy SCE1 seeks to meet the Strategic Objectives 2 (sustainable development) and 15 (supporting the town centres). Within the policy itself it is noted that it is proposed to diversify and repurpose centres, enhanced by appropriate complementary uses, particularly including, inter alia, community uses and supporting the evening economy. Therefore, the PCCWM objects to the lack of appropriate wording within Policy SCE1 to address the expansion of the leisure evening economy which will impact on policing. It would be unsound for the impact of this significant area of growth and development to be ignored as it could potentially undermine the Plan's Strategic Objectives and the sustainable development objectives of the NPPF. Similarly, there is no reference to safety, crime or disorder in the justification to the policy. Safety issues of particular relevance to the evening economy include for example: - Access to and from the facilities e.g. nearby public transport network, access to taxis and private hire vehicles; - Safe and reasonably priced parking facilities - well lit, accessible car parks where people feel safe, with CCTV and good access control, meeting the standards set out in the Police Crime Prevention Initiative Safe Design Scheme. Do not ask about the scheme ... we note that for the Tier Two town centre of Blackheath there appear to be no significant proposals for growth identified. Some redevelopment site opportunities are identified, but these are not significant in scale and are for mainly residential use. For the Tier Two town centre of Cradley Heath, similarly there are no significant proposals for growth identified, with mostly residential redevelopment site opportunities identified.	Object	Amend policy and WJ to incorporate additional text on safety and crime/night time economy. ... "text at 6(d) shown in bold: '6. A land use approach will be adopted to encourage regeneration and to meet the challenges facing Sandwell's centres, particularly as little retail capacity has been identified to support additional floorspace, through supporting: ...d. a variety of facilities, appealing to a wide range of age and social groups, provided in such a way to ensure a safe, accessible and inclusive environment and any anti-social behaviour is discouraged, for example through management, improved lighting and CCTV coverage where appropriate.'" (Model policy/amendment).
C250	786	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	... we note that for the Tier Two town centre of Blackheath there appear to be no significant proposals for growth identified. Some redevelopment site opportunities are identified, but these are not significant in scale and are for mainly residential use. For the Tier Two town centre of Cradley Heath, similarly there are no significant proposals for growth identified, with mostly residential redevelopment site opportunities identified.	Comment	Comment Noted
C251	897	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	Policy SCE1 WM CPRE supports the aspiration for more mixed used / redevelopment for housing in town centres.	Support	Support noted and welcomed
C252	785	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	Dudley MBC supports the use of the jointly produced Black Country Centre Study update (2021) evidence base for the SLP. The draft Dudley Local Plan also utilises this evidence base. Dudley MBC is supportive of the general approach to Centres. We are supportive of the impact test threshold of 280sqm for edge or out of centre proposals, which is consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP27 Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Development (we note that the contents of Table 10 of the SLP would appear to require updating to clarify this is the approach i.e., that proposals of more than 280sqm require impact tests). The implementation of the SLP policies should ensure that the scale of proposals for growth within the centres is commensurate to their scale, role, function and order in the hierarchy, taking account of nearby centres outside Sandwell borough including those in Dudley.	Support	Table 10 of the SLP to be updated to clarify that proposals of more than 280sqm require impact tests for Edge of Centre, Out of Centre for T2 Centres p225.
C253	787	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	As outlined in our response to Policy SDS2, the principle of the regeneration and redevelopment of Owen Street District Centre (also known as Tipton Town Centre) is supported however any specific proposals should be at a scale appropriate to the District Centre so as not to detract from the function of higher order centres within the vicinity, including Dudley Town Centre (identified as a Tier 2 centre within the draft Dudley Local Plan).	Comment	The proposed redevelopment of Owen Street is primarily residential, with no new retail floor space currently envisaged. There will be a net reduction in retail floorspace for the centre, with the post office relocated into a vacant unit. The new residential units will bolster the remaining commercial units in the centre.
C254	1066	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	Similar to our comments concerning residential developments, in the general policy for centres across Sandwell, public transport accessibility to differing tiered centres could further be considered, with a criteria in place to ensure that they are well served, by the core bus network. Similar public transport accessibility criteria's have been developed for other local plans – ensuring varying hierarchies of centres are served by appropriate public transport provision and could be something Sandwell Council may want to consider developing within its local plan.	Comment	Noted. The overall aim of Chapter 11 (Transport) is to deliver an improved and integrated transport network across the borough, including influencing the demand for travel and travel choices, which includes maintaining and increasing public transport options to centres and growth areas where there is demand.
C255	1158	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SCE1 - Sandwell's Centres	This policy would benefit from a clause relating to the historic environment, heritage led regeneration, heritage led public realm improvements, information relating to shop fronts and design within heritage centres and conservation areas and reference to Wednesbury High Street Heritage Action Zone and other potential opportunities.	Comment	Noted. Reference to the historic environment and heritage led regeneration has been included within the policy and supporting text for SDS3 (Regeneration in Sandwell), for relevant town centre conservation areas in policy SHE1 (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas).

C256	875	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SCE2 - Non-E Class Uses in Town Centres	<p>The PCCWM objects to the lack of appropriate wording within Policy SCE2 to address the expansion of the non-E class uses in town centres which will primarily relate to the leisure evening economy - as drafted the policy will impact on policing. It would be unsound for the impact of this significant area to be ignored as whilst the policy makes reference to such uses as public houses and live music venues, it does not provide details of how such applications will be assessed in the context of crime and disorder and therefore the policy could potentially undermine the Plan's vision and objectives and the sustainable development objectives of the NPPF.</p> <p>The PCCWM considers that the general objectives of evening specific issues for any decision-maker include ensuring a thriving, vibrant economy where people can feel safe, with reduced crime and a reduction in the fear of crime.</p> <p>The PCCWM objects to the lack of any reference in Policy SCE2 to crime, fear of crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour as considerations for planning applications for non-E class uses in town centres. The PCCWM requests that the policy be modified by the introduction of the following text shown in bold:</p> <p>'5. In all areas of Town Centres, it is important that a variety of facilities, appealing to a wide range of age and social groups, are offered and that these are provided in such a way to ensure a safe, accessible and inclusive environment and any anti-social behaviour is discouraged, for example through management, improved lighting and CCTV coverage where</p>	Object	Noted. Paragraph 5 added to policy SCE2 (Non-E Class Uses in Town Centres) to include suggested text.
C257	876	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SCE3 - Town Centres (Tier-Two centres)	<p>In these policies which relate to Town, District and Local Centres, as well as Small-Scale Local Facilities not in Centres, there is no reference in the policies to crime, fear of crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour as considerations for planning applications as would be expected in light of the Council's statutory duty and its objectives and vision in the draft Sandwell Local Plan, and therefore the PCCWM objects and requests that these policies all contain the following wording:</p> <p>'In locations where there are considered to be issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder, advice will be sought from the police and other safety organisations before planning permission is granted for proposals.'</p> <p>The justification to the policies should similarly reference this requirement.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Policy SCE3 paragraph 6 explains that within Tier Two centres the Council will consider any issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder and will, where necessary, seek advice from the police and other safety organisations.</p> <p>Proposals across the borough, including within Centres, is subject to Policy SDM1 (Design Quality) which requires development to demonstrate compliance with crime prevention measures, such as Secured by Design and/or Park Mark principles. Supporting text at paragraph 15.19 confirms that the Council and applicants should work with West Midlands Police to design out crime.</p> <p>Similarly there is reference to designing out crime at policy SD55 (Achieving Well-designed Places) section 9.</p>
C258	877	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SCE4 - District and Local Centres (Tier-Three centres)	<p>In these policies which relate to Town, District and Local Centres, as well as Small-Scale Local Facilities not in Centres, there is no reference in the policies to crime, fear of crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour as considerations for planning applications as would be expected in light of the Council's statutory duty and its objectives and vision in the draft Sandwell Local Plan, and therefore the PCCWM objects and requests that these policies all contain the following wording:</p> <p>'In locations where there are considered to be issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder, advice will be sought from the police and other safety organisations before planning permission is granted for proposals.'</p> <p>The justification to the policies should similarly reference this requirement.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Policy SCE4 paragraph 4 explains that within Tier Three centres the Council will consider any issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder and will, where necessary, seek advice from the police and other safety organisations.</p> <p>Proposals across the borough, including within Centres, is subject to Policy SDM1 (Design Quality) which requires development to demonstrate compliance with crime prevention measures, such as Secured by Design and/or Park Mark principles. Supporting text at paragraph 15.19 confirms that the Council and applicants should work with West Midlands Police to design out crime.</p> <p>Similarly there is reference to designing out crime at policy SD55 (Achieving Well-designed Places) section 9.</p>
C259	878	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SCE5 - Provision of Small-Scale Local Facilities not in Centres	<p>In these policies which relate to Town, District and Local Centres, as well as Small-Scale Local Facilities not in Centres, there is no reference in the policies to crime, fear of crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour as considerations for planning applications as would be expected in light of the Council's statutory duty and its objectives and vision in the draft Sandwell Local Plan, and therefore the PCCWM objects and requests that these policies all contain the following wording:</p> <p>'In locations where there are considered to be issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder, advice will be sought from the police and other safety organisations before planning permission is granted for proposals.'</p> <p>The justification to the policies should similarly reference this requirement.</p>	Comment	Suggested added text .." In locations where there are considered to be issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder, advice will be sought from the police and other safety organisations before planning permission is granted for proposals. "
C260	811	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SCO2 - Pollution Control	<p>Sport England supports the reference to the agent of change principle in part 6 of the policy and associated text in paragraph 14.19 in how this relates to ensuring unreasonable restrictions are not placed on the functioning of existing businesses and community facilities, which includes sports facilities. This is entirely consistent with the guidance in para 187 of the NPPF.</p>	Support	Comment noted.
C261	924	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCO2 - Pollution Control	<p>The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council's draft Development Constraints and Industrial Legacy policies can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific policies identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals (as requested amendments above refer). Accordingly, we request the incorporation of cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the introductory text to this section, for example after para 14.5. or more specifically in the justification texts for Policies SCO2 - Pollution Control and Policy SCO3 - Land contamination and instability (ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>Similarly, we request para 14.17 of the justification text lists potential receptors of light pollution impact and includes the canal network within that list. (ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>See also comments on Appendix E and Appendix F below.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted. Reference to potential receptors of light pollution impact including the canal network will be added.</p> <p>It is not clear how or where Policy SCO3 could be amended to refer to the canal policy directly.</p>
C262	1253	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SCO3 - Land contamination and instability	<p>The Trust is content that canal-specific implications arising from the Council's draft Development Constraints and Industrial Legacy policies can be adequately addressed through the issues-specific policies identified elsewhere in this response, and in particular the use of Policy SNE6 - Canals (as requested amendments above refer). Accordingly, we request the incorporation of cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the introductory text to this section, for example after para 14.5. or more specifically in the justification texts for Policies SCO2 - Pollution Control and Policy SCO3 - Land contamination and instability (ACTION REQUEST).</p> <p>Similarly, we request para 14.17 of the justification text lists potential receptors of light pollution impact and includes the canal network within that list. (ACTION REQUEST)</p>	Comment	Noted. See response to rep ID 924
C263	1269	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SDM1 - Design Quality	<p>Accordingly, we request the incorporation of cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the introductory text to this section, or more specifically in the justification texts for Policy SDM1 - Design Quality, Policy SDM2 - Development and Design Standards, and Policy SDM3 - Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites.</p>	Comment	<p>Amend Policies SDM1 and SDM3.</p> <p>Policy SDM2 refers to technical standards and a reference to canals would not be suitable or necessary.</p>
C264	689	Mrs Melanie Lindsay [57]		Policy SDM1 - Design Quality	<p>The Coal Authority records indicate that within the Sandwell area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, coal workings and reported surface hazards. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.</p> <p>We are pleased to see that land instability is included at criteria (i) as a matter which should be addressed as part of development proposals, if relevant. The Coal Authority support this policy.</p>	Support	noted and welcome support
C265	882	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDM1 - Design Quality	<p>In accordance with national policy, it should be recognised that good design can have a role in reducing opportunities for crime and policies or design codes/ SPD should include reference to the mechanisms for achieving safe environments.</p> <p>The PCCWM supports the proposed policy requirement (2d) that Design and Access Statements must demonstrate that a number of aspects of design have been addressed, including, '...d) crime prevention measures, Secured by Design and Park Mark principles and the requirements of Part Q of the Building Regulations 2010 or any successor legislation.' However, the PCCWM considers the policy does not go far enough as it does not have a requirement for Secured by Design principles and Park Mark to be incorporated into development proposals. Furthermore, only some mainly larger planning applications require Design and Access Statements so as an overarching design policy for the plan, it should apply to all development proposals.</p> <p>The PCCWM also supports the inclusion in point 4 of the policy that states that development must not cause an adverse impact on the living environment of occupiers of existing residential properties, or unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers of new residential properties, including in terms of 'h) crime and safety'.</p> <p>The PCCWM also supports the wording of justification paragraph 15.17 which explains that 'A key objective for new developments should be that they create safe and accessible environments where crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour do not undermine the quality of life, health or community cohesion. Good design, layout and spatial relationships (including the use of sensitively designed and located landscaping that reduces opportunities for anti-social behaviours) can make a positive contribution towards improving community safety in an area. It is the intention of Sandwell Council to work with the police towards the reduction of crime and the fear of crime, and anti-social behaviour across Sandwell. This will be a material consideration in all planning proposals.' However, as this policy is the overarching design policy in the draft Local Plan, the PCCWM requests that reference is also made within this paragraph 15.17, to the need for developers, as well as the local authorities, to engage with the West Midlands Police Design Out Crime Officers (DOCO) at the pre-application as well as the planning application stage.</p>	Support	<p>Noted and welcome support.</p> <p>Amend to include reference to Secured by Design / Park Mark</p>
C266	812	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SDM1 - Design Quality	<p>Sport England supports the approach in this policy to achieving good place making, and welcomes the reference in para 15.18 to Sport England's Active Design guidance, within which we draw out how Sport England's 10 Active Design principles align with those within the National Design Guide. Where possible we would support embedding a hyperlink to the guidance within this paragraph so that this is readily accessible to the reader.</p> <p>https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</p>	Support	<p>Noted and welcome support.</p> <p>Include footnote with hyperlink</p>

C267	993	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDM1 – Design Quality	Policy SDM1 – Design Quality 101. HBF are supportive of the use of 'Building for a Healthy Life' as best practice guidance but suggest its use should remain voluntary rather than becoming a mandatory policy requirement. Building for a Healthy Life is not really a 'standard' to be achieved, but rather a toolkit for considering design and thinking about the qualities of successful places.	Comment	Noted The policy does not require all the listed criteria to be delivered, as the elements may not be required or suitable in some cases. What it is asking for is an indication that these requirements have been considered and where they are not appropriate / deliverable, an explanation provided as part of the supporting information. Amend justification to clarify status of guidance
C268	1170	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDM1 – Design Quality	Clause g) we welcome reference to the historic environment within this policy and would request that 'historic assets' are amended to 'heritage assets' and that the significance of heritage assets including their settings are protected and where possible, enhanced.	Comment	Noted. Amend text to clarify references
C269	855	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SDM1 – Design Quality	The approach of the Sandwell Local Plan to design quality should accord with the Framework (2023) guidance (paragraphs 126 to 136). Policy should be clear about design expectations and how proposals will be tested against policy, having regard to national guidance and other material considerations. The references to the National Design Guide ¹¹ , Manual for Streets ¹² , NDS ¹³ , Building for a Healthy Life ¹⁴ and accordance with agent of change principles ¹⁵ are noted but Sandwell should prepare design guides and/or design codes consistent with the principles set out in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, and which reflect local character and design preferences. If these are to follow as supplementary planning documents, given the reference to local housing design SPDs for new housing developments, then the draft development plan policy should be explicit in this regard. Policy SDM1 should provide clarity over what development proposals should address within design and access statements, within the Sandwell-specific context: a. the ten characteristics of the National Design Guide, to provide a high-quality network of streets, buildings and spaces; b. the principles of Manual for Streets, to ensure urban streets and spaces provide a high-quality public realm and an attractive, safe and permeable movement network; c. use of the Building for a Healthy Life criteria (or subsequent iterations) and Sandwell's local housing design codes, masterplans and guidance for new housing developments, to achieve high design standards, good place-making and sustainable development; d. crime prevention measures, Secured by Design and Park Mark principles and the requirements of Part Q of the Building Regulations 2010 or any successor legislation; e. the agent of change principle, in relation to existing uses adjacent to proposed development sites.'	Comment	Noted. SLP states that a design code for the borough will be prepared - until such time, extant local and national guidance will be used as necessary to provide a context for decisions on design.
C270	1214	Oldbury (Smethwick) Limited [238]	Planning Prospects Ltd (Mr Chris Dodds, Associate Director) [163]	Policy SDM1 – Design Quality	Requires (all) developments to demonstrate that its listed criteria have been addressed and at part 3) requires (all) major developments to contribute to the greening of Sandwell by delivering against its listed criteria. However, the draft Policy's prescriptive approach lacks flexibility and is likely to impact upon deliverability of development – particularly allocated brownfield sites which are subject to other policy requirements and masterplan aspirations which, if inflexibly applied, are stifling development from them. The Policy also needs to recognise that development must be viable in order to deliver its requirements. As such, the Policy must be amended to provide sufficient flexibility to ensure that development is viable, and ultimately deliverable, whilst delivering its requirements where possible, or where viable. This more flexible approach is provided in draft Policy SH04 and draft Policy SH05 for example, which make it clear, and are explicit, that affordable housing provision and wheelchair accessibility standards (respectively) are required but only 'subject to financial viability'.	Object	Noted. The policy does not require all the listed criteria to be delivered, as the elements may not be required or suitable in some cases. What it is asking for is an indication that these requirements have been considered and where they are not appropriate / deliverable, an explanation provided as part of the supporting information. A policy on viability is included in the SLP.
C271	1270	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards	Accordingly, we request the incorporation of cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the introductory text to this section, or more specifically in the justification texts for Policy SDM1 – Design Quality, Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards, and Policy SDM3 – Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites.	Comment	Amend text to include reference - SDM1 and SDM3. SDM2 relates to technical standards and does not warrant changing.
C272	1207	Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]		Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards	We support the policy requirement to achieve the lower water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day, as set out in Part G2 of the Building Regulations. We agree with section 15.26 of the Justification text that this standard is justified given Severn Trent Water (apart from Chester Water Resources Zone) now operates in an area classed as seriously water stressed as of July 2021. This would also be in the spirit of paragraph 158 of the NPPF where it stresses the need to take into account the long-term implications including water supply and support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities. The focus of building design can often be on energy efficiency and water consumption. However, reducing waste from occupation and use can include improved design and provision for sufficient waste storage and sorting on site. Designing for waste can make recycling easier and cover a wider range of waste items (i.e. Waste Ergonomics the right type of bin in the right location). For example, designing where food waste collections or other specific waste streams such as Waste Electronic and Electrical Equipment (WEEE) and Batteries are established. Building design can also address accessibility considerations around handling waste to help the elderly, infirm or disabled residents move bags or bins easily, especially when segregating waste. Building design can also help to minimise problems such as fly tipping in insecure communal areas. This might also be relevant for policy SCC1.	Comment	noted and welcome support
C273	995	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards	Water efficiency in new dwellings 109. This policy also seeks to introduce a water efficiency standard of 110 litres/person/day. HBF note that Part G Building regulations already stipulates 125lpppd normal conditions and 110lpppd in water stressed areas. Therefore, HBF question whether there is a need for this to be referred to within the Local Plan as it is already required by other regulatory frameworks. 110. The policy should be deleted.	Object	Sandwell falls within the catchment of Severn Trent, which has been identified as an area of water stress, so the higher requirement is justified.
C274	940	West Midlands Housing Association Planning Consortium [91]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Iwan Evans, Assistant Planner) [90]	Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards	As detailed in our response to the Sandwell Local Plan Issues and Options consultation, the WMHAPC's stance on the Nationally Described Space Standard remains unchanged. As set out above and in line with paragraph 35 of the NPPF (2023) in order to be found sound at examination policies should be appropriately "Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence". Among tests of viability and timing Planning Practise Guidance requires the application of Nationally Described Spaces Standards (NDSS) to based on an established need: "evidence should be provided on the size and type of dwellings currently being built in the area, to ensure the impacts of adopting space standards can be properly assessed, for example, to consider any potential impact on meeting demand for starter homes." It is understood that the Black Country Housing Market Assessment (March 2021) identifies the need for accessible and adaptable housing across the housing market area. However, there is currently an absence in the need for such housing in Sandwell itself. For draft Policy SDM2 to be found 'sound', an evidenced need for NDSS should be established and assessed at a local authority level.	Comment	Comment noted. As set out in the policy, this is intended to give the council more control in situations where interventions of this sort could result in better living accommodation. This will be addressed in more detail in the Council's emerging Design Code.

C275	994	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDM2 – Development and Design Standards	<p>102. The BFB does not support the introduction of the optional Nationally Described Space Standards though policies in individual Local Plans. If the Council wanted to do this, they will need robust justifiable evidence to introduce the NDSS, as any policy which seeks to apply the optional nationally described space standards (NDSS) to all dwellings should only be done in accordance with the NPPF1, which states that “policies may also make use of the NDSS where the need for an internal space standard can be justified”.</p> <p>104. The BFB also remind the Council that there is a direct relationship between unit size, cost per square metre (sqm), selling price per sqm and affordability. The Council’s policy approach should recognise that customers have different budgets and aspirations. An inflexible policy approach to NDSS for all new dwellings will impact on affordability and effect customer choice. Well-designed dwellings below NDSS can provide a good, functional home. Smaller dwellings play a valuable role in meeting specific needs for both open market and affordable home ownership housing.</p> <p>105. An inflexible policy approach imposing NDSS on all housing removes the most affordable homes and denies lower income households from being able to afford homeownership. The introduction of the NDSS for all dwellings may mean customers purchasing larger homes in floorspace but with bedrooms less suited to their housing needs with the unintended consequences of potentially increasing overcrowding and reducing the quality of their living environment. The Council should focus on good design and usable space to ensure that dwellings are fit for purpose rather than focusing on NDSS.</p> <p>106. The BFB considers that if the Government had expected all properties to be built to NDSS that they would have made these standards mandatory not optional.</p> <p>107. If the proposed requirement for NDSS is carried forward, then the Council should put forward proposals for transitional arrangements. The land deals underpinning residential sites may have been secured prior to any proposed introduction of the NDSS. These sites should be allowed to move through the planning system before any proposed policy requirements are enforced. The NDSS should not be applied to any reserved matters applications or any outline or detailed approval prior to a specified date.</p> <p>108. The policy should be deleted.</p>	Object	Comment noted. As set out in the policy, this is intended to give the council more control in situations where interventions of this sort could result in better living accommodation. This will be addressed in more detail in the Council's emerging Design Code.
C276	1254	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SDM3 – Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites	In relation to tall buildings and gateway sites the Trust requests that Policy SDM3 – Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites sub-heading 5(c) specify that this relates to both designated and non-designated heritage assets (ACTION REQUEST). The associated justification text should also contain reference to the need for impact of tall buildings within typically lower height profile canal environments to be a material consideration, to enable assessment of impact on the prevailing visual environment and character of the canal network (ACTION REQUEST).	Comment	Amend to refer to all heritage assets
C277	748	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Policy SDM3 – Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites	6. How about asking the local residents how it will effect their wellbeing if a massive high rise goes up right next to them and blocks out their natural sunlight.	Comment	Comment noted. Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024 The purpose of including this policy is to enable the Council to offer guidance on and exercise control over the potential impacts of tall buildings on adjacent low-rise residential properties, by specifying the need to take those impacts into account when a decision on a proposal is taken.
C278	1171	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDM3 – Tall Buildings and Gateway Sites	Does the Council have any evidence base relating to tall buildings and which has been/ could be used to inform locations which may be appropriate or may not be appropriate for tall buildings? We have concerns about the impact of this policy on the historic environment and the historic nature of the area and are keen to understand if there is more information available at this time that has considered these issues? With reference to both tall buildings and gateway sites, we are unclear what has informed the policy and what the policy is seeking to achieve.	Comment	The purpose of including this policy is to enable the Council to exercise control over the potential impacts of tall buildings on adjacent low-rise residential properties, by specifying the need to take those impacts into account when a decision on a proposal is taken.
C279	1172	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDM5 - Shop Fronts and Roller Shutters	It would be useful to include a section on the historic environment and what is appropriate in the context of heritage assets including conservation areas and listed buildings.	Comment	Comment noted
C280	883	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDM6 - Hot Food Takeaways	The PCCWM supports a prescriptive policy on Hot Food Takeaways as set out, noting that the justification to the policy acknowledges that such uses (compared to other retail uses) are more likely to have, inter alia, a detrimental impact on amenity and such harmful impacts tend to increase anti-social behaviour. However, it is considered that Policies SDM6 and SDM7 should be amalgamated into one policy as the inference is that if a proposal complies with the prescriptive and numerical thresholds under Policy SDM6 it will be acceptable, even though it at may not meet the criteria set out in Policy SDM7 – Management of Hot Food Takeaways – and vice versa. The PCCWM considers the criteria in Policy SDM7 to be equally important in the consideration of a planning application for a hot food takeaway, particularly as hot food takeaways are often a flashpoint for violence after pubs and clubs close.	Support	Support noted. The decision was taken to separate out the different elements of the approach to hot food takeaways for clarification and ease of use. Where appropriate, both policies will be used in conjunction to make a decision on an application.
C281	884	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDM7 - Management of Hot Food Takeaways	The PCCWM notes that the Council confirm at paragraph 15.62 that in addition to Policy SDM6, ‘...Policy SDM7 offers guidance on the requirements for the provision of hot food takeaways. Applicants wishing to provide or alter a hot food takeaway outlet should ensure they address the issues raised in the policy, which is designed to manage adverse impacts on adjacent residents and properties.’ However, it is noted that Policy SDM7 itself does not include any policy requirements to reflect the references in paragraphs 15.66 and 15.67 to such uses attracting gatherings of people and becoming a focus for anti-social behaviour and nuisance, especially at night. Paragraph 15.67 notes that where there are concerns in this respect, the applicant may be asked to contribute towards or install safety and security measures, such as CCTV systems. In order for this consideration to carry appropriate weight, to reflect the reference to possible nuisance and anti-social behaviour created by hot food takeaways, the PCCWM objects to Policy SDM7 and requests that it should be amended to include a new point 8 (current point 8 should be renumbered 9) as follows – ‘Management of Associated Impacts... 8. In locations where there are considered to be issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder, advice will be sought from the police and other safety organisations before permission is granted for proposals for new hot food takeaways.’ In accordance with the PCCWM comments made under Policy SDM6, it is considered that Policies SDM6 and SDM7 should be amalgamated into one policy as the inference is that if a proposal complies with the prescriptive and numerical thresholds under Policy SDM6 it will be acceptable, even though it at may not meet the criteria set out in Policy SDM7 – Management of Hot Food Takeaways – and vice versa	Object	Noted. Amend policy to include reference to advice from safety organisations
C282	887	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDM8 - Gambling Activities and Alternative Financial Services	The PCCWM supports Policy SDM8 and particularly Point 6 as follows – ‘6. In determining any planning application for all pay day loan shops, pawnbrokers, and gambling uses the Council will consider any issues concerning community safety, crime, and disorder and will, where necessary, seek advice from the police and other safety organisations.’ The PCCWM recommends that the justification to this policy be expanded to cover point 6.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C283	880	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDM9 - Community Facilities	The PCCWM’s response to Policy SD55 is also applicable to Policy SDM9, in terms of the importance of proposals relating to new community facilities needing to consider the threat of terrorism and measures to minimise crime and anti-social behaviour which can be associated with large gatherings. Policy SDM9 gives examples of the community facilities it applies to, which include but are not limited to, banqueting suites and entertainment venues, places of worship and / or religious instruction and community centres. However, such community uses have the potential to attract large numbers of people. Whilst the policy acknowledges that most community facilities would be best located in town centre, it is recognised that such uses also take place outside of town centres, therefore the policy references to uses attracting the congregation of large numbers of people should also be included in policies relating to sites outside of town centres. Whilst Policy SDM9 makes reference to the need to consider noise and car parking in relation to such proposals, the policy makes no reference to the need for applicants to undertake an assessment as part of the design of new developments likely to attract large numbers of people, or to demonstrate and document how potential security and crime-related vulnerabilities have been identified, assessed and where necessary, addressed in a manner that is appropriate and proportionate. The requirement for this is set out in the PCCWM response under Policy SD55 above and the PCCWM objects to the omission of this policy wording under Policy SDM9, and requests a new bullet point that states that: ‘6. An assessment should be undertaken (as part of the design of new community developments likely to attract large numbers of people) to demonstrate and document how potential security and crime-related vulnerabilities have been identified, assessed and where necessary, addressed in a manner that is appropriate and proportionate.’ In addition, it is noted that the listed community facilities do not include emergency services such as police or fire, all of which are community facilities necessary for achieving sustainable development.	Object	Noted. Amend policy to include new point relating to safety as set out in objection

C284	1174	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	This emerging policy proposes to deliver at least 11,167 net new homes over the 2022 -2041 plan period. However, this 11,167 figure is minimal when compared to the identified housing need of 29,773 new homes throughout the same time period, identifying a shortfall of 18,606 homes. As a percentage, the proposed supply in the draft plan represents just 38% (rounded) of the borough's total housing needs. This is unacceptable, in both the immediate context and historic undersupply, but also when looking at the wider national level and Government objectives enshrined within the NPPF, particularly at paragraph 60 which requires the supply of homes to be "significantly boosted" and importantly that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed and to ensure the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed. Due to this, difficult decisions need to be made with regards to the proposed spatial strategy, including consideration of Green Belt land release, without which is artificially restricting the development potential within Sandwell. The starting point of a new Local Plan cannot be the continued chronic under-provision of housing, such that the exist delivery issues will be further exacerbated.	Object	it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside. Sandwell is satisfied that while there remains a considerable housing and employment land shortfall, given the limited nature and extent of GB in the borough the allocation of housing within it would not significantly outweigh the harm such development would cause to the openness and permanence of the GB or the prevention of coalescence between existing built-up areas.
C285	710	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	The Edwin Richards Quarry site represents an excellent opportunity to deliver a significant amount of housing, within the Plan period and into the subsequent plan period.	Support	comment noted
C286	860	Mr Kevin Priest [210]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	One comment said that the authority will benefit from the introduction of HS2. As you're aware, HS2 now ends at Birmingham and therefore Sandwell is unlikely to see any benefit from HS2. SDS1 Pg 51 "3.6 The borough's main strategic centre, West Bromwich, is already served by an extensive transport system and therefore provides a suitable location for economic and housing growth, although improvements are required to enhance connectivity, accessibility and environmental quality. 3.7 Strong links will be created between the strategic town centre, the areas identified for regeneration and existing town and local centres and communities, through high-quality design, green infrastructure and transport investment, to help spread regeneration benefits, improve community cohesion and create an effective network."	Comment	comment noted
C287	826	Heyford Developments [205]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	A substantial shortfall and need to find a definitive solution. The strategy as presented leaves a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the Council's administrative area. This is a substantial number of homes and represents a substantial number of people and families that will go without homes should a definitive solution not be found.	Object	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. .
C288	1083	Dr Baljit Bhandal [224]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	A substantial shortfall and need to find a definitive solution. The strategy as presented leaves a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the Council's administrative area. This is a substantial number of homes and represents a substantial number of people and families that will go without homes should a definitive solution not be found. Dr Baljit Bhandal would like to implore Sandwell Council to engage with the other authorities within the HMA to find a location to secure the delivery of these 18,606 dwellings. As will be demonstrated below, the housing shortfall has reached critical levels across the HMA and the onus is on the authorities where the housing need cannot be met to secure the support of the authorities with land available, including Green Belt land, to assist. Meeting the needs of all part of the population The pressure to find a definitive solution to address the housing shortfall, is only further emphasised by the fact that the delivery of affordable housing on those sites within the Sandwell administrative area will fall woefully short of the affordable housing need identified. The Black Country Housing Market Assessment Report (March 2021) identified a need for 4,605 social rented properties and 1,913 shared ownership dwellings (accounting for nearly 24% of the total housing requirement. The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it. Supporting Economic Growth Delivering the right number of homes, in the right location is an important component in fostering economic growth. For Sandwell, this means securing the delivery of homes as close to and /or in locations well connected to Sandwell as possible. The obvious locations being Bromsgrove to the south and South Staffordshire to the west, when you account for the adjoining authorities not having the capacity to assist with meeting Sandwell's need. It is Dr Baljit Bhandal consider that the starting point should be sites on the edge of the conurbation to provide homes close to where the demand arises and that can provide a range of homes, including more executive homes for the owners of new businesses. The requirement in Dudley is 11,954 dwellings however, Dudley claims it only has capacity to accommodate 10,876 of these leaving a shortfall of 1,076 (although we consider Dudley has capacity to not only meet its housing requirement, but also contribute to meeting the pressing need for housing in the HMA, including the overspill from Sandwell).	Comment	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities' housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. .
C289	1190	Bloor Homes [231]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	The strategy as presented leaves a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the Council's administrative area. This is a substantial number of homes and represents a substantial number of people and families that will go without homes should a definitive solution not be found. Bloor would like to implore Sandwell Council to engage with the other authorities within the HMA to find a location to secure the delivery of these 18,606 dwellings. As will be demonstrated below, the housing shortfall has reached critical levels across the HMA and the onus is on the authorities where the housing need cannot be met to secure the support of the authorities with land available, including Green Belt land, to assist.	Object	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. .
C290	1194	Folkes [233]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	The strategy as presented leaves a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the Council's administrative area. This is a substantial number of homes and represents a substantial number of people and families that will go without homes should a definitive solution not be found. Folkes would like to implore Sandwell Council to engage with the other authorities within the HMA to find a location to secure the delivery of these 18,606 dwellings. As will be demonstrated below, the housing shortfall has reached critical levels across the HMA and the onus is on the authorities where the housing need cannot be met to secure the support of the authorities with land available, including Green Belt land, to assist.	Object	Comment noted - Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. .
C291	765	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	The key elements of this policy are supported by Dudley MBC, including the principle of delivering as much new development as possible on previously developed land and sites within the urban area. Sandwell MBC should continue to keep its urban capacity under review to identify any further opportunities for new development that would contribute to the shortfalls in housing and employment land supply currently identified. Please note our response to Policy SHO1 in respect of the housing land supply position. The SLP identifies that Sandwell's unmet housing and employment land needs will need to be provided for across the Housing Market Area (HMA), Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) and other areas with which Sandwell has a physical or functional relationship. Reference is made to the latest position in respect of the Duty to cooperate with further information contained in the supporting Draft Plan Statement of Consultation (Duty to Cooperate Statement, 2023). This Statement (at paragraphs 31-34) identifies that there are a series of 'offers' from other local authorities outside of the Black Country towards the unmet housing needs of the area. Dudley MBC agrees that this largely reflects the latest position, but there are some updates to take account of. The Dudley MBC Duty to Cooperate Statement (2023) at paragraph 2.27 notes that Telford and Wrekin Council has since published its Regulation 18 Local Plan (October 2023) with a potential contribution of 1,600 homes towards the Black Country's unmet housing needs. The Lichfield Local Plan was withdrawn from Examination in October 2023. We would also note that Cannock Chase and South Staffordshire Councils' previously paused work on their local plans following the Government's proposed reforms to the national planning policy framework in December 2022. We are aware that work on both plans has recently recommenced. The Sandwell MBC Duty to Cooperate Statement (at paragraph 34) states that discussions are ongoing in relation to how these contributions are disaggregated between the four Black Country authorities, which is also reflected within the Dudley MBC Duty to Cooperate Statement (paragraph 2.26). Dudley MBC has identified a housing supply shortfall, as detailed within our recent Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan, which it is similarly working to address via contributions from relevant local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate. Dudley MBC will therefore continue to work jointly with Sandwell MBC under the Duty to Cooperate to progress this matter. In respect of unmet employment land needs, the Sandwell MBC Duty to Cooperate Statement (paragraphs 36-41) sets out the 'offers' from other local authorities, which reflects the information contained within the Dudley MBC Duty to Cooperate Statement (2023). It is recognised that this reflects the position as was the case for the Black Country Local Plan draft plan consultation stage (as of 2021). The latest position, as contained within the up-to-date Black Country Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA, 2023) and Black Country Employment Land Supply Paper (2023) and resulting from any future updates to relevant local authority contributions, will need to be reflected at the next stage (Regulation 19) of our respective Local Plans. Dudley MBC has identified an employment land supply shortfall, as detailed within our recent Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan, which it is similarly working to address via contributions from relevant local authorities under the Duty to Cooperate. Dudley MBC supports the principle of addressing the employment land shortfalls via the Black Country FEMA and will continue to work jointly with Sandwell MBC under the Duty to Cooperate to progress this matter. For clarity, Dudley MBC is unable to contribute towards the housing and employment land supply shortfalls of Sandwell MBC. In respect of the other strategic matters set out within the Sandwell MBC Duty to Cooperate Statement e.g., transport, natural environment, whilst it is recognised that here will be the key prescribed bodies to engage on these matters, Dudley MBC would welcome any cross-boundary considerations related to such topics also being reflected within forthcoming Statements of Common Ground between our authorities, as necessary.	Comment	Comment noted - Dudley agrees with the Council, that the employment shortfall will be met through the Black Country FEMA and other areas which have a physical or functional relationship with the borough.

C292	830	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	Policy SDS1 should be clear on how the projected provision for net additional homes is arrived at, and what provisions will be taken to ensure that delivery matches projected requirements.	Comment	Comment noted.
C293	1243	Redrow Homes [239]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	The strategy as presented leaves a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings that cannot be accommodated in the Council’s administrative area. This is a substantial number of homes and represents a substantial number of people and families that will go without homes should a definitive solution not be found.	Comment	Comment noted.
C294	1127	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	Clause j - This could be amended to read conserve and enhance the significance of the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings through xxx to ensure that it is the significance of heritage assets that is being considered and protected through the policy text.	Comment	Comment noted and amend policy to reflect suggested change
C295	946	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>10. As Council is planning only to meet one third of their proposed housing number, this means two thirds are not being planned for. As HBF believe the housing requirement should be higher to start with, the actual percentage of unmet need would be even higher. Even, setting the appropriate housing number issue is aside for now, HBF is very concerned about this proposed shortfall. Failure to meet the housing needs of Sandwell will inhibit growth and do nothing to address the current housing crisis, with implications for the economy and population of wider region. It will be important for the Council to clearly show how the unmet need will be met, and what they will do to ensure that it is. However, the Council needs to first establish the appropriate housing requirement for Sandwell before considering if and how this could be met.</p> <p>12. HBF notes that the Plan therefore proposes not only significant unmet housing need but also a significant unmet employment need. This would further constrain the ambitions for Growth in Sandwell, and the wider region. HBF suggest these circumstances warrant a full Green Belt review and the allocation of sites to meet the housing and employment requirements of the Borough even if these are within the current Green Belt.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF . In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: “Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process.” This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.
C296	1271	Consortium of Housebuilders and Land Promoters [240]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>There is no agreed strategy between the 14 GBBCHMA authorities as to how the unmet need up to 2031 will be accommodated, notwithstanding the significant scale of unmet need emerging beyond 2031. This is clear from Sandwell’s own evidence, as part of this consultation it refers to confirming at a later date any likely contribution to its own shortfall, this however is only likely to address a small proportion of it.</p> <p>In the absence of this strategic level agreement, all 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be exploring all growth options in order to meet its own objectively assessed needs and those of the wider GBBCHMA, if their plan is to be considered positively prepared.</p> <p>In Sandwell’s case, it is clear that not all growth options have been explored to meet its own objectively assessed needs, let alone those of the wider HMA. The plan proposes a supply of circa 38% of its total need and exacerbating the shortfall of the wider HMA by circa 18,600 homes. Under NPPF paragraph 139, Sandwell’s unmet need alone represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing the borough’s Green Belt boundaries, as does the scale of unmet need across the wider HMA.</p> <p>In summary, the 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be seeking to agree a strategy now for how the unmet needs up to 2031 and beyond will be comprehensively met in full. As part of this all authorities should be exploring all options for growth, including the release of Green Belt land, given the unmet need represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing Green Belt boundaries.</p>	Object	Comment noted. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF . In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: “Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process.” This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development. Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DTC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell’s need
C297	905	Clowes Developments (UK) Limited [214]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Part 1b Part 1b is very misleading. It states that at least 1,206 ha of employment land will be provided but all of it bar 29ha is existing employment land. The proposed supply is only 42 hectares of which 26ha are new allocations (“new urban sites”).</p> <p>Duty to Cooperate Paragraph 3.14 Harris Lamb agrees that there is evidently a substantive and significant shortfall with the proposed employment shortfall. Again “an anticipated lead of allocations of 1,206ha of employment land” is simply incorrect as nearly all of it is currently occupied. Further the shortfall of 143ha does not account the 26ha projected loss of employment land to other uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.15 This is a correct application of NPPF’s policy. It should state here which local authority areas have a physical or functional relationship with Sandwell. One area is evidently South Staffordshire where there is a strong commuting pattern in both directions.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.17 It is evident to date that the employment land shortfall falls well below the existing and anticipated contributions from other Local Planning Authorities. The scale of the shortfall, along with the even greater shortfall in respect of housing, means that for greater contribution from appropriate local authority areas e.g. South Staffordshire is necessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.18 Ongoing “engagement with its neighbours to secure the most appropriate and sustainable location for housing and employment growth to meet local needs” is clearly not enough as all the neighbouring LPAs are also struggling to meet their own needs, especially so Birmingham. Therefore, it should state the LPAs which could provide a substantive and appropriate contribution including South Staffordshire.</p> <p>Part 1h Harris Lamb objects to the blanket policy approach i.e. no inappropriate development in it without any up-to-date technical evidence to justify it.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Re reference to quantum of employment land - use of the figure for employment land is designed to demonstrate that Sandwell is retaining and protecting a significant amount of employment land through its continued allocation as such, and is not reallocating it as land for housing or other uses. taken as a whole, the policy wording suggests that no less than 1206 ha of employment land will be provided taking into account planning decisions on schemes throughout the life of the SLP. Despite this stance, the Council will amend the wording of Policy SDS1 part 1b to clarify status of current allocations . In respect of employment land, the BC authorities have recently finalised a refreshed version of the EDNA and are working with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate to establish the possibility of meeting additional employment land needs outside the sub-regional borders.
C298	947	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>13. With regards the housing requirement itself, HBF strongly support the need for more housing in the Sandwell Local Plan for a variety of reasons including addressing the current housing crisis, meeting housing need, providing affordable housing and supporting employment growth. HBF would request that the Council considers the annual LHN as only the minimum starting point and fully considers all of the issues that may result in a need for a higher housing requirement, including the need to provide a range and choice of sites, the need for flexibility, viability considerations and whether higher levels of open-market housing are required in order to secure increased delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>14. Paragraph 22 of the NPPF requires that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption. HBF note that the current plan period is to 2041 but would still question if the plan period is long enough to cover this requirement. This Reg 18 consultation closes at the end of 2023 and then the representations need to be considered an analysed, a submission plan prepared and consulted, examination, main modifications consultation, inspectors report and adoption by the Council.</p> <p>15. HBF suggest that the plan-making process may take some time, especially if additional Green Belt release is needed, and suggest that the plan period could be extended now, especially as this would require an update to the evidence base as is important for the evidence base to be consistent with the Plan Period. Extending the plan period would also require an increase to the housing requirement to cover the additional years, and consequential additional housing supply.</p> <p>16. The Government has made it clear that it still supports the national target of 300,000 new homes per year. The standard method housing requirement has always been the minimum starting point for setting the housing requirement, and HBF support more housing than the standard method housing requirement in order to support economic growth, provide a range and type of sites and to support small and medium house builders.</p> <p>17. HBF suggest that each of these reasons on its own could justify an increase in the housing requirement for Sandwell and the Council should consider planning for an additional amount of housing to address each reason in turn. However, as previously mentioned it is important that the housing requirement is established, before any consideration is given to any issues around housing land supply, or lack thereof.</p> <p>18. The plan-led system requires Council to proactively plan to meet the needs of their community. This means that there is a need to provide a range and choice of sites, a need for flexibility and viability considerations to be taken into account, and a need for the Council to consider whether higher levels of open-market housing are required in order to secure the delivery of affordable housing and/or support economic growth. HBF can not see how planning to meet only one third of the housing need for the area represents a positively prepared plan for the future of the area for the next fifteen years and beyond.</p> <p>19. Once the housing requirement has been set, the next phase is to consider housing land supply. It is important to both minimise the amount of any unmet needs that cannot be accommodated within the Borough and clearly set out how any unmet need will be addressed elsewhere. HBF recognise the Council’s view as to the constrained nature of the Borough and the amount of current Green Belt designation, but would also highlight the size of the shortfall in Housing and Employment land being proposed in this plan. It is important that the housing needs of Sandwell are met in full.</p>	Comment	Comments noted. The timetable for the local plan anticipates adoption in early 2026, as the plan has an end date of 2041, the minimum requirement of a 15 year plan on adoption will have been met. The Council have used the standard method to calculate the need and New evidence (Local Housing Need review 2024, Icenii) considers that an uplift to LHN is not required to support economic growth The supply has a range and type of sites. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council’s development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough’s green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence to demonstrate that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell.

C299	1068	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>2.2The Draft SLP confirms that Sandwell needs to identify land for 29,773 homes in the period 2022 to 2041. We are satisfied that the Council has correctly calculated its local housing need applying the standard method. However, the NPPF is clear that the local housing need calculated using the standard method should be treated as a ‘minimum’ starting point for determining the number of homes needed in the area.</p> <p>2.3The PPG confirms that there are other factors that need to be assessed prior to, and separate from, considering how much of the overall need can be accommodated to determine whether the actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates. Further evidence is, therefore, required to demonstrate that the standard method figure reflects the actual need for housing in the Borough.</p> <p>2.4We note that the housing need identified in the draft SLP is based on a plan-period of 2022-2041. Whilst this would exceed the minimum requirement for strategic policies to look ahead over at least 15 years, given the timescales for the preparation and submission of the Plan and that the Council anticipates that the Plan may not be adopted in until early 2026, this would only leave 15 years (i.e. the minimum period set out in paragraph 22 of the NPPF) on adoption. The Council should, therefore, consider extending the plan period to ensure that the strategic policies in the plan look ahead and plan appropriately for the longer term.</p>	Comment	Comments noted. New evidence (Local Housing Need review 2024, Icen) considers that an uplift to LHN is not required to support economic growth. The timetable for the local plan anticipates adoption in early 2026, as the plan has an end date of 2041, the minimum requirement of a 15 year plan on adoption will have been met.
C300	1069	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Housing Requirement and Scale of Unmet Need</p> <p>2.5The Council is proposing to set its housing requirement at 11,167 homes. The Council’s approach to setting the housing requirement appears to be entirely driven by its assessment of the supply of suitable land available within the urban area of the Borough rather than its starting point being first to assess and establish the appropriate requirement before considering how this could be met.</p> <p>2.6The draft SLP is, therefore, proposing to plan for only approximately 37% of its overall housing need. Whilst it is accepted that the Borough is unlikely to be able to meet its needs in full given the scale of the need and constraints on the supply of land available in the Borough, the draft SLP would leave 62% of the minimum local housing need for Sandwell not being planned for.</p> <p>2.7A plan which only provides for a third of its minimum local housing need cannot possibly be consistent with the national policy which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing nor can it be considered “positively prepared” because the strategy does not as a minimum, seek to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs and is not currently informed by agreements with other authorities over how the unmet need will be redistributed.</p> <p>2.8The Council must do more to minimise the extent of its unmet need before going on to set out how any remaining unmet need will be addressed elsewhere to ensure that Sandwell’s needs are met in full.</p>	Object	Comments noted. Welcome the recognition that the scale of the need and constraints on the supply of land mean that it is unlikely the Council will not be able to meet its needs in full. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council’s development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough’s green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence, which includes the West Midlands Combined Authority Brownfield Land Study 2022, that demonstrates that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell. The Council has and will continue to discuss our housing and employment shortfall with our neighbouring authorities through Duty to Cooperate.
C301	952	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>22.HBF believe that Sandwell’s inability to meet its housing (and employment) needs requires revisiting the Spatial Strategy and results in the ‘exceptional circumstances’ that would require the need for a Green Belt review as set out in para 140 of the NPPF.</p> <p>23.HBF notes that the issue of fully meeting housing needs within Sandwell remains, despite the ending of the work on Black Country Plan. Sandwell therefore needs to undertake its own calculations for the housing need and requirement, robustly test how much of this can be met within Sandwell and how much (if any) is an unmet need. The Council then need to work with neighbouring authorities to identify how that unmet need will be redistributed and prepare a Statement of Common Ground on this issue. This issue is both a soundness and a Duty to Cooperate issue. At this stage HBF do not believe the Council has done enough to try and meet all its needs, or explored every and all option to do so.</p>	Comment	Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell.
C302	889	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Policy SDS1/Para 3.13.</p> <p>West Midlands CPRE objects to the housing supply figure give in Policy SDS 1, 1a. We consider the figure to be too low.</p> <p>We consider further work should be undertaken to ensure the Regulation 19 Plan includes takes account of higher potential brownfield capacity.</p> <p>In particular we consider the level of windfall development should be higher. This includes at least 484 more small windfalls and a calculation of large windfall sites, consistent with the evidence both quantitative and qualitative that supports this.</p> <p>This approach should take account in particular of both the potential for additional housing in centres through redevelopment or mixed development (as supported by Policy SCE1 Para 6) as well as the expectation that some further industrial land will come forward on sites which are currently unavailable (As envisaged in Policy SEC4). The windfall approach is suitable because these opportunities cannot be exactly predicted.</p>	Object	Note comments. 97% of new development identified in the SLP will take place on brownfield and previously-developed sites. A small number of greenfield sites have been identified and under very specific circumstances will provide opportunities to deliver additional housing and employment in sustainable locations. During the preparation of the BCP, work was undertaken to look at whether there were any available brownfield sites that the Black Country authorities, including Sandwell, had missed and whether the approach to development on such sites could be changed - the work demonstrated that all available and reasonable brownfield sites had been identified and with very few caveats, it would not be reasonable or possible to deliver more housing on brownfield sites. Where sites may become vacant during the lifetime of the SLP, their redevelopment for housing or employment uses will of course be considered at that time.
C303	1197	Monarchi Developers Limited [66]	Monarchi Developers Limited (Mr Simon Hawley, Director - Planning) [65]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>The proposed development strategy in the Local Plan identifies a housing requirement of 29,773 dwellings to meet the minimum Standard Method housing needs figure. It is, however, advised that there is only available capacity to deliver 11,167 of these dwellings in the Plan area, leaving a shortfall of 18,606 dwellings. There are only two solutions for addressing the shortfall. Either Sandwell need to allocate additional sites within its administrative area, or the Council need to reply upon neighbouring authorities allocating land for development to meet the unmet housing need.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that neighbouring authorities will be able to provide significant support to meet Sandwell’s housing shortfall. Indeed there is a significant shortfall in the wider Housing Market Area due to a shortfall of housing sites. As a consequence Sandwell should actively make additional housing allocations in the meeting Local Plan.</p>	Comment	Note comments. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council’s development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough’s green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence to demonstrate that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Given the importance of the green belt and green spaces to the health and wellbeing of local residents, in addition to their value for biodiversity, the Council has decided not to allocate sites within the green belt or change GB boundaries to exclude such sites despite a significant level of housing and employment land need. This would run counter to the development strategy and would result in adverse impacts on the character and amenity of Sandwell. The Council has and will continue to discuss our housing and employment shortfall with our neighbouring authorities through Duty to Cooperate.
C304	726	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	generally support the vision and development strategy. not against building on some green, non public land, eg Brandhall golf course, as long as it's well designed, at a higher density, and includes lots of open space and biodiversity opportunities.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C305	813	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Sport England supports part 1c) of the policy which states that the Council will ensure that sufficient physical, social and environmental infrastructure is delivered to meet identified requirements, though there seems to be lack of a specific policy to address the provision of social infrastructure generated by proposed new developments through CIL/Section 106 agreements or any successor mechanism.</p> <p>Sport England supports the references in part 1d) of the policy to providing improvements to health and well-being through increased access to green spaces, active recreation and active travel, and improved and accessible education infrastructure as these are key elements of ensuring sandwell residents have opportunities to be physically active. Where required to meet the needs of proposed development there should be a specific requirement to secure the provision of such social infrastructure through CIL/S106, or any successor mechanism.</p>	Comment	Noted Insert new introduction, policy and justification SID1 to include CIL / S106
C306	659	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	Ensuring that new development helps to contribute positively to the Local Nature Recovery Network should be mentioned in this Policy.	Comment	SDS1 is a strategic policy and as such does not specifically mention any designation or allocation. The Council feels there is sufficient support given elsewhere in the SLP to the LNRS and related designations for a specific mention here to be superfluous.
C307	950	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	21.Criteria 3 of the policy sets out that “Appendices B and C show how the housing and employment land ambitions for Sandwell will be met. Those development needs that cannot be accommodated within the borough will be exported to sustainable locations in neighbouring local authority areas, following consultation.” HBF would question the appropriateness of this approach, but if it is to be pursued then this should be set out as an integral part of the policy and not deferred to Appendix B and C. Surely Housing Allocations should be made as an integral part of the Plan and not in an Appendix.	Comment	The inclusion of the details of allocated sites in Appendices B and C is a matter of convenience and layout and does not represent a lessening of their importance. This was also the approach adopted in the former BCP.

C308	937	West Midlands Housing Association Planning Consortium [91]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Iwan Evans, Assistant Planner) [90]	Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Paragraph 3.13 on page 52 of the Draft Local Plan sets out a considerable shortfall in the ability of the authority to provide for the housing needs of its residents:</p> <p>“This Plan aims to allocate sites for 11,167 new homes in Sandwell over the period 2022-41, compared to a local housing need of 29,773 (2022 – 2041) homes; this identifies a shortfall of 18,606 homes.” (Emphasis added).</p> <p>Given the significant shortfall, the WMHAPC is concerned that the Council is progressing the draft strategic housing policies without showing that neighbouring authorities can accommodate the shortfall in the number of homes needed while also addressing their own housing needs. This is an acutely important matter that should be resolved under the Duty to Cooperate and also set out within a Statement of Common Ground by the parties involved.</p> <p>While it appreciated that efforts have been made to work collaboratively with other Black Country Authorities, the Sandwell Local Plan - Regulation 18 Duty to Co-operate Statement (November 2023) still leaves a high level of uncertainty as to where the shortfall in housing can be addressed. The statement demonstrates that existing offers from neighbouring authorities in meeting wider-than-local housing needs result in the capacity of up to 8,000 homes, which falls far short of the 18,606 homes required in Sandwell.</p> <p>The WMHAPC is of the view that further work between Sandwell Borough Council and neighbouring authorities is needed before the strategic housing policies contained in the Draft Local Plan are able to provide for the housing need of the authority and subsequently be found ‘sound’ at examination by being ‘positively prepared’ and ‘effective’, as set out by Paragraph 35 of the NPPF (2023):</p> <p>“Plans are ‘sound’ if they are:</p> <p>a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;</p> <p>b) Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;</p> <p>c) Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross- boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and</p> <p>d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.”</p> <p>At present the Draft Plan does not provide for the area’s objectively assessed need and there are no formal agreements in place that have been set out in evidence which demonstrated unmet need can be met in neighbouring authorities.</p>	Comment	Through Duty to Cooperate, the Council will continue discussions with neighbouring authorities and within a Statement of Common Ground set out where they can help to accommodate the housing and employment land shortfall.
C309	1062	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Under this policy header, the plan expresses a need to ensure growth is sustainable by allocating housing in locations with the highest levels of sustainable transport access to residential services (retail provision, schools, healthcare facilities, fresh food, employment etc).</p> <p>Whilst fully supporting this, we feel this could be even stronger in that it should seek to ensure that all new development is designed to encourage sustainable travel and that it doesn't make transport worse in any way.</p>	Comment	Noted. Policy should be read in context of other policies within the SLP.
C310	1099	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy	<p>Under this policy header, the plan expresses a need to ensure growth is sustainable by allocating housing in locations with the highest levels of sustainable transport access to residential services (retail provision, schools, healthcare facilities, fresh food, employment etc).</p> <p>Whilst fully supporting this, we feel this could be even stronger in that it should seek to ensure that all new development is designed to encourage sustainable travel and that it doesn't make transport worse in any way.</p>	Comment	Noted. Policy should be read in context of other policies within the SLP.
C311	758	Mr Mark Davies [32]	Iceni Projects (Miss Lydia Frimley, Assistant Planner) [31]	Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	<p>In relation to the Soho Foundry and Mint, Smethwick, policy SDS2 is directly at odds with Policy SEC3. Policy SDS2 promotes “new green neighbourhoods on re-purposed employment land and accessible active travel routes” in the Smethwick to Birmingham Canal Corridor. This conflicts with the requirements for Local Employment Areas which limit the uses permitted to more traditional industrial uses and would inhibit the ability tot achieve green neighbourhoods.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Ambiguity with the wording of policy SDS2 will be clarified so as to refer to appropriate re-purposed employment land.
C312	766	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	<p>Dudley MBC supports the SLP approach of focusing new development and regeneration within the identified Regeneration Areas and West Bromwich strategic centre. The Regeneration Area of Dudley Port and Tipton relates to the draft Dudley Local Plan Regeneration Corridor 4 (the Regeneration Area of the Wednesbury to Tipton Metro Corridor is also of relevance). Dudley MBC supports references to the new public transport hub to be developed around the interchange of the Midland Metro Extension and Dudley Port railway station. Combined with the metro extension from Dudley town centre to Dudley Port, this will provide Dudley borough residents with enhanced access to the national railway network. Housing and employment development in this area is supported but should take account of any cross-boundary infrastructure requirements arising from specific proposals. The justification to the policy references the opportunities to build upon the existing infrastructure, making the canals and greenspace a destination, linking to wider attractions such as the Dudley Canal Trust, Black Country Museum and Dudley Zoo. Recognition of these attractions and potential opportunities to enhance linkages to them is supported. It is noted that £20million has been awarded from the Levelling Up Fund towards the regeneration of Tipton. Whilst the principle of the regeneration and redevelopment of such areas to deliver additional housing and employment growth is supported, specific proposals for the regeneration/redevelopment of the Owen Street District Centre (also known as Tipton Town Centre) should be of an appropriate scale to that centre so as not to detract from the functions of higher order centres within the vicinity, including Dudley Town Centre (identified as a Tier 2 centre within the draft Dudley Local Plan).</p>	Support	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements are being assessed as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is an evidence based document supporting the SLP.</p> <p>Proposals for Tipton Town Centre are currently being finalised and will likely involve the construction of new affordable housing and the rationalisation of retail floorspace within the centre in response to high vacancy rates. The proposals are not expected to detract from the functions of higher order centres within the vicinity, including Dudley Town Centre. For further information about the project please visit https://regeneratingsandwell.co.uk/sandwell_projects/tipton-town-centre-regeneration/</p>
C313	831	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	<p>3.08 Regeneration Areas as set out within policy SDS2 are the stated focus for new development, regeneration and public and the encouragement of private investment. Subsection 3(e) states that at least 2,581 new homes of mixed type and tenure are to be delivered in the regeneration areas; in sustainable locations well- supported by community services. Sandwell currently has a significant shortfall in housing delivery against Government requirements. It is highly likely that a component of any solution addressing the current housing shortfall will be higher density residential development on brownfield land included within in the identified Regeneration Areas.</p>	Comment	<p>Noted. Policy SH03 sets out minimum density standards for new development.</p> <p>Many of the other Regeneration Areas will meet the policy criteria for minimum 45 dp ha. The Council will encourage proposals to exceed the minimum requirement where appropriate and the scheme is designed well.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to prepare a Design Code which will provide design guidance for housing developments and explain how high density residential development can be designed well.</p>
C314	1019	Birmingham City Council (Mr Ian Macleod, Director of Planning, Transport & Sustainability) [68]		Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	<p>In relation to this point, the City Council is therefore also supportive of the inclusion of Smethwick as one of five Regeneration Areas as part of the Development Strategy within the Draft Local Plan (Policy SDS2). This will help to promote and cement the development and regeneration opportunities on the boundary with Birmingham which will have mutual regeneration benefits for both authorities with a focus around the development of the new Midland Metropolitan Hospital (which will serve communities on either side of the boundary).</p>	Support	Noted. Sandwell Council will continue to work with Birmingham City Council to realise the proposals in the Smethwick to Birmingham Corridor Framework
C315	910	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	<p>As set out within our response to the Issues and Options consultation the Trust welcomes the retention and enhancement of a canal-specific policy (Policy SNE6) within the Reg 18 SLP and as such does not seek the addition of replica canal-specific wording within every other relevant policy wording within the SLP. However, where specified we request cross-referencing to Policy SNE6 as identified in the requests below as a means of identifying the needs and opportunities of the waterway network in delivering Sandwell’s vision.</p> <p>Specifically, the Trust notes Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell and the extent to which the Dudley Port and Tipton, Wednesbury and Smethwick Regeneration Areas interact with the canal network. The Trust welcomes mention of our network within both policy wording and justification text for these areas and requests continued engagement through existing (e.g. Smethwick-Birmingham Corridor Framework and Rolfe Street Masterplans) and newer stakeholder engagement groups and the implementation and development of associated Supplementary Planning Documents resulting throughout the plan period (ACTION REQUEST).</p>	Comment	Noted. The Council will continue to engage with CRT on planning matters that impact the canal network.
C316	1128	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	<p>This policy would benefit from reference to the historic nature of the area and its heritage assets and how conserving the historic environment will be a benefit for the regeneration of the area. It would also be useful to reference the Wednesbury High Street Action Zone during the text regarding regeneration in Sandwell and the benefit of heritage led regeneration programmes. This would help meet the aims of the Plan mentioned earlier in the text. We note a brief reference in paragraph 3.42.</p>	Comment	Noted. The policy justification will be revised to refer to new funding that has been secured since the SLP was prepared and to provide greater context on the historic nature of the area and its heritage assets and how conserving the historic environment will be a benefit for the regeneration of the area.
C317	727	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell	Support the proposals.	Support	Support noted and welcomed

C318	1003	Chance Heritage Trust [56]	Iceni Projects (Katie Inglis, Associate Director) [215]	Policy SDS2 – Regeneration in Sandwell Another Policy potentially at odds with Policy SEC3 is Policy SDS2, which also covers the site. Policy SDS2 designates Regeneration Areas as the primary focus for new development, regeneration, and investment. The site specifically is located within the Smethwick to Birmingham Canal Corridor Regeneration Area, where Policy SDS2 promotes “new green neighbourhoods on re-purposed employment land and accessible active travel routes.” CHT support Policy SDS2 and consider that the Soho Foundry would be a prime opportunity to meet this aim. The site is located along the Canal Corridor and contains exceptionally significant buildings which are capable of promoting the area’s unique history and provide significant community facilities for the public. The site could also be safely accessed by pedestrians from the canal, promoting active travel along this route. Despite this, the inclusion of the site within Policy SEC3 will mean that the restoration of the site would be restricted to industrial uses, which would work against the aspiration to create green neighbourhoods using re-purposed employment land and therefore strongly hinder the public enjoyment of these assets. Therefore, the site should be removed from Policy Allocation SEC3 and a bespoke allocation which supports flexible uses included within the emerging Local Plan if the regeneration aims of Policy SDS2 are to be achieved.	Comment	The draft plan identifies a significant shortfall of both housing and employment land over the plan period. Indeed one of the principle land use issues that the plan seeks to address is the balance of housing and employment land. Soho Foundry was subject to a Site Assessment. That Assessment concludes that the proximity of established, viable, albeit low value employment uses precludes residential development. The site is poorly connected to local services and the presence of adverse noise and air quality conditions would create a poor residential environment. It is adjacent to Sims Metal, a significant metal recycling facility, and it is considered that the amenity impacts that the recycling facility would have on future residents can not realistically be overcome and would result in a poor living environment. Should this situation change, the Council would be able to prepare a Supplementary Plan setting out new policies as to how Soho Foundry could be regenerated for alternative uses outside of the SLP preparation process. There is the opportunity to create new green neighbourhoods on re-purposed employment land elsewhere in the Regeneration Corridor, such as at Rolfe Street and Cranford Street. Policy SDS2 will be clarified to confirm that this will apply on appropriate re-purposed employment land.
C319	1129	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDS3 – Towns and Local Areas clause a)) - We would request re-phrasing of this clause as sites submitted during a Call for Sites exercise will not necessarily be suitable for development. We would request that this is also re-phrased in any other policies that this statement may appear. clause d) - Could make reference to the historic environment	Comment	Add Text to effect... "...or ones submitted as part of a Call for Sites exercise, (where they have been found to be acceptable under planning policies and regulations)...sugg additional rtext in red- alaise with Trisha."d. An integrated and (where possible) continuous network of green infrastructure and walking and cycling routes, as well as a network of centres, health, leisure, sports, recreation and community facilities, which have due regard to the historic environment, ; and"...sugg additional rtext in red.
C320	711	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SDS3 – Towns and Local Areas Policy SDS3 part 1a. states that towns and local communities outside West Bromwich and the regeneration areas will provide 503 new homes. This 503 homes figure is not explicitly referenced elsewhere in the Plan (e.g. within Policy SHO1 (Table 5), Policy SHO2 or Appendix B). Clarification of how this figure has been calculated and how it relates to the proposed allocated sites outside of West Bromwich and the regeneration areas is requested.	Comment	Agree that it is unclear where this figure is from. It is part of the supply in Table 5 - Additional Floorspace in Centres (Town centres and District and Local Centres) and the remainder is from the Small sites windfall allowance. Will ensure that this figure referenced in the future as to its origins and relationship with Table 5.
C321	814	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SDS3 – Towns and Local Areas Sport England supports part 1d) of the policy that references providing an integrated and continuous network of green infrastructure and walking and cycling routes, as well as a network of centres, health, leisure, sports, recreation and community facilities as this relates well to Sport England's Strategy Big issue Active Environments, and to our 10 principles in Sport England's Active Design Guidance. https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design	Support	Support noted and welcomed
C322	1131	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places clause 3) - Confusing wording, we would request that this is amended yet we support the principle that the significance of heritage assets including their setting will be protected and it would benefit from a clearer form of words. Also consider re-wording paragraph 3.61. clause 9) - Historic England are available to engage in this work.	Comment	Amend wording of part 3 to clarify requirements
C323	660	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places Well-designed spaces should help to contribute to the wider Local Nature Recovery Network, as well as providing maximum biodiversity benefit.	Comment	Comment noted.
C324	729	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places Support, particularly point 5	Support	Noted and welcome support
C325	762	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places The PCCWM supports the requirement at Policy SDS4 point 6 that 'Development should contribute positively to creating high quality, active, safe and accessible places.' And at point 7 that 'To support the development of safe neighbourhoods, ensure quality of life and community cohesion are not undermined and minimise the fear of crime, the design of new development should create secure and accessible environments where opportunities for crime and disorder are reduced or designed out.' In addition, the justification to the policy at paragraph 3.58 confirms the environmental, economic and social benefits, including community safety, of designing high-quality places.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C326	815	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places Sport England supports those parts of this policy, particularly parts 5 and 6 that that reference the importance of creating permeable and accessible places for active travel, and to creating high quality, active, safe and accessible places to contribute to healthier communities as these relate well to Sport England's Strategy Big issue Active Environments, and to our 10 principles in Sport England's Active Design Guidance. https://www.sportengland.org/guidance-and-support/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design	Support	Noted and welcome support
C327	832	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places The Sandwell Local Plan discusses that well-designed places should accord with the latest National Planning Guidance and other material considerations. Point 9 of the policy states that a design code will be produced for Sandwell which shall reflect local character and design preferences, providing a framework for creating high-quality places. This approach is supported and in accordance with National Design Guide and National Model Design Code, provided that it incorporates the requisite flexibility necessary to address local market conditions and the impact that these have on development values.	Comment	Noted and welcome support
C328	1130	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places Clause 2) - We support this reference and recommend additional detail in the Plan on how this can be achieved.	Support	Noted and welcome support. Amend to include reference to additional information
C329	941	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places However, the PCCWM objects to the omission of any reference to 'Secured by Design' principles and the 'Park Mark' parking standards, which would ensure a consistency in designing out crime. Secured by Design is proven to reduce crime and anti-social behaviour by 87% - see Police Scotland research: Secured by Design - The success of Secured by Design – Police Scotland's Stuart Ward showcases extraordinary 87% reduction in crime in Secured by Design properties Park Mark facilities have seen vehicle-related crime drop by 80%: ParkMark - About The Scheme It is recommended that the following modification to the policy (shown in bold) be included after Point 7 of Policy SDS4: 'All new development should include consideration of crime prevention measures, Secured by Design, Park Mark principles, and the need for a maintenance plan to reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.'	Object	Noted. Amend wording to refer to Secured by Design and Park Mark
C330	911	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places The Trust requests incorporation of cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the justification text to Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places, for example at para 3.64, to reflect the role active incorporation of the canal network can have in delivering good design, well-being, and sustainable travel and the need to take the canal into account when designing new development near it (ACTION REQUEST). We believe protection and enhancement of the canal network through design, layout and integration into developments should always be an expectation for canal-side sites, as this is consistent with the NPPF chapters on design and the historic environment and the National Design Guide on integrating nature and public spaces. The avoidance of fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour reduction can also be achieved through the use of good design techniques. Future local Design Codes can also provide developers with detailed guidance encouraging high quality design, following on from the principles advocated within the National Design Guide and Design Code. Given the importance and extent of canals within the borough such codes will need to address waterside developments specifically and various key design principles for successful canal-side developments could be outlined within them, including creating activation with the canal, natural surveillance and appropriate landscaping. The Trust requests consultation on any local design codes which are to be developed (ACTION REQUEST). We acknowledge that positive place-making next to a canal, waterway or water body is often site-specific on a case-by-case basis, and therefore early consultation with the Trust is recommended to receive guidance on the best approach to achieving good design. This could be through stakeholder-led master planning approaches or through individual pre-application engagements. The Trust requests on-going engagement from the Council on submitted pre-application enquiries, and can also encourage developers to seek pre-application advice from us direct: https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design/our-statutory-consultee-role/what-were-interested-in/pre-application-advice ACTION REQUEST) In relation to design quality, the canal network also presents opportunities for positive placemaking and the reduction of anti-social behaviour as commented on above in relation to Policy SDS4 - Achieving Well-designed Places.	Comment	noted. Some of these issues are not directly related to the SLP but will be passed on to other sections of the Council as necessary.

C331	879	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Policy SD55 - Cultural Facilities and the Visitor Economy	Visitor facilities and attractions for canal and towpath users in Sandwell are very limited at present. This means that touring canal boats have little reason to linger in the Borough. The new main line and Tame valley canals are bleak and isolated through much of their length. The plan should aim to enhance the attraction of Owen Street and Smethwick for canal users, and improving links to the BCLM, Dudley Zoo and the Dudley Canal Trust.	Comment	Comment noted
C332	763	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SD55 - Cultural Facilities and the Visitor Economy	<p>Policy SD55 - Cultural Facilities and the Visitor Economy</p> <p>The PCCWM highlights the need to consider the threat of terrorism and measures to minimise crime and anti-social behaviour which can be associated with large gatherings, such as in town centres, under the remit of Policy SD55. All locations which will generate crowds in public places should consider the need for appropriate security measures in the design of buildings and spaces. Good counter-terrorism protective security can also support wider prevention.</p> <p>Policy SD55 is considered to be one measure to achieve Strategic Objective 7 (ensuring communities in Sandwell are safe and resilient and social cohesion is promoted and enhanced) and Objective 11 (to ensure new development supports health and wellbeing).</p> <p>The PCCWM supports the inclusion of the following wording in Policy SD55 (point 5), which take on board the previous representations made on behalf of the WMP in respect of Policy CSP5:</p> <p>'An assessment should be undertaken (as part of the design of new developments likely to attract large numbers of people) to demonstrate and document how potential security and crime-related vulnerabilities have been identified, assessed and where necessary, addressed in a manner that is appropriate and proportionate.'</p> <p>However, the justification to the policy does not reference the background to this wording and why it has been included. It is requested that the justification takes account of, and references, the following policy background:</p> <p>•The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that for all locations which will generate crowds in public places, consideration should be given to appropriate security measures in the design of buildings and spaces. Good counter-terrorism protective security can also support wider prevention. The PPG identifies a number of sources of guidance in this respect including 'Protecting Crowded Places: Design and Technical Issues', which refers to 'Secured by Design and 'Safer Parking' standards, 'National Counter Terrorism Security Office (NaCTSO)' crowded places and 'Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI)' built environment guidance.</p> <p>The PPG goes on to advise that as well as the above referenced guidance, local police Counter Terrorism Security Advisors (CTSAs) and Designing Out Crime Officers (DOCOS) have training and experience of advising on security, are independent in their advice and have further access to more specialist resources where required, including the NaCTSO and the CPNI, and states that local planning authorities should consider referring appropriate planning applications for public access buildings and spaces to the police who will determine the appropriate specialist input (Paragraph: 012 Reference ID:53-012-20190722 revised 22nd July 2019)</p> <p>•The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear in its requirement that local planning authorities should anticipate and address possible malicious threats, especially in locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate. It states at paragraph 97 that, 'Planning policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements by: a) anticipating and addressing possible malicious threats and natural hazards, especially in locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate. Policies for relevant areas (such as town centre and regeneration frameworks), and the layout and design of developments, should be informed by the most up-to-date information available from the police and other agencies about the nature of potential threats and their implications. This includes appropriate and proportionate steps that can be taken to reduce vulnerability, increase resilience and ensure public safety and security.'</p> <p>The facts to the above paragraph confirm this includes transport hubs, night time economy venues, cinemas and theatres, sports stadia and arenas, shopping centers, health and education.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Amend justification to clarify guidance
C333	767	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SD55 - Cultural Facilities and the Visitor Economy	Dudley MBC supports references within the justification text to assets that are also within Dudley borough, including cross-boundary sites such as Bumble Hole and Warrens Park.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C334	1132	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SD55 - Cultural Facilities and the Visitor Economy	We support the reference to heritage tourism and welcome its inclusion in the policy, as well as in the justification paragraphs.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C335	938	West Midlands Housing Association Planning Consortium [91]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Iwan Evans, Assistant Planner) [90]	Policy SD56 - Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>Policy SD56 sets out Sandwell's policy approach to the Green Belt. Supporting text to draft Policy SD56 at paragraph 3.85 states:</p> <p>"It is the Council's view that there are no exceptional circumstances in Sandwell that would justify amending current boundaries and releasing any areas of green belt for new development. While there is an identified shortfall of land suitable for housing and economic development, this of itself does not outweigh the need to maintain the openness and permanence of the green belt within Sandwell, especially given the densely developed and urban character of most of the rest of the borough."</p> <p>Paragraph 141 of the NPPF (2023) states that before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, all other reasonable for meeting its identified need for development should be considered. Paragraph 141 goes on to state "This will be assessed through the examination of its strategic policies, which will take into account the preceding paragraph, and whether the strategy:</p> <p>a) makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land;</p> <p>b) optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and</p> <p>c) has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground."</p> <p>In relation to points a), b) and c) of paragraph 141 of the NPPF (2023) and the discussion above relating to the duty-to-cooperate, the ability of neighbouring authorities to accommodate the shortfall in the housing needs of Sandwell remains uncertain.</p> <p>Similarly, the Urban Capacity Appraisal (November 2023) demonstrates the limited capacity of Sandwell in meeting the housing needs of the authorities' residents within its Urban Areas and the limited benefit of increasing development density would have given the scale of the existing shortfall.</p> <p>1 "Where this relates to housing, such needs should be assessed using a clear and justified method, as set out in paragraph 61 of this Framework."</p> <p>Considering the above, the statement that there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant a Green Belt Review is somewhat premature and open to question given the Council has no set plan for how the shortfall in housing needs is going to be met.</p> <p>While the limited extent of Sandwell's Green Belt and historical and environmental significance of Sandwell's Green Belt is appreciated, a more levelled approach to meeting housing need within Sandwell's Green Belt may be more appropriate with the allocation of housing sites to directly address the housing needs of local communities.</p>	Comment	The latest version of the NPPF continues to allow flexibility for local authorities to determine their own approach to the use / allocation of GB to meet housing needs. Given that the Council remains of the view that GB in Sandwell remains highly vulnerable to development pressures and also continues to fulfill the main purposes of GB designation, and that the work done on GB for the BCP remains valid, it does not intend to undertake a formal review of GB boundaries. Potential GB allocations have been considered as part of the reasonable alternatives under the SA, but it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. Allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside .
C336	949	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SD56 - Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>20. Although HBF is pleased to see the Council commit to ongoing working with neighbouring authorities to try an address [unmet housing and employment land need] under the Duty to Cooperate (or its replacement) the fact remains that the Local Plan's policies should ensure the availability of a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land to deliver Sandwell's housing requirement. If it is not possible to do this within the boundary then Green Belt release may be needed.</p> <p>22. HBF believe that Sandwell's inability to meet its housing (and employment) needs requires revisiting the Spatial Strategy and results in the 'exceptional circumstances' that would require the need for a Green Belt review as set out in para 140 of the NPPF.</p>	Comment	The latest version of the NPPF continues to allow flexibility for local authorities to determine their own approach to the use / allocation of GB to meet housing needs. Given that the Council remains of the view that GB in Sandwell remains highly vulnerable to development pressures and also continues to fulfill the main purposes of GB designation, and that the work done on GB for the BCP remains valid, it does not intend to undertake a formal review of GB boundaries. Potential GB allocations have been considered as part of the reasonable alternatives under the SA, and work is ongoing to look at all potential allocations to ensure nothing has been missed, but it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside .

C337	858	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Josh Plant, Senior Promotion and Policy Planner) [209]		Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>Gladman strongly disagree with the Council's position on Green Belt in the borough where they have considered that there are no exceptional circumstances which would justify amending the current boundaries and releasing any areas of green belt for new development. Noting that the shortfall of deliverable land for housing does not outweigh the need to maintain openness and permanence of the Green Belt within Sandwell (Paragraph 3.85 Draft Local Plan).</p> <p>The Local Plan presents a critically low housing land supply that does not come close to meeting the identified housing needs of the borough. Seeking to deliver the homes people desperately need, including affordable homes, in the location they arise represents a very exceptional circumstance in which to review the Green Belt. In addition, it is clear that the council have sought to explore all other reasonable options for meeting its housing needs and therefore a review of the Green belt must be undertaken to understand the most appropriate locations to release land from the Green belt and deliver its development needs1.</p> <p>While it is true that not all areas of Green Belt will represent an appropriate location to deliver growth, the Council should undertake a thorough review to understand how all parcels of the Green Belt perform against the five purposes set out in the Framework. Without this information it is impossible to determine whether Green Belt boundaries could be appropriately amended to accommodate a proportion of the significant shortfall in housing supply.</p>	Object	<p>Comment noted. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF . In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.</p> <p>Given that the Council remains of the view that GB in Sandwell remains highly vulnerable to development pressures and also continues to fulfill the main purposes of GB designation, and that the work done on GB for the BCP remains valid, it does not intend to undertake a formal review of GB boundaries. potential GB allocations have been considered as part of the reasonable alternatives under the SA, and work is ongoing to look at all potential allocations to ensure nothing has been missed, but it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside .</p>
C338	816	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>Sport England supports part 3 of the policy that expressly references improving the value and recreational role of the green belt in Sandwell Valley through improving safe accessibility for all users and by providing facilities for active and passive recreation. The latter contains a proviso with a footnote reference to para 149 of the NPPF which deals with preserving the openness of the green belt when considering the construction of new buildings.</p> <p>Para 150 of the NPPF references certain other forms of development that are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt, which includes e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation). Policy SD6 as currently drafted does not cover this since the footnote only relates to para 149, and the material change of use of land is not addressed elsewhere in the policy.</p> <p>Sport England would wish to see the policy amended to address this point so that the policy is consistent with para 150 of the NPPF.</p>	Comment	<p>Note comment - previous reference to paragraph 149 related to a superceded version of the NPPF; the updated reference referred to is now paragraph 154. Amend footnote to update NPPF ref to GB.</p>
C339	1077	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>3.3 Whilst we agree that the focus of development should be on the urban area and in the most sustainable locations, i) the Council's inability to meet its development needs; ii) the scale of the unmet need; and iii) the absence of any agreed Statement of Common Ground with neighbouring authorities about how the unmet needs might be redistributed, means that it is essential that the Council explore all options to meet the housing needs of the Borough in order for the Plan to be considered sound. This includes carrying out a comprehensive review of Green Belt boundaries to identify and allocate suitable sites in the Green Belt which could towards the development needs of the Borough during the plan period. For these reasons, we fundamentally disagree with the Council's assertion that "exceptional circumstances" do not exist for release of land from the Green Belt.</p> <p>3.4 Moreover, the Council's strategy and approach to the Green Belt is fundamentally at odds with that taken by the consortium of Black Country Authorities in the preparation of the now abandoned Black Country Plan (BCP). The Regulation 18 Draft version of that BCP which was consulted upon in autumn 2021 confirmed that the Black Country Authorities (including Sandwell) considered that there were "exceptional circumstances" to justify Green Belt release, that it had identified land that, if developed, would cause the least harm to Green Belt and the landscape. In that context, the draft BCP proposed to release land from the Green Belt for housing in Sandwell.</p> <p>3.5 The draft SLP does not provide any evidence which justifies the change in approach to the Green Belt from that contained in the BCP.</p>	Object	<p>Note comment. Work is being undertaken through the DTC and a statement of common ground will be produced for the Reg 19 Plan and examination. Work is also proceeding across the HMA area and will be used to inform further iterations of the SLP if necessary and available. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no pressing requirement to undertake a further GB review. The Council does not agree with the respondent's interpretation of the BCP approach to GB - this was a joint plan designed to address housing need across a much wider area than Sandwell alone. As such and given the fact that both Dudley and Walsall contain considerably more GB than Sandwell, it was appropriate to consider the GB as a source of additional provision across the wider BC area. At no time was the GB in Sandwell considered as a location appropriate to provide for any significant housing or employment provision, reflected in the dearth of sites identified within it for such development.</p>
C340	1189	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>3.45 Criterion 2 of the policy notes that: "Sandwell green belt's nature conservation, landscape, heritage and agricultural value will be protected and enhanced." Wain Estates draw issue with this wording, as it implies that the Green Belt is a designation of both environmental and heritage value, this is not the case, it is a spatial designation for which there can also be both environmental and heritage features and designations within it. This type of wording adds confusion to the purposes of the Green Belt and the value placed upon its protection. This is recognised in the supporting text to the policy at paragraph 3.84 which states that:</p> <p>"While green belt is not itself a reflection of landscape quality or value, large parts of the local green belt are also identified as being of significant historic, environmental and landscape importance."</p> <p>3.46 Wain Estates suggest that the policy wording is amended to make clearer the difference between the spatial designation and the purposes of the Green Belt and the distinction between this and environmental and heritage designations, whilst recognising their potential concurrent nature.</p> <p>3.47 Criterion 3 of the policy states that:</p> <p>"Opportunities will be taken to improve the value and recreational role of the green belt in Sandwell Valley:</p> <p>a. through improving safe accessibility for all users;</p> <p>b. by providing facilities for active and passive recreation (if this preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it"</p> <p>3.48 It must be recognised that in order to improve the value and recreational role of the Green Belt in Sandwell, development will likely need to occur. Land within private ownership is not accessible to the public for these purposes, enhancing access will only come as a compensatory improvement as part of future development proposals through planning applications.</p> <p>3.49 Providing such improvements would form part of a two-way process of negotiation as part of future planning applications, with the provision of housing potentially acting as an enabler, to allow the council to meet the enhanced recreational role of the Green Belt. This also supports Sandwell's wider vision, which seeks to increase accessible open spaces, such spaces need to come from somewhere, the Green Belt is a key facilitator for this, however it will not come forward of its own accord.</p>	Object	<p>Note comments. Disagree that the wording implies that GB relates to environmental or historic designations - the NPPF is clear about the nature of the GB and its roles / purpose and the SLP does not deviate from this. There is also no reason to allow development in the GB to facilitate recreational activity - large areas of Sandwell Valley itself are open for public access. While additional areas of publically accessible open space are always welcome, there is no justification to allocate housing in the GB to allow for it.</p>
C341	655	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>Green Belt land should not merely prevent the coalescence of built up areas, but fulfil a range of functions including access for residents to natural landscapes. Sandwell is surrounded by the conurbation, so local areas of 'countryside' need to be protected.</p>	Support	<p>Noted and welcome support</p>
C342	890	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>Policy SDS6</p> <p>WM CPRE support the Policy to protect the Green Belt within Sandwell, including the very important asset of the Sandwell Valley.</p>	Support	<p>Noted and welcome support</p>
C343	1237	Consortium of Housebuilders and Land Promoters [240]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SDS6 – Sandwell's Green Belt	<p>There is no agreed strategy between the 14 GBBCHMA authorities as to how the unmet need up to 2031 will be accommodated, notwithstanding the significant scale of unmet need emerging beyond 2031. This is clear from Sandwell's own evidence, as part of this consultation it refers to confirming at a later date any likely contribution to its own shortfall, this however is only likely to address a small proportion of it.</p> <p>In the absence of this strategic level agreement, all 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be exploring all growth options in order to meet its own objectively assessed needs and those of the wider GBBCHMA, if their plan is to be considered positively prepared.</p> <p>In Sandwell's case, it is clear that not all growth options have been explored to meet its own objectively assessed needs, let alone those of the wider HMA. The plan proposes a supply of circa 38% of its total need and exacerbating the shortfall of the wider HMA by circa 18,600 homes. Under NPPF paragraph 139, Sandwell's unmet need alone represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing the borough's Green Belt boundaries, as does the scale of unmet need across the wider HMA.</p> <p>In summary, the 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be seeking to agree a strategy now for how the unmet needs up to 2031 and beyond will be comprehensively met in full. As part of this all authorities should be exploring all options for growth, including the release of Green Belt land, given the unmet need represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing Green Belt boundaries.</p>	Object	<p>Note comment. Work is being undertaken through the DTC and a statement of common ground will be produced for the Reg 19 Plan and examination. Work is also proceeding across the HMA area and will be used to inform further iterations of the SLP if necessary and available. A review of the GB was undertaken for the BCP and it is the view of Sandwell Council that this work remains extant. As such, there is no intention to undertake a further GB review. This is also in accordance with the recent revision to the NPPF . In December 2023 there was a key change to national planning policy as set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF: "Once established, there is no requirement for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed or changed when plans are being prepared or updated. Authorities may choose to review and alter Green Belt boundaries where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, in which case proposals for changes should be made only through the planmaking process." This change means that local authorities preparing a Local Plan who do not have enough suitable land to meet their housing or employment development needs, can now choose whether or not to review the green belt to release land for more housing or employment development.</p> <p>Given that the Council remains of the view that GB in Sandwell remains highly vulnerable to development pressures and also continues to fulfill the main purposes of GB designation, and that the work done on GB for the BCP remains valid, it does not intend to undertake a formal review of GB boundaries. potential GB allocations have been considered as part of the reasonable alternatives under the SA, and work is ongoing to look at all potential allocations to ensure nothing has been missed, but it is the case that Sandwell does not have sufficient land to meet its housing and employment land needs and even allocating sites in the GB would not make any significant difference to this position. allocating GB would instead have significant adverse impacts on openness, coalescence and protection of countryside .</p>
C344	656	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	<p>Green infrastructure is particularly important in densely populated areas like Sandwell.</p>	Support	<p>Comment noted</p>
C345	661	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	<p>- This policy should make mention of the Local Nature Recovery network, as green and blue infrastructure are integral parts of this.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted</p>
C346	891	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	<p>Policy SDS7</p> <p>The policy should be strengthened to exclude solar arrays and other energy related developments on any Green Belt or other agricultural land or other green space. The only right place for solar panels is on roofs and brownfield land, such as above car parks. See CPRE report on this subject (attached).</p> <p>WM CPRE support the Policy to protect Green and Blue infrastructure, including the very important asset of the Sandwell Valley and the key wildlife, nature and amenity assets which stretch out and link with the countryside in Walsall, Birmingham and further afield. We are not in a position to comment in detail on the SNE policies to protect nature and heritage in the Borough but generally consider that protection should be of the highest order.</p>	Support	<p>Comment noted</p>

C347	1134	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	We would request a clause to be included in this policy regarding the historic environment and its function within Green/ Blue Infrastructure.	Comment	Comment noted. Amended as above (rep ID 1133)
C348	817	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	Sport England generally supports the Council's approach to recognise that Green and Blue Infrastructure can provide multiple benefits to local communities. We note that para 3.86 explains that the terms Green and Blue Infrastructure are taken to include various land types including h) sports pitches and recreational areas. We also note the reference in para 3.88 part b) to the role of GI as places for sport, play, walking and cycling, and d) supporting healthy lifestyles. Whilst the policy itself contains several cross-references to other policies in the plan, including those relating to nature conservation (SNE1-SNE6), climate change (SCC1-SCC6), and wildlife habitats (SNE2), there is no cross reference to policies SHW4 on Open Space and recreation nor SHW5 Playing Fields and Sports Facilities. Given the content of paras 3.86 and 3.88 we consider that an appropriate part to the policy should be added that cross-references these policies for consistency in the overall approach to addressing the multi-functional role of the Borough's GI.	Comment	Comment noted. Include cross reference to open space policy
C349	865	Mr Kevin Priest [210]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	Green and blue infrastructure pg 74/75 Townscapes – Why not introduce covered seating structures with greenery incorporated in the design, planting on roof. See Stone Street Square Dudley	Comment	Comment noted. Where appropriate, SMBC does include green street furniture or parklets (e.g. West Bromwich) to increase the amount of green infrastructure in urban locations, and will continue to do so on its own schemes. It will also look to private development proposals to include such infrastructure where appropriate, hence the policy.
C350	731	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	Support. Green and blue infrastructure should also be enhanced through reduction in pollution, fly tipping, waste, litter etc, as well as infrastructure like sealed surfaces for cyclists and wheelchairs	Support	Noted and welcome support
C351	912	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell	The Trust welcomes inclusion of the canals within Policy SDS7 - Green and Blue Infrastructure in Sandwell and its introductory and justification texts. We also request partner engagement with the Council in the forthcoming preparation, adoption and implementation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy as identified in Policy SDS5 sub- section 1a. The Trust reiterates its Issues and Options advice in relation to Green Infrastructure improvements, "There are opportunities for developers and other agencies to contribute towards further GI improvements through a variety of mechanisms, such as developer contributions through the planning process, corporate partnerships https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/donate/partner-with-us/corporate-partnerships or adopting a section of canal https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/donate/partner-with-us/volunteering-in-partnership . Improvements could also be made through the design of canal-side developments providing open space and landscaping adjacent to the waterside. Any future policy should acknowledge such opportunities and will need to set out the requirements for GI developer contributions consistent with para 34 of the NPPF. GI Improvements could also be made through the provision of recreation facilities for use by the public. In the context of the canal network this could range from paddle craft launching provision and fishing pegs, including wheelchair accessible pegs, to larger visitor attractions, such as at the Roundhouse (albeit not an example within Sandwell), which provides for guided tours, visitors centre with exhibitions, events, and a café within a canal-side Grade II* Listed Building. The Plan should recognise that GI improvement opportunities can come about through future development providing a policy framework for securing improvements whether that be through the design and layout of a site, through financial contributions or other means. It is also important to acknowledge that the quality of GI is dependent on its ongoing maintenance, which should be addressed in policy and considered early on at the design stage, to ensure it continues to provide benefits for users."	Comment	Noted. Comment will be flagged to officer undertaking work on GBI strategy
C352	899	National Grid [79]	Avison Young (Mr Matt Verlander, Director) [77]	Policy SEC1 – Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs	Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets: Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets. Details of the sites affecting NGET assets are provided below. Development Plan Document Site Reference SEC1-9 Roway Lane, Oldbury - VT ROUTE TWR (019 - 036): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: KITWELL - OCKER HILL SEC1-7 Site of Bilport Lane, Wednesbury - VT ROUTE TWR (001A - 016): 400Kv	Comment	Comment noted
C353	870	South Staffordshire Council (Mr Edward Fox, Strategic Planning Team Manager) [87]		Policy SEC1 – Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs	The latest evidence on employment needs covering the Black Country (Black Country EDNA 2023 update) has identified a need for 185 ha of employment land in Sandwell. There is an identified supply of 42 hectares, leaving a shortfall of 143ha. to be exported to authorities with a strong existing or potential functional economic relationship with Sandwell. South Staffordshire Council paused local plan production following completion of a Regulation 19 Publication Plan consultation in December 2022 in light of proposed Government changes to national planning policy. South Staffordshire Council has now recommenced work on plan production but is awaiting the final adoption of changes to national policy before proceeding to an updated Publication Plan (Regulation 19) consultation in Spring 2024. The Regulation 19 Plan was supported by a draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) across the South Staffordshire FEMA (consisting of South Staffordshire, Cannock, Dudley, Stafford, Walsall and Wolverhampton), plus Sandwell, as a result of its close economic relationship with the three other Black Country authorities that fall within the South Staffordshire FEMA. At this time, South Staffordshire through this SoCG indicated its position, as set out in our November 2022 Publication Plan, that we have a 36ha (excluding WMI) surplus of employment land that we can make available to unmet needs of the Black Country FEMA. Following the decision by national government to amend national planning policy with respect to Green Belt land releases South Staffordshire Council is currently reassessing the scale of future commitments with a view to producing a revised draft local plan in Spring 2024. To accompany the revised plan SSDC is undertaking an update to the evidence base which will include revisiting the EDNA prior to our next stage of public consultation and this will inform the council's decisions with respect to future employment land commitments. This will inform an update to the SoCG across the FEMA and our position in relation to contributing to unmet employment needs.	Comment	Comment noted - Continued work with South Staffs through Dtc
C354	1155	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SEC1 – Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs	We have not been able to comment on the specific employment proposals at this time, we will consider these in the new year and would welcome a meeting with the Council to understand how the historic environment has been considered. If there are any proposed allocations which could cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, including their setting, we would expect to see heritage impact assessment.	Comment	Comment noted - further work with Historic England
C355	850	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SEC1 – Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs	Policy SEC1 (4) is concerned with the regeneration of existing employment areas: 'Within the existing employment areas subject to Policies SEC2, SEC3 and SEC4, the Council will support, with public intervention as necessary, the regeneration and renewal of such areas, including their environmental enhancement and incorporation of sustainable measures to mitigate climate change impacts. Industrial developments will need to demonstrate how they have been designed to maximise resistance and resilience to climate change, as set out in Policy SCC1.' SEC1 should acknowledge that the housing policies of the Sandwell Local Plan include existing/former employment sites/areas that are allocated for and transitioning to residential use. Some of the existing/former employment sites/areas being brought forward for housing will be alongside other employment areas being retained in employment use. SEC1 should set out that any proposals for the regeneration or renewal of existing employment areas will be considered in context of the potential impact on neighbouring land uses, both existing and proposed.	Comment	Comment noted - no future action required
C356	907	Clowes Developments (UK) Limited [214]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SEC1 – Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs	Part 1 It should state how much new employment land is being allocated. Part 2 This is overly optimistic. Redevelopment of employment land is limited on account of very low vacancy rates. There is also very limited scope for "intensification" of employment sites to deliver substantive new employment space as the gross to net plot ratios tend to be very low.	Comment	Comment noted - The policy does state how much new employment land is being allocated.

C357	782	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SEC1 – Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs	<p>SLP Policy SEC1- Providing for Economic Growth and Jobs, identifies that the borough will provide at least 1,206ha of employment land. This consists of 1,177ha of occupied employment which is allocated as strategic, local or other employment land and 29ha of land that is currently vacant.</p> <p>The SLP notes that the latest Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA, produced jointly in 2023 between the Black Country local authorities) identifies an employment land requirement of 185ha for Sandwell (2020-2041). The SLP (at paragraph 2.14) states that completions for 2020-2022 and the supply of land available for employment use totals 42ha, including a vacant land supply of 29ha. There is a resulting shortfall of 143ha against Sandwell's employment land requirements. The SLP (at the supporting text to Policy SEC1) identifies that the shortfall will be addressed through the Black Country Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) and that unmet needs should be exported, as far as possible, to authorities that have a strong existing or potential functional economic relationship with Sandwell. This work is ongoing under the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The general approach of the SLP towards employment land provision is supported by Dudley MBC, however we would note that the EDNA published as part of the SLP consultation is dated August 2023. The most up to date version of the EDNA is October 2023, which reflects the current employment land requirements and supply position for all the four Black Country local authorities. This identifies an employment land requirement of 186ha for Sandwell, which increases to 212ha if the replacement of employment land losses is accounted for (for information, the draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP18-Economic growth and job creation identifies that the need for the replacement of employment land losses, equivalent to 26ha for Dudley borough, will be monitored over the plan period). We would welcome confirmation that the most current version of the EDNA (October 2023) will be used to inform the next stage of the SLP.</p> <p>Dudley MBC recommends that the text at current paragraph 2.14 is replicated in the supporting justification text to Policy SEC1 to clarify that the employment land supply for Sandwell is 42ha (2020-2041). We note that EDNA and the Black Country Employment Land Supply Paper (2023) identifies an additional supply of circa 78ha arising from large and small windfall sites within the Black Country which would further reduce the employment land supply shortfall (it is noted that this figure is not disaggregated to the local authority level at this time). The borough specific contribution from the West Midlands Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (as detailed in the Stantec report of 2021)1 can also be accounted for, as per the supporting text contained within the draft Dudley Local Plan in respect of this contribution from outside the Black Country. These additional sources of supply should be recognised within the SLP supporting justification text going forward.</p> <p>The latest EDNA (October 2023) and Black Country Employment Land Supply Paper (October 2023) has informed the draft Dudley Local Plan. The evidence base has been produced jointly by the Black Country local authorities, reflecting the strong FEMA that exists. This evidence base identifies individual local authority employment land requirements as part of a wider Black Country requirement. It also applies this to the employment land supply. The Employment Land Supply Paper notes the contributions that have been secured to date from other local authorities towards the Black Country employment land supply shortfall, namely from Shropshire and South Staffordshire at this time. It is envisaged that these discussions will continue as the respective local plans progress and the latest position will need to be reflected in our respective Regulation 19 local plans.</p> <p>We note that there is one employment site allocation nearby the Dudley borough boundary at Conegre Business Park for 7.22ha (reference SEC1-5). This is situated in proximity of the Strategic Employment Area (Ionic Business Park) within Dudley. The proposals for the site should take account of any cross-boundary infrastructure considerations, particularly impacts upon key infrastructure such as highways.</p> <p>This site is close to the A4123/borough boundary and depending on the nature of the development, increased traffic may impact on this key route which is currently being improved to facilitate both active travel and bus route enhancements. It remains a cross boundary joint improvement initiative including input from both local authorities, Black Country Transport and Transport for the West Midlands. Continued joint working in respect of any cross-boundary implications would be welcomed, including consultations on any planning applications, as appropriate.</p>	Comment	Comments noted - The most up to date EDNA (October 2023) will be used to inform the Reg 19 plan. Look into rewording para 2.14 to reflect the supporting justification text to policy SEC1. Looking into making reference to the small sites supply of 78 hectares across the Black Country and the 67 hectares (18 ha Sandwell) at West Midlands Strategic Rail freight Interchange in the Policy. Finally engage with Dudley regarding the development of the Conegre Business Park Site.
C358	1156	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SEC2 – Strategic Employment Areas	We have not been able to comment on the specific employment proposals at this time, we will consider these in the new year and would welcome a meeting with the Council to understand how the historic environment has been considered. If there are any proposed allocations which could cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, including their setting, we would expect to see heritage impact assessment	Comment	Comment noted - further work with Historic England
C359	784	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SEC2 – Strategic Employment Areas	It is noted that the Conegre Industrial Estate is identified as a Local Employment Area. This lies adjacent to Ionic Business Park within Dudley borough which is identified as a Strategic Employment Area. It is noted that this reflects the findings of the Black Country Employment Area Review (BEAR, 2021).	Comment	Comment noted - look into the score of the Conegre Industrial Estate BEAR score
C360	783	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SEC2 – Strategic Employment Areas	Dudley MBC supports the SLP approach to Strategic Employment Areas (Policy SEC2), Local Employment Areas (Policy SEC3) and Other Employment Sites (Policy SEC4). The policy approach is broadly consistent with that set out in the draft Dudley Local Plan. We note that the followings areas are identified as Local Employment Areas (LEA), and we support these designations as they are consistent with cross boundary/adjacent sites to the boundary of Dudley borough: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Brymill Industrial Estate (adjacent to Budden Road, Coseley LEA in Dudley) •The Angle Ring Company Ltd (adjacent to Budden Road, Coseley LEA in Dudley) •Bloomfield Park (adjacent to Budden Road, Coseley and Birmingham New Road LEAs in Dudley) •Providence Street, Cradley Heath (adjacent to Westminster Industrial Estate LEA in Dudley) •Eakemore Industrial Estate (adjacent to Cakemore Road LEA in Dudley) •Station Road Industrial Estate (adjacent to Nimmings Road LEA in Dudley) 	Support	Noted and welcome support
C361	851	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SEC3 – Local Employment Areas	Supported is the inclusion of the clarification at SEC3 (3) that not all areas will be suitable for all employment uses. SEC3 should include specific reference to the fact that the housing policies of the Sandwell Local Plan include existing/former employment sites/areas being brought forward for housing will be alongside other employment areas being retained in employment use. SEC3 should set out that any proposals for new uses in local employment areas that require planning permission will be considered in context of the potential impact on neighbouring land uses, both existing and proposed.	Comment	Comment noted
C362	759	Mr Mark Davies [32]	Iceni Projects (Miss Lydia Frimley, Assistant Planner) [31]	Policy SEC3 – Local Employment Areas	A flexible and adaptive policy position to support the more appropriate regeneration approach to these heritage assets is required, in the form of a new allocation for this site. The Chance Heritage Trust therefore request that the Local Employment wash over be removed from the Soho Foundry and Mint parts of the site. See submitted stand-alone representations for further information.	Object	Comment noted
C363	1002	Chance Heritage Trust [56]	Iceni Projects (Katie Inglis, Associate Director) [215]	Policy SEC3 – Local Employment Areas	<p>Policy SEC3 – Local Employment Areas</p> <p>The site forms part of the Foundry Lane (south) SEC3 Local Employment Area Allocation. Accordingly, under this proposed policy, only industrial uses, and ancillary uses which support the LEA's function, will be supported in the LEA.</p> <p>The rationale for this policy is stated in the supporting text. It notes that LEAs play an important role in the local economy as they offer a source of mainly low-cost industrial units. The supporting text notes that one of the key characteristics of LEAs is "a critical mass of active industrial and service uses and premises that are fit for purpose".</p> <p>The financial feasibility of restoring the heritage assets on the site is significantly compromised within the framework of this allocation, as it is tailored more for generic industrial spaces, trade, haulage or logistics related uses and doesn't recognise the unique circumstances of the site. Currently, the heritage assets on the site are not in active industrial use and the restoration of the assets for these uses is not the optimal viable use, nor are these uses suitable for the existing buildings and structures on the site, and are likely to jeopardise the funding available to CHT and/or others to deliver the restoration and regeneration works.</p> <p>The Council's own site assessment report of the March 2023 states "it is accepted that the future of the site is somewhat dependent on introducing a high quality, mixed use, heritage led, regeneration programme", however, this assessment has not been reflected in the proposed policy position in the Draft Local Plan, as Policy SEC3 only allows for more traditional industrial uses. This represents a significant potential policy hurdle and blocker to the regeneration aims and objectives of this site, and does not accord with Paragraph 190 and Chapter 16 of the NPPF, which requires Plans to "set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk of neglect, decay and other threats. This strategy should take into account a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation..."</p> <p>Without the retention of the mixed-use allocation and/or the provision of a site specific allocation to support alternative, viable, feasible and most optimal use of these buildings, the site is likely to remain vacant, rundown and closed to the public. CHT, a trust which is driven by the protection, restoration, and celebration of the Soho Foundry buildings, consider that the inclusion of the site within the wider employment allocation would render it undeliverable, and provides a significant barrier to the restoration of the site.</p> <p>If the site remains in a predominantly industrial allocation, CHT may have no choice but to abandon the site, which begs the question as to whether a commercial developer or industrial business will be willing to take on this financial cost and afford equal priority to the history and celebration of these assets. CHT agree that some employment uses could form part of the mix of uses proposed, but if the policy position is overly restrictive, as currently set out in the Reg 18 Local Plan, then it is likely that funding availability to restore the site will be limited.</p> <p>Policy SEC3 Response – Site specific allocation</p> <p>To facilitate the regeneration of the site, it is essential to carve out a specific site allocation that caters solely and explicitly to the Soho Foundry buildings, so it is viable and not hinged upon the wider industrial-led regeneration of the area. This bespoke allocation should provide the flexibility needed to explore a range of uses that align with heritage-led regeneration, enabling CHT to achieve its mission without the constraints imposed by the Policy SEC3 framework</p> <p>There is a clear policy rationale at the national level for a new approach to be considered in the next Local Plan. Paragraph 122 of the NPPF emphasises the need for planning policies to reflect changes in demand for land. Given the prolonged lack of progress under the existing policy, it is prudent to reassess and reallocate the land for a more deliverable use. The proposed draft policy hinders the ability of the site to be restored and fulfil alternative needs, including the restoration and celebration of unique heritage assets of national value.</p>	Object	Comment noted - as the wider area is employment in nature it could become a employment led mixed use allocation.

C364	1157	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SEC3 – Local Employment Areas	We have not been able to comment on the specific employment proposals at this time, we will consider these in the new year and would welcome a meeting with the Council to understand how the historic environment has been considered. If there are any proposed allocations which could cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, including their setting, we would expect to see heritage impact assessment.	Comment	Comment noted - further work with Historic England
C365	1264	Palmer Timber Limited [230]	Miss C Buchanan [202]	Policy SEC3 – Local Employment Areas	<p>Policy SEC3 - Local Employment Area</p> <p>Proposed Local Employment Area designation - Current Housing site allocation</p> <p>We are disappointed to see the housing designation has been removed from the site as we consider the site has ongoing potential to accommodate residential development. The site is surrounded by existing residential development to the east, west and south and therefore is in a location which is suitable to support additional residential development.</p> <p>We do not consider there is the requirement for the site to be removed from the Local Plan as having potential to accommodate residential development during the emerging plan period.</p> <p>The circumstance of the site that warranted its allocation for residential housing in the current adopted plan remain unchanged and therefore the site should retain its designation as a potential residential site.</p> <p>The site is a brownfield site in a sustainable location which offers excellent potential as a future residential site.</p> <p>My client, in correspondence with the Council, highlighted that the site is in employment use currently, however, the business is under constant review and the current view on the site may be subject to change over the medium-long term.</p> <p>This indicated that there could be potential for redevelopment of the site to housing in the medium -long term, during the emerging plan period. Therefore, removing the residential development allocation on the site will hinder the forward planning potential of the site and risk a site become vacant and derelict should employment uses on site no longer be viable.</p> <p>One of the main objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to significantly boost the supply of houses, (paragraph 60, NPPF, 2023), the policy states "it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward".</p>	Object	The site is considered suitable for employment and housing use, however it is not clear when this site would be available for development as the site is currently operating and has expanded. Therefore it is proposed to amend the allocation to SECA which protects the current use but does not preclude it coming forward for residential use should the criteria in the policy be met. Should a site be allocated for development in the local plan, the potential impacts on environmental allocations can be assumed to have been taken into account when that decision to allocate was made. As a result, while mitigation, enhancement and BNG requirements will still need to be addressed, the site itself can be considered to be acceptable in principle for development. Development or redevelopment within the boundary of the existing site is also likely to be acceptable in principle, depending on the details of the proposals. The specific designation referred to is a very longstanding one dating back many years to former versions of the local plan for Sandwell. It does not appear to have been the case that the wildlife corridor designation has had any impact on the use of the site nor on any development that may have occurred in the interim.
C366	896	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SEC4 – Other Employment Sites	<p>Policy SEC4</p> <p>WM CPRE generally supports the reallocation of employment land for housing where the land is not needed for employment use and there is a good case for doing so.</p>	Support	Comment noted
C367	900	National Grid [79]	Avison Young (Mr Matt Verlander, Director) [77]	Policy SEC4 – Other Employment Sites	<p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets:</p> <p>Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets. Details of the sites affecting NGET assets are provided below.</p> <p>Development Plan Document Site Reference 70-74 Crankhall Lane - VT ROUTE TWR (001A - 016): 400kV Overhead Transmission Line route: BERKSWELL - OCKER HILL</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C368	677	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Policy SEC4 – Other Employment Sites	The intention of the 'flexible' policy SEC4 is welcome, the wording of the policy is unlikely to produce beneficial change in these, often substandard areas. The stringent conditions in Clause 2 make changes to other uses, including housing, unlikely without a long-term public programme of land assembly. The policy should contain a clause favouring developments (1a and 1b) which demonstrate a positive impact on the wider local environment, economy and climate change mitigation.	Comment	Support noted
C369	1065	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SEC5 – Improving Access to the Labour Market	While we have no specific policies we would change in this section, we strongly welcome policy SEC5, in terms of access to labour markets. Yet accessibility could also be captured in the Strategic Employment Areas policies and Local Employment Areas, given that Sandwell has higher levels of non-car ownership than the rest of the West Midlands, so we need to ensure that all new employment is accessible by sustainable and active travel modes, for as many people to access as possible.	Support	Comment noted
C370	1140	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHE1 – Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas	We welcome the inclusion of this policy. We would request that there are some amendments to the wording to ensure it is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 199 to 205 particularly. Heritage assets are an 'irreplaceable resource' and efforts should be made to ensure that the significance of heritage assets, including their setting are protected. The policy wording in clause 1 and 2 can be strengthened to reflect this. The wording in clause 3 is welcome and we are supportive of the need for Heritage Impact Assessment. The assessment should also set out the level of harm, how harm can be avoided or mitigated against and any opportunities for enhancement. Clause 4, setting in itself is not a heritage asset but it should be included within the section on significance and can still be a reason for refusal where the setting contributes to the significance of an asset, but will be affected by proposed development. Recording the loss of any heritage asset/ features on the Historic Environment Record (HER) would also be beneficial to include within this policy. Consider the wording for clause 5 to ensure the protection of a Conservation Area. We would recommend deleting clause 6. Paragraph 4.121 relates to this paragraph also.	Support	<p>Comments noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Amend policy wording to reflect irreplaceable nature of resource.</p> <p>Amend reference to assessments to include need to specify and address harm.</p> <p>Amend to refer to recording loss on HER.</p> <p>Delete part 6</p>
C371	670	Dr Michael Hodder [48]		Policy SHE1 – Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas	This policy is titled Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas but parts 1, 2 and 3 of the policy then talks about heritage assets and their settings- heritage assets, as defined in the NPPF, include locally listed buildings and sites of archaeological interest. The wording of parts 1,2 and 3 is welcomed, but perhaps the policy was intended to specifically relate to listed buildings and conservation areas (which are designated heritage assets, along with scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens)	Comment	Note comments. Amend wording to clarify as necessary
C372	735	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SHE1 – Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas	Locally listed buildings should be considered and protected through planning policy - to maintain heritage, the unique character of Sandwell and recognition of embedded carbon in existing buildings.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C373	672	Dr Michael Hodder [48]		Policy SHE2 – Development in the Historic Environment	It would be useful to define the Historic Environment Record here or elsewhere in the Plan.	Comment	Amend Glossary
C374	915	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SHE2 – Development in the Historic Environment	<p>This section includes a number of policies in relation to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (SHE1), Development in the Historic Environment (SHE2), Locally Listed Buildings (SHE3), and Archaeology (SHE4).</p> <p>In particular the Trust welcomes mention of 'the canal network and its associated infrastructure, surviving canal- side pre-1939 buildings and structures, and archaeological evidence of the development of canal-side industries and former canal routes' within SHE2 5e.</p> <p>...</p> <p>The Trust also requests cross-referencing to Canal Policy SNE6 within the justification text to this section of the Policy SHE2 – Development in the Historic Environment, to reflect the role of canal network can have in conserving locally distinctive historic aspects of Sandwell, both designated and non-designated (ACTION REQUEST).</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C375	774	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SHE2 – Development in the Historic Environment	The policy and the supporting justification text references the Black Country Historic Landscape Characterisation Study (2019) and the supporting justification text references that Areas of High Historic Landscape (AHHLV) and Areas of High Historic Townscape value (AHHTV) were identified as part of this study. However, these areas do not then appear to be reflected within the policy itself (in terms of specific reference to them) or identified on the SLP Policies Map. There is also no reference made to the other two Historic Environment Area Designations (HEADS) identified in the Black County HLC - Designed Landscapes of High Historic Value (DLHHV) or Archaeological Priority Areas (APAs). For consistency in the implementation of the shared Black Country evidence base, and in recognition of cross boundary considerations in relation to the historic environment, Dudley MBC would welcome further references to these designations within the policy and for them to be reflected on the Policies Map. This is particularly relevant for site allocations which border/are adjacent to the Dudley borough boundary.	Object	<p>Comment noted. The policy states, "proposals have been prepared with full reference to the Black Country Historic Landscape Characterisation Study (October 2019)," and the supporting text summarises the individual designations in broad terms "This was a review of the existing historic environment evidence base carried out to identify areas of significance to the historic environment, based upon the area's historic landscape and townscape, as well as its archaeological and designed landscape value ." Links to the work have been provided, but for the avoidance of doubt, a more specific reference will be included in the justification.</p> <p>Amend justification to clarify designations and consider including on an inset map.</p>

C376	1141	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHE2 – Development in the Historic Environment	<p>Similar to comments above, ensure that the policy is NPPF compliant and that it seeks to protect and conserve the historic environment and sets out where applications will be refused. As referenced the historic environment is an 'irreplaceable resource' and the NPPF sets out clearly how to deal with harm and how if necessary to apply the tests of harm. Clause 1 for example requests that heritage informs proposals and is considered; there should be a clause that states that harm to heritage will be refused unless xx. Again, clause 2 refers to the need to inform proposals which is beneficial, yet there needs to be wording inserted to prevent harm to the historic environment and conserve their significance, including setting.</p> <p>Where 'historic assets' are referenced this should be amended to state 'heritage assets'.</p> <p>Clause 3, heritage assets should be protected as set out in the NPPF and relevant legislation.</p> <p>Clause 5, delete 'aim'. The policy wording should be strengthened to ensure that heritage assets are protected and conserved in Sandwell. The examples used are useful and provide a context for the type of heritage within the Borough; it would be beneficial to ensure that this describes some examples only and reference the relevant heritage evidence base that prospective developers will need to consider in full.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to have a clause that relates to the need for appropriate qualified individuals undertaking assessment work, that the Historic Environment Record should be considered as a minimum, that views analysis is a useful tool to consider in the wider process etc. for all proposals which could affect heritage.</p> <p>Para 4.123 - Delete 'ancient'.</p> <p>It would be useful to provide some additional information about what a heritage impact assessment could include.</p>	Comment	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Amend to state that where schemes will have a significant adverse impact on the heritage asset in question that cannot be mitigated or justified, they will be refused.</p> <p>Change reference to heritage asset in s.3</p> <p>Amend list in s5 to clarify it is indicative and not exclusive.</p> <p>Note comments - amend justification to include reference to suitably qualified staff etc.</p> <p>Amend para 4.123 as suggested</p> <p>Other aspects of HE's suggested changes are already incorporated in the current NPPF and as such do not need to be replicated in the policy.</p>
C377	671	Dr Michael Hodder [48]		Policy SHE2 – Development in the Historic Environment	No additional comments	Support	Noted.
C378	737	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SHE3 – Locally Listed Buildings	See previous comment. If demolition is required, there should be 100% offset of embedded carbon related to the new development to further make demolition less attractive than restoration.	Support	Comment noted
C379	1142	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHE3 – Locally Listed Buildings	Consider referring to significance generally in this clause. It would be useful to have a link to the Sandwell Local List. We are supportive of a Local List and welcome this.	Support	Comment noted. Not clear which part of the policy is being referred to, unless referring to section 1 and removing reference to architectural and historic significance?
C380	673	Dr Michael Hodder [48]		Policy SHE3 – Locally Listed Buildings	No further comments	Support	Noted and welcome support
C381	1256	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SHE4 - Archaeology	Similarly, we welcome the addition of Chances Glassworks, Smethwick Engine Arm Aqueduct, and Smethwick Engine House within the list of Scheduled Ancient Monuments within Sandwell and acknowledges the protection afforded to them under SNE4 - Archaeology.	Support	Comment noted - We will be reviewing the SFRA
C382	675	Dr Michael Hodder [48]		Policy SHE4 - Archaeology	<p>4. lines 3-5 should read "...conditions of planning permissions for archaeological excavation to be undertaken prior to impact on or loss of the asset, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation to be approved by the Council, followed by analysis and publication of the results. [evaluation is the wrong term here because it refers to assessment undertaken prior to determination of a planning application]</p> <p>5. This should begin "For sites with known or likely archaeological potential..." [the use of the term evaluation in this sentence is correct].</p> <p><u>The Council must consult Historic England about the wording of this policy</u></p>	Comment	Noted. Amend wording as suggested
C383	1143	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHE4 - Archaeology	<p>Considering re-phrasing the opening clause to ensure that the significance of archaeological heritage assets are protected and where possible enhanced.</p> <p>Development proposals which cause harm to heritage assets should be refused unless the specifications set out in the NPPF are met. We consider that the wording should reflect this. There also needs to be consideration of non designated archaeology that could be of national significance. Ensure that heritage assets are referred to in line with the relevant clauses of Section 16 of the NPPF. A separate clause for archaeological investigation would be useful and to set out how it applies to heritage assets. Any archaeological investigation should be carried out by an appropriate and qualified professional and a programme of works agreed by the Council's archaeology officer. A separate clause for recording would be beneficial. Clause 5 we would anticipate that all relevant information would be provided for the Council to assess the level of harm and to then make an informed decision within the context of the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>para 4.133/34 - Additional information would be beneficial.</p> <p>Consider re-ordering the policies to have a historic environment policy first, and then specific policies on asset type, where relevant.</p>	Comment	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Amend to clarify and emphasise importance of non-designated archaeological assets.</p> <p>Part three of the policy already states that schemes that will have an adverse impact on archaeological significance will be refused. Locl plan policies should not repeat what is in national guidance, so repeating the NPPF wording would be unnecessary.</p>
C384	1076	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	2.26The Council proposes to divide its housing requirement into four phases with housing targets for each phase identified in Table 5 of Policy SHO1. However, the Trajectory included at Appendix I of the draft SLP refers to an annual draft housing plan target of 587.7 dwellings per year but also includes an annual requirement which varies year to year. The annual draft housing plan target does not align with the 'phased housing targets' identified in Table 5. It is not, therefore, clear whether the Council is seeking to agree a 'stepped' requirement across the four phases identified in Table 5 or if it is intending its supply to be assessed against the annual draft housing plan target of 587.7 dwellings per year. If the Council is seeking a stepped housing requirement then further justification is required in accordance with the NPPG (Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 68-021-20190722).	Comment	The Council is not proposing a 'stepped' requirement. The four phases set out in Table 5 are there to provide an indication of how many homes are anticipated to be delivered in those timeframes. The Council is not phasing the plan and delivery of the housing requirement. Amend text. The key sources of housing land supply are summarised in Table 5, which also sets out the minimum housing target for each of the Plan-phases: which also provides an indicative number of homes to be delivered in the following timeframes; 2022 - 2027, 2027 - 2032, 2032 - 2037 and 2037 - 2041.
C385	1074	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	2.22The Council's supply assumes that 219 dwellings would come forward in place of vacant retail floorspace in the Borough's centres. However, the calculations which underpin this figure are set out in the Council's SHLAA and appear to be based on entirely arbitrary assumptions in terms of how much floorspace might be converted to housing. There is no certainty that the floorspace would be brought forward for housing and it is, in our view, inappropriate for the Council to be relying on this as part of its supply.	Comment	Comments noted. the NPPF seeks LA to maximise their supply by looking at all possible sources, the WMCA brownfield land study highlighted that possible supply in centres needed to be addressed. Sandwell has looked at the centres and applied a conservative assumption of what can be delivered. It is considered suitable to incorporate this small figure into the housing land supply.
C386	892	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	<p>Policy SHO1</p> <p>Policy SHO1 set outs the current supply of housing and this should be reviewed in line with our objections to Policy SDS 1.</p> <p>We attach the report we commissioned on housing calculations to support this objection.</p>	Object	Comment noted.
C387	1152	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	We have not been able to comment on the specific housing proposals at this time, we will consider these in the new year and would welcome a meeting with the Council to understand how the historic environment has been considered. If there are any proposed allocations which could cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, including their setting, we would expect to see heritage impact assessment.	Comment	Comment noted.
C388	973	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	57.HBF supports the principal of discounting the housing land supply assumptions to take account of non-implementation rates. We note that site with planning permission include a lapse rate of 5% other commitments are SHLAA are discounted by 10% and occupied employment land discounted by 15%, but these figures should be clearly evidenced. HBF also notes that no allowance is made for non-delivery of windfall sites and we believe one is needed. HBF would question if the discount rates should in fact be higher especially for sites that are currently occupied in employment use. The anticipated loss of current employment sites to housing further underlines the need for housing and employment to be considered together, and for the potential implications of not meeting with the housing and employment need of the borough to present the exceptional circumstances required to justify Green Belt release.	Comment	Comments noted. The discounts applied are consistent with those used in the Black Country Core Strategy, and also those used in the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA Strategic Growth Study (GL Hearn), February 2018, which compared the BCA with other HMA local authorities. This Study concluded that applying a higher discount of 15% to some allocations in the Black Country is appropriate, because this reflects the significant proportion of the land supply on occupied employment land with delivery challenges. However, significant constraints still affect the remaining supply on occupied employment land and other housing allocations, as evidenced by the Viability and Delivery Study conclusions, which mean that there is a reliance on external funding to deliver a significant proportion of sites.
C389	971	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	55.In relation to criteria one, HBF's detailed comments in relation to the amount of housing needed in Sandwell can be found in our response to policy SD1: Development Strategy. In summary, HBF request that the standard method LHN should be the minimum starting point for establishing the housing requirement and the Council should then fully considers all of the issues that may result in a need for a higher housing requirement, including the need to provide a range and choice of sites, the need for flexibility, viability considerations and whether higher levels of open-market housing are required in order to secure increased delivery of affordable housing. HBF suggests that these considerations should result in a higher housing requirement for Sandwell which set be set out in the Local Plan. Only then should consideration around deliverability and housing land supply come into play, the housing requirement should be established first.	Comment	Comments noted. The Council have used the standard method to calculate the need and New evidence (Local Housing Need review 2024, Icen) considers that an uplift to LHN is not required to support economic growth.

C390	857	Gladman Developments Ltd (Mr Josh Plant, Senior Promotion and Policy Planner) [209]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	Gladman are concerned that the Local Plan only proposes to deliver 11,167 homes between 2022- 2041 against an identified housing need of 29,773 homes, representing a shortfall of 18,606 homes, over 60%. This is a critically low level of housing provision in a context where there is an estimated shortfall of up to 40,676 homes across the Greater Birmingham and Black Country HMA (GBBCHMA) (See Appendix 1). Every opportunity to meet these identified housing needs must be explored to ensure that real people are provided with the housing they need.	Comment	Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DtC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held.
C391	1238	Consortium of Housebuilders and Land Promoters [240]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	There is no agreed strategy between the 14 GBBCHMA authorities as to how the unmet need up to 2031 will be accommodated, notwithstanding the significant scale of unmet need emerging beyond 2031. This is clear from Sandwell's own evidence, as part of this consultation it refers to confirming at a later date any likely contribution to its own shortfall, this however is only likely to address a small proportion of it. In the absence of this strategic level agreement, all 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be exploring all growth options in order to meet its own objectively assessed needs and those of the wider GBBCHMA, if their plan is to be considered positively prepared. In Sandwell's case, it is clear that not all growth options have been explored to meet its own objectively assessed needs, let alone those of the wider HMA. The plan proposes a supply of circa 38% of its total need and exacerbating the shortfall of the wider HMA by circa 18,600 homes. Under NPPF paragraph 139, Sandwell's unmet need alone represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing the borough's Green Belt boundaries, as does the scale of unmet need across the wider HMA. In summary, the 14 GBBCHMA authorities should be seeking to agree a strategy now for how the unmet needs up to 2031 and beyond will be comprehensively met in full. As part of this all authorities should be exploring all options for growth, including the release of Green Belt land, given the unmet need represents exceptional circumstances for reviewing Green Belt boundaries.	Object	Continued Duty to Cooperate - Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DtC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held.
C392	976	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	63. Criteria 3 indicates that regular monitoring will be undertaken annually of housing delivery, but this does not tally with the Monitoring Framework at the end of the Plan. It should also be possible to see from Housing Trajectory how much reliance is being made on windfalls, or from when. To be both justified and effective the Housing Trajectory should include break down the housing numbers into different sources of supply. HBF are of the view that any allowance for windfall should not be included until the fourth year of a housing trajectory, given the likelihood that dwellings being completed within the next three years will already be known about (as they are likely to need to have already received planning permission to be completed within that timeframe).	Comment	Criteria 3 states The estimated net effect of housing renewal up to 2041 will be reviewed annually and used in the calculation of housing land supply. Table 5 identifies the different sources of supply of housing land. It also details what year the windfall allowance will be included, Table 5 shows that the windfall allowance is applicable from 2027 and is therefore not included in the first 5 years. Will include a breakdown of sources in the trajectory
C393	978	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	64. HBF also question the need for Criteria 6 about BNG to be repeated here within the policy (and in other policies elsewhere in the Plan) when this matter has already been addressed elsewhere within the Plan, and the Plan should be read as a whole. To repeat this only this policy requirement here seems repetitious and confusing. HBF comments on BNG can be found in response to Policy SNE2 which is the appropriate place for them to be considered. HBF does not believe it there is any need to repeat the requirements of policy SNE2 here.	Comment	Delete criteria 6. - A minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain is required for each site in accordance with Policy SNE2
C394	1209	Oldbury (Smethwick) Limited [238]	Planning Prospects Ltd (Mr Chris Dodds, Associate Director) [163]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	Policy SHO1 and residential allocation SH55 "Cape Arm / Cranford Street" Policy SHO1 (Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth) sets out that sufficient land will be provided to deliver at least 11,167 net new homes over the period 2022 – 2041 and includes 6,951 homes from "Housing Allocations that the Plan considers can be delivered over the Plan period. Appendix B of the draft Plan sets out details of Sandwell's proposed allocation sites and first lists each of the Housing Allocations, including Allocation SH55 "Cape Arm / Cranford Street" which is shown as a 2.13 ha brownfield site with a potential yield of 170 homes at a net development density of 80 dwellings per hectare (dph) over an indicative net developable area of 2.13 ha. Appendix B sets out that the Anticipated Delivery Timescale (completion year) for this allocated site is 2030. Our client, Oldbury (Smethwick) Ltd, a subsidiary of Pall Mall Investments, are the owners of approximately 1.78 ha of land within Allocation SH55. They intend to put forward a residential development proposal for this land and have sought the Council's pre-application advice to inform their latest proposals for up to 90 homes (under reference PA/22/00618). As such, our client remains generally supportive of the continued allocation of this site for residential development within the draft Sandwell Local Plan – following its allocation for residential use in the adopted Sandwell Site Allocations Document (2012) and subsequent draft allocation in the now defunct Black Country Plan. However, the representations made here, and to other draft policies of the draft Sandwell Local Plan, make some initial observations and suggested amendments to the draft policies to ensure they optimize the market attractiveness, viability and deliverability of development for our client's site in particular. Our comments seek to ensure that the emerging policies are flexible enough to ensure that the anticipated, and allocated, residential regeneration of our client's land can be achieved. Whilst our client welcomes the continued residential allocation of the site under SH55, as it will enable them to bring forward residential development of the site when the current temporary use (facilitating the construction of the Midland Metropolitan Hospital) ceases, they have several comments / observations on the draft site allocation as follows: - The gross site area is shown to be 2.13 ha of brownfield land. Our client assumes that this includes both our client's land, which at 1.78ha forms the significant majority of the allocation, and the small parcel of land that originally formed part of the site but that is now in the control of the NHS trust by virtue of Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to facilitate the construction of the neighbouring Midland Metropolitan Hospital. The draft Local Plan Proposals Map also suggests that a small parcel of land on the southern side of the Cape Arm is also included within this allocation. The table provided at Appendix B suggests the indicative development capacity is 170 homes and indicates a development density of 80 dph across a net developable site area of 2.13 ha. By way of background, the former BCP draft allocation indicated a development density of 38dph at this site, equating to an indicative capacity of 70 dwellings (over the former site area of 1.85ha). Our client highlighted that this was at the lower end of the range of development densities that could be achieved at this site, and indicated that its own masterplan / site layout work had indicated an achievable site capacity (at that time) of 80 to 90 homes at a density of approximately 43 to 50 dph. On this basis, our client submitted an indicative proposal for up to 90 dwellings (or around 50 dph) as part of a pre-application submission to the Council, demonstrating that this level and nature of development represented a viable proposal (at that time) and one that would have been most attractive to the market, and ultimately one that could have been deliverable here. The latest draft allocation at a density of 80 dph is significantly higher (60% higher) than the density considered deliverable by our client. It is also significantly higher than the other residential allocations immediately surrounding SH55 and forming part of the wider Council's residential provision within the wider Southwick Regeneration Area, a SH5 which has development density of 40dph and SH59	Comment	Note support for allocation of site for residential use. The small site windfall allowance is based on a continuation of average historic rates which span a representative 10 years. This method conforms with national planning guidance. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council's development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough's green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence to demonstrate that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Due to the location of the site overlooking the canal arm and having a positive relationship with the hospital, it is considered that the estimated capacity and density is achievable.
C395	730	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	In relation to the housing allocations proposed, the inclusion of ERQ (site ref. SH37) is strongly supported. The proposed allocation suggests a capacity of c.526 dwellings in the Plan period; with a further c.100 dwellings in the post-Plan period (total site capacity c.626 dwellings). This proposed quantum of development at ERQ is considered to be sensible, conservative and achievable at this time.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C396	777	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	Dudley MBC is supportive of the Council's approach in terms of prioritising brownfield land development in the first instance and appropriate greenfield sites within the urban area. The approach to the review of urban capacity is generally supported, and the application of assumptions related to discounting of the housing land supply is largely consistent with that applied in Dudley borough. It is noted that the Council consider there are no exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt land to meet identified housing needs, including the housing supply shortfall. Dudley MBC is supportive of Sandwell MBC maximising its urban area supply to meet its own housing needs as far as possible, particularly considering the scale of the current housing supply shortfall identified (representing around two thirds of the minimum housing requirement). Sandwell MBC should continue to keep its urban capacity under review to identify any further opportunities for new development that would contribute to the shortfalls in housing supply identified.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C397	972	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	56. In relation to criteria two, HBF note that the Council is looking to phase the plan and delivery of the housing requirement. For the plan to be effective and justified, a clear explanation of this approach and the reasoning behind for it is needed. As HBF is of the view that the overall housing requirement for Sandwell should be higher, it follows that our view is that the numbers in each phase should be higher too.	Comment	The Council is not phasing the plan and delivery of the housing requirement. The four phases set out in Table 5 are there to provide an indication of how many homes are anticipated to be delivered in those timeframes. The Council is not phasing the plan and delivery of the housing requirement. Amend text The key sources of housing land supply are summarised in Table 5, which also sets out the minimum housing target for each of the Plan phases, which also provides an indicative number of homes to be delivered in the following timeframes; 2022 - 2027, 2027 - 2032, 2032 - 2037 and 2037 - 2041.

C398	1072	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	<p>2.18 However, there are inconsistencies between the information presented in Table 5 of the draft SLP and the SHLAA (2022) which are not explained in the draft SLP or accompanying evidence. For example, Table 14 of the Council's SHLAA identifies sites with planning permission for 2,431 dwellings. However, Table 5 of the Local Plan refers to sites with planning permission 2,543 dwellings (i.e. 112 dwellings more than identified in the SHLAA), after a 5% 'discount' or non-implementation rate has apparently been applied to existing permissions. On this basis, the SLP appears to overestimate the number of dwellings with planning permission. This requires further clarification to ensure that the Council is not overestimating its existing supply of sites with planning permission.</p> <p>2.19 At Table 5 the Council splits its proposed housing allocations into four categories with different 'discounts' or 'non-implementation rates' applied to each category of allocation. However, Appendix B of the draft SLP which identifies the proposed allocations and the supporting evidence does not make it clear which allocations fall into each category. It is, therefore, impossible to confirm whether or not the Council has made appropriate assumptions in terms of the supply available from its proposed allocations or if it has applied the discounts for non-implementation that it says it has to proposed allocations.</p> <p>2.20 The discount rates applied to the Council's supply require further justification and may require adjusting, including to take into account on-going work on viability. Further clarification is also required as to how those discount rates have been applied to individual sites to demonstrate that the housing land supply identified in Policy SHO3 is robust.</p>	Comment	comment noted and will ensure that correct figures are listed in all documents. Will ensure that clarity is provided as to which sites have which discount applied.
C399	974	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	<p>59. The NPPF requires Local Plans to identify land to accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, unless there are strong reasons why this cannot be achieved. HBF has undertaken extensive consultation with its small developer members. One of the chief obstacles for small developers is that funding is extremely difficult to secure without a full, detailed, and implementable planning permission. Securing an implementable planning permission is extremely difficult if small sites are not allocated. Without implementable consents lenders are uneasy about making finance available or the repayment fees and interest rates they set will be very high. Small developers, consequently, need to invest a lot of money and time up-front in the risky business of trying to secure an allocation and a planning permission, and this is money that many small developers do not have.</p> <p>60. HBF would therefore wish to see the 10% small sites allowance delivered through allocations. Indeed, we would advocate that a higher percentage of small sites are allocated if possible. Such sites are important for encouraging the growth in SME housebuilders who will tend to develop these sites but rarely see the benefits that arise from the allocation of sites in a local plan. Up until the 1980s, small developers accounted for the construction of half of all homes built in this country resulting in greater variety of product, more competition, and faster build-out rates. Since then, the number of small companies has fallen by 80%.</p> <p>61. HBF also note that support for small and medium builders need not be limited to only small sites of less than 1Ha. SMEs also deliver on other types of non- strategic sites (for example up to 100 units). The inclusion of additional non- strategic allocations would expand the range of choice in the market, and be of a scale that can come forward and making a contribution to housing numbers earlier in the plan period.</p>	Comment	The Sandwell Brownfield register identifies sufficient land to accommodate at least 10% of our housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare. This is in accordance with the NPPF.
C400	1181	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	<p>3.19 Turning more specifically to emerging Policy SHO1 Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth and the elements which make up the proposed housing supply of 11,167 new homes, Wain Estates also have significant concerns regarding the sources which make up this already insufficient number of homes.</p> <p>3.20 Within Table 5 of the above emerging policy, the first source of the housing land supply is made up of sites currently under construction (1,060 homes), with planning permission or prior approval (998 homes) and sites with other commitments (61 homes)[footnote referring to GT provision of ten units] Therefore, 2,119 homes included within the figures, are made up of the current supply.</p> <p>3.21 The second source is made up of housing allocations, comprising occupied employment land (2,234 homes), other (3,094 homes), sites with planning permission (1,545 homes) and sites under construction (78 homes). Therefore, 1,623 homes included within the housing allocations are made up of current / existing supply (calculated by adding together sites with existing planning permission and sites under construction). Of the remaining allocations, despite the occupied employment land (2,234 homes) having a 15% discount figure applied, in recognition of the fact that there can be multiple delivery constraints, this in itself does not mean that there is capability of the full 2,234 homes to be delivered given that these sites are in active use for employment.</p> <p>3.22 It has also been demonstrated through the previous Black Country Plan that such approaches are not effective for delivering housing. As part of the Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS) a total of 16,182 homes were allocated on occupied employment land. Based on the Urban Capacity Review Update (May 2021) only 679 (4.2%) of those homes have been delivered to date (with less than five years of the plan period remaining).</p> <p>3.23 Furthermore, as recognised in our previous representations, not only is the delivery of housing on such sites questionable, but it also reduces the ability for the Council to provide a sufficient supply of employment sites, of which the Council recognise there are also not enough being provided for as part of the emerging SLP. Paragraph 8.11 of the emerging SLP notes that, 143ha of the employment land need arising in Sandwell cannot be met solely within the Borough, and that the unmet need is to be exported to neighbouring authorities, as part of ongoing duty-to-cooperate work, which is yet to be secured.</p> <p>3.24 It is good practice to ensure that any elements of housing supply included in a council's figures, are suitable, available, and achievable of being viably developed. Wain Estates are of the view that there has not been enough evidence provided for the proposed allocations on occupied employment land, as a robust element of the housing supply.</p> <p>3.25 Taking the above into account, only 3,094 homes (see Table 5 Housing Land Supply Sources within emerging Policy SHO1) are allocated which are not made up of existing commitments or situated on occupied employment land, this is a very minor figure when compared to both the proposed delivery of 11,167 net new homes over the plan period and even more so when compared to the actual housing need of 29,773 new homes.</p> <p>...</p> <p>3.29 The fourth part of the housing supply is made up of additional floorspace in centres (219 homes). This element makes up a very small part of the overall proposed supply figures. It demonstrates the limitations that emerge from seeking to maximise land on brownfield sites, and the misconception that such spaces are often not being utilised to the best of their ability.</p> <p>3.30 Overall, the elements which make up the already under-delivering housing land supply as part of the emerging SLP are seen to be questionable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, there is a large reliance on existing commitments, as sites with planning permission or already under construction to make up the housing numbers. • Secondly, the level of allocations which are included on occupied employment sites is high and such sites are known to be slow at delivering and riddled with issues which slow down or prevent the development for more vulnerable residential uses, in addition to the fact they will result in a loss of employment floorspace, for which there is a recognised need within the borough. • Thirdly, the proposed allocations themselves are not without issues to overcome – such as access, site assembly, land ownership and remediation – which are not insubstantial. • Finally, the overly restrictive nature of the windfall housing policy means there is a severe limit as to where such sites can come forward and on what type of land, despite the NPPF not stipulating such limitations exist. 	Object	The SLP provides a realistic and appropriate balance between maximising housing delivery on brownfield and urban sites and protecting green belt and greenfield land from inappropriate and unsustainable development. Occupied employment sites have only been allocated for housing development where there is evidence that they are both suitable and deliverable and the loss of these areas from employment land supply would not undermine the SLP employment land supply strategy. A comprehensive Viability and Delivery study supports the SLP, and a significant amount of external funding is committed from Government and other sources to support a long term programme of brownfield development subsidy.
C401	975	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	<p>62. In relation to criteria three, HBF notes that NPPF (para 71) only permits an allowance for windfall sites if there is compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available and will continue to be a reliable source of supply. HBF are also of the view that any buffer provided by windfall sites should be in addition to the buffer added to the housing need figures derived from the Standard Method to provide choice and competition in the land market. However, by including windfalls within the Plan's housing requirement supply, any opportunity for windfalls to provide some additional housing numbers and flexibility is removed. Windfalls do not provide the same choice and flexibility in the market as additional allocations.</p>	Comment	The small site windfall allowance is based on a continuation of average historic rates which span a representative 10 years. This method conforms with national planning guidance.
C403	1279	Mr Sandeep Birdie [152]	Avison Young (Miss Steph Eastwood) [151]	Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth	<p>Housing Requirement and Scale of Unmet Need</p> <p>2.5 The Council is proposing to set its housing requirement at 11,167 homes. The Council's approach to setting the housing requirement appears to be entirely driven by its assessment of the supply of suitable land available within the urban area of the Borough rather than its starting point being first to assess and establish the appropriate requirement before considering how this could be met.</p> <p>2.6 The draft SLP is, therefore, proposing to plan for only approximately 37% of its overall housing need. Whilst it is accepted that the Borough is unlikely to be able to meet its needs in full given the scale of the need and constraints on the supply of land available in the Borough, the draft SLP would leave 62% of the minimum local housing need for Sandwell not being planned for.</p> <p>2.7 A plan which only provides for a third of its minimum local housing need cannot possibly be consistent with the national policy which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing nor can it be considered "positively prepared" because the strategy does not as a minimum, seek to meet the area's objectively assessed needs and is not currently informed by agreements with other authorities over how the unmet need will be redistributed.</p> <p>2.8 The Council must do more to minimise the extent of its unmet need before going on to set out how any remaining unmet need will be addressed elsewhere to ensure that Sandwell's needs are met in full.</p>	Object	Welcome the understanding that the borough is unlikely to be able to meet its need in full given the scale of the need and constraints on supply of land in the borough. Sandwell has explored in depth the availability of housing land across the borough, and using a series of assessments, the SA process and a Call for Sites has allocated those sites that will deliver sustainable and deliverable housing growth to 2041. An update to the current SHLAA is underway and will be used to refine housing numbers once it is completed. The Council's development strategy recognises both the need for development and the need to retain the borough's green and open spaces and therefore promotes a balanced approach to growth. There is evidence to demonstrate that all available brownfield land within the borough has been assessed and that there are no further sites available, given the demand for employment land that also exists. Sandwell is continuing to work with the GBBCHMA authorities on identifying opportunities for additional housing growth across the area and will be continuing to speak to neighbouring authorities as part of the DtC for the current plan. Work is underway to review the current HMA study, where alternative options and mechanisms for addressing the wider housing need will be considered. Sandwell will monitor other authorities housing delivery where there is agreement to meet some of Sandwell's need. A Statement of Common Ground and a Duty to Cooperate statement will be produced as required once further discussions have been held. [positively prepared/ consistent with nppf]

C404	776	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		<p>Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth</p> <p>It is noted that 11,167 net new homes will be delivered over the plan period (up to 2041) with 97% on brownfield land and 3% on greenfield land. The SLP prioritises the development of previously developed land. The Plan identifies that there is a resulting shortfall of 18,606 homes against a housing requirement of 29,773 homes. The draft SLP states that Sandwell MBC is in discussions with neighbouring authorities to seek their agreement to accommodate some of Sandwell's unmet needs (at paragraphs 3.12-3.19).</p> <p>It is noted that the Council has explored opportunities for additional supply from its centres (West Bromwich, Town, District and Local Centres across the borough). This yields around 219 additional dwellings. Related Policy SHO3- Housing Density, Type and Accessibility states that the highest densities of 100+ dwellings per hectare representing apartment schemes will only be acceptable where accessibility standards set out in Table 6 are met and the site is located within West Bromwich. We would welcome clarification on whether schemes located outside of West Bromwich namely at the other town centres within the borough (as identified in Table 10 of the SLP) could also achieve such higher densities given their accessible locations.</p> <p>Achieving higher densities within such locations could potentially yield additional urban supply, albeit it is recognised this is unlikely to be significant in the context of the scale of the housing supply shortfall. This would however be consistent with the approach set out under the former draft Black Country Local Plan (2021) Policy HOU2 where such densities were identified as appropriate for strategic and town centres. The draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP11- Housing Density, Type and Accessibility identifies that the strategic centre of Brierley Hill and its other town centres at Dudley, Halesowen and Stourbridge are in principle suitable for such high-density developments (subject to local character considerations for individual schemes). Please also see our response to Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy in respect of matters related to the housing supply shortfall.</p> <p>It is noted there are several major housing allocations proposed along/nearby the boundary with Dudley borough including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •SH25- Bradleys Lane/High Street, Tipton (189 dwellings)- no planning permission. •SH1- Brown Lion Street (27 dwellings)- planning permission. •SH7- The Boat Gauging House and adjacent land (50 dwellings)- subject of planning application. •Several allocations around Cradley Heath including: SH16- Cradley Heath Factory Centre, Woods Lane (196 dwellings)- partly subject of planning application; SH4- Lower High Street – Station hotel and Dunns site (20 dwellings)- no planning permission; SH13- Silverthorne Lane/Forge Lane (81 dwellings)- no planning permission; SH15- Mearthun Road Industrial Estate (13 dwellings)- no planning permission. •SH34- Brandhall Golf Course (190 dwellings)- subject of planning application. <p>•Whilst located near to Rowley Regis, given the scale of the proposed allocation at SH37-Edwin Richards Quarry (526 dwellings within the plan period and 100 dwellings post plan period, partly subject of planning permission/application for 276 dwellings) we also note the relative proximity of this site to Dudley borough.</p> <p>These allocations should take account of cross-boundary infrastructure considerations given the potential for the cross-boundary use of and impacts upon highways, health, and education services. Matters related to impacts upon amenity and character of the local area should also be considered on a cross boundary basis. Dudley MBC would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on any future masterplans/other planning documents that may be produced for these sites going forward (and any planning applications, as appropriate). We would also welcome the opportunity to be engaged on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will support the SLP as its progresses to the next Regulation 19 stage so that any cross-boundary issues can be identified and addressed.</p> <p>In respect of education provision specifically, we would note that historically for cross-border flow of pupils the largest flow for Dudley MBC is with Sandwell MBC. As such Dudley MBCs education team would welcome ongoing discussions in relation to housing allocations nearby the boundary including updates on the proposed delivery timescales and Sandwell MBCs position on the education provision for such schemes. We particularly note that the SH25 allocation at Bradley's Lane and the various allocations around Cradley Heath are located closer to primary schools within Dudley borough than those in Sandwell.</p> <p>In respect of transport matters specifically, all developments exceeding 150 dwellings (as compliant with Local Transport Note LTN 1/20) at or near the Dudley MBC boundary should be considered in terms of impact on the surrounding network and subject to traffic impact assessments. All new developments should be considered in terms of opportunities to deliver active travel, Community Infrastructure</p>	Comment	Through DTC will discuss allocations and impacts
C405	788	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	<p>Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth</p> <p>SHO1 – Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth</p> <p>The need for contributions towards Police infrastructure to ensure sustainable growth</p> <p>In order to sustain the level of growth proposed in the draft Sandwell Local Plan consultation and to meet the national and local policy objectives relating to safety and security, contributions will be required through CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of Police services to create environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or social cohesion. The PCCWM objects to Policy SHO1 as it should include reference for the need for contributions for social, environmental and physical infrastructure to support sustainable housing growth in accordance with the aspirations of the policy and the plan – however point 4 of the Policy states 'The development of sites for housing should demonstrate a comprehensive approach, making best use of available land and infrastructure and not prejudicing neighbouring uses.'</p> <p>As set out elsewhere in this representation, in the comments of the PCCWM on the Sandwell Spatial Portrait and Chapter 12 'Infrastructure and Delivery', a growth in housing and population in the Borough will bring increased demand for police services and there is a need for developer contributions to fund that growth for the reasons set out.</p> <p>Therefore, new development, including larger housing sites/ housing allocations, should be subject to CIL/ S.106 agreements as appropriate to help fund the provision and maintenance of Police services, and the requirement for this infrastructure should be enshrined in the wording of Policy SHO1.</p> <p>Of note, point 5 to Policy SHO1 refers to 'ancillary uses appropriate for residential areas' in sites with existing planning permission, sites allocated for housing by the Plan and windfall sites, in tacit acknowledgement that such uses as health facilities, community facilities and local shops are linked to housing development and that there may be a gap in provision. However, funding for such community services as policing is necessary and contributions should be required through CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of, inter alia Police services to create environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or social cohesion.</p> <p>Proposed housing allocations</p> <p>The PCCWM requests that the following police sites are considered for residential allocation in the draft Sandwell Local Plan. All sites are owned by the PCCWM.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oldbury Police Station 2. Wednesbury Police Station 3. Smethwick Police Station 4. Windmill House, Smethwick 	Comment	Comments noted - new policy on CIL / s106 is to be included in the SLP that will address such issues.
C406	845	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	<p>Policy SHO1 - Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth</p> <p>Policy SHO1 discussed that the Sandwell Local Plan will deliver at least 11,167 net new homes over the period 2022-2041.</p> <p>Table 5 discusses the Housing Land Supply for the borough setting out the minimum housing target of the plan period and the key sources of housing land supply. The total from identified sites is 9,080, with the remainder a windfall allowance.</p> <p>Policy SHO1 should be clear on how the quoted requirement of net additional homes is arrived at.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C407	1154	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		<p>Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>We have not had the opportunity at this time to comment on the site allocations specifically. We would request that any proposed allocations consider the impact on the historic environment and ensure that where there is harm for the historic environment that an appropriate heritage impact assessment is available as an evidence base to support a proposed allocation.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C408	780	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		<p>Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>Dudley MBC supports the proposed protection of existing authorised pitches (16 in total) and note that 10 new pitch allocations are proposed. The proposed allocation SG1 is nearby the Dudley borough boundary at Brierley Lane for 10 pitches, which would be an extension to an existing caravan site.</p> <p>The draft SLP policies are supported by the joint evidence base produced for the Black Country; the Black Country Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA, 2022). We welcome the use of this jointly produced evidence base. The GTAA identified a need of eight pitches up to 2031 and an additional six pitches from 2031-2041 for Sandwell. The SLP will deliver ten pitches to meet the need up to 2031 plus a buffer of two pitches (20%) - providing a five-year deliverable supply of pitches from adoption of the SLP in 2025. The approach will provide 71% of the total need for 14 pitches over the Plan period (2023-41). The SLP states that it is not possible to identify and allocate further sites to meet the remaining need for four pitches up to 2041 as no deliverable site options were put forward through the Sandwell Local Plan preparation process. Therefore, this remaining need will be met within the borough through the planning application process. This is consistent with past trends, where small windfall sites have come forward within the urban area.</p> <p>The GTAA identified a need for 32 Travelling Showpeople plots for Sandwell. The SLP states it is not possible to identify and allocate sites to meet this need as no deliverable site options have been put forward through the Sandwell Local Plan preparation process. Therefore, this need will also be met within the borough, through the planning application process (and is consistent with past trends for windfall sites).</p> <p>Dudley MBC is supportive of Sandwell MBC seeking to meet its outstanding needs via the planning application process. For clarity, Dudley MBC is unable to contribute towards any unmet needs of Sandwell and has identified its own shortfall in Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision within the draft Dudley Local Plan.</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support

C409	873	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople	<p>The PCCWM supports the wording of the policy and justification to Policy SHO10, which reflects the representations made to the Sandwell Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>The PCCWM supports the specific reference within the policy itself, point 6 as follows -</p> <p>‘6. Proposals should be well designed and laid out in accordance with Secured by Design principles as set out in Policy SDM1.’</p> <p>The justification to Policy SHO10, paragraph 7.70, that pitches and plots are well designed in line with Secured by Design principles, and that advice is sought from West Midlands Police Design Out Crime Officers is also supported by the PCCWM.</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support
C410	1206	Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]		Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople	<p>Permanent Gypsy and Traveller communities can be particularly vulnerable to the risks from flooding. We recommend the following wording be added to section 4:</p> <p>The site should ensure that it is safe from flood risk and proposals do not increase flood risk for others in accordance with Policy SCC4.</p>	Comment	Noted. Amend policy wording as suggested.
C411	781	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople	<p>Dudley MBC would welcome clarification on the size of the existing site. As set out within the SLP supporting text (paragraph 7.71) there is generally a preference for family-sized sites of 10-15 pitches. As this allocation of 10 pitches represents an extension to an existing site, we would welcome clarification of the total eventual site size including existing and proposed pitches. We would be concerned with the delivery of a site whose scale is not well related to its surrounding area. Detailed proposals for this site should take account of any cross-boundary infrastructure issues arising and matters related to impacts upon amenity and character of the local area (including within Dudley borough).</p>	Comment	This site and the next door occupied site was originally one site, the site underwent improvement by creating 16 pitches on the occupied site, but was then awaiting funding to redevelop the remaining proposed site. The proposed site is capable of having 10 pitches. Although this figure is higher, it is still considered to be suitable to meet the needs of the G&T community.
C412	869	South Staffordshire Council (Mr Edward Fox, Strategic Planning Team Manager) [87]		Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople	<p>South Staffordshire Council (SSDC) published an updated Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment in 2022 which identified a need for 121 pitches during the plan period to 2039. SSDC are now updating the GTAA to align with our revised plan period up to 2041. We have not yet received the findings of the updated GTAA but expect our needs for pitches may have increased.</p> <p>South Staffordshire Council wrote to SMBC (and other GBBCHMA and neighbouring authorities) in August 2022, and subsequently in October 2023, where we set out that we had only identified a supply of 37 pitches to allocate against a 5-year requirement of 72 pitches. In the letters we set out the steps we had taken to explore supply options including exploring options in the Green Belt, options on publicly owned land, and options for new pitches as part of proposed housing allocations.</p> <p>SSDC are seeking to ensure that neighbouring and GBBCHMA authorities undertake the same steps that SSDC have taken in exploring pitch options so we can have confidence that our Duty to Cooperate partners have taken a consistent approach when considering if they can assist with SSDCs unmet needs for pitches.</p> <p>We therefore request that through your plan preparation you explore, and evidence, the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intensifying supply on existing sites - Expanding all suitable existing sites - Exploring all public land options in the Borough for new public sites - Approaching sites proposed for general housing allocation to identify if the landowner would be willing to set aside part of the site for pitch needs <p>South Staffordshire Council would welcome an indication that all such options have been explored and we look forward to continuing to engage with SMBC on this issue.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - this will be part of the housing topic paper
C413	1276	Shropshire Council (Mr Edward West, Planning Policy & Strategy Manager) [235]		Policy SHO10 – Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Showpeople	<p>The housing requirements of all communities including travellers should be assessed and met to comply with NPPF paragraphs 60 & 62. NPPF paragraph 62, in footnote 27 references the substantive requirements of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS, 2015) to assess the needs of gypsies and travellers under the definitions in Annex 1. PPTS requires gypsy and traveller sites to be treated as a distinct type of residential need and the supply of pitches and plots to meet their needs are to be identified separately from the general housing supply.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C414	707	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SHO11 - Housing for people with specific needs	<p>See main representation for full justification.</p> <p>Given the increase in the number of older people projected, the significant housing need and benefits that older persons' housing brings, together with the guidance of the NPPF / PPG, we consider that the need for older people's housing need must be incorporated into the emerging Local Plan in a more positive manner. The plan should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the older persons' housing need. • Allocate specific sites to meet the needs of older people and include a standalone policy actively supporting the delivery of specialist older people's that are in sustainable locations 	Object	The SHMA will identify older persons' needs - we do not have the capacity to identify sites specifically to meet the needs of certain sections of the community but we expect sites suitable for such development to come forward and will support their delivery as appropriate.
C415	789	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SHO2 – Windfall developments	<p>SHO2 – Windfall Developments</p> <p>Under Policy SHO1, windfall housing is to deliver 1,868 dwellings during the plan period. In order to sustain the level of growth proposed in the draft Sandwell Local Plan consultation and to meet the national and local policy objectives relating to safety and security, contributions will be required through CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of Police services to create environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or social cohesion. The PCCWM objects to Policy SHO2, as it should include reference for the need for contributions for social, environmental and physical infrastructure to support windfall development. Windfall development, as well as development on larger sites/ allocations, should be subject to CIL/ S.106 agreements to help fund the provision and maintenance of Police services, and the requirement for this infrastructure should be enshrined in the wording of Policy SHO2.</p> <p>The Council's attention is also drawn to the comments of the PCCWM on the Sandwell Spatial Portrait and Chapter 12 'Infrastructure and Delivery'.</p>	Comment	Following on from the draft BCP, the SLP has not referenced general or routine contributions towards police infrastructure in the policy or list infrastructure types. The NPPF, paragraph 57, requires that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests: a) Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It is considered that this cannot include non specific pooled contributions towards revenue expenditure where this is typically funded through alternative areas of public funding and government departments. Following the Regulation 18 consultation Sandwell has carefully considered the range of necessary infrastructure and viability of development typologies. The Council are preparing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will inform the SLP Regulation 19 Publication Plan. Where appropriate, specific infrastructure (e.g. capital investment) required to address the additional demands of planned growth will be identified in the IDP and policy SID1 allows for delivery of this infrastructure. New infrastructure policy will be introduced.
C416	893	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SHO2 – Windfall developments	<p>Policy SHO2</p> <p>WM CPRE generally support Policy SHO2 on Windfall sites. However, it should refer to both large and small windfall sites.</p>	Support	Comment noted.
C417	1153	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHO2 – Windfall developments	<p>Clause 2) c amend to will not cause harm to the significance of heritage assets, including their setting or similar.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Amend policy wording as suggested.
C418	979	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SHO2 – Windfall developments	<p>65. Policy SHO2- Windfall Developments</p> <p>66. As outlined above HBF are concerned about the Councils reliance on windfall in place of allocating housing sites. HBF also question whether it is appropriate to treat council owned land differently in policy terms from any other land. Consideration of who the applicant or landowner is, is not normally considered to be a planning matter. The allocation of sites and the granting of permission for windfall housing should be considered on their planning merits and the contribution they can make to sustainable development, not who is the owner of the land.</p> <p>67. HBF contend there is need for greenfield development in Sandwell to address the housing crisis and meet the housing requirement, some of these greenfield sites may need to be on Green Belt land. If monitoring showed underperformance of housing delivery additional housing will need to be brought forward which could include allowing additional green field sites. The policy should be amended to account for this possibility.</p> <p>68. It should be noted that HBF also support the need for additional greenfield allocations to meet the housing requirement.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. NPPF allows authorities to calculate an allowance for windfalls.

C419	1106	Stratford-on-Avon District Council (Mr Michael Brown, Policy Planner) [226]		Policy SH02 – Windfall developments	Given the shortfall in housing sites for allocation, Sandwell Council should act to maximise the amount of new housing that can come forward on windfall sites, and in particular, on existing residential sites. This could be through the development of design codes which set out ways to appropriately densify existing residential areas, for example through infill, additional storeys, sub-division, or replacement dwellings.	Comment	Comment noted
C420	1187	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SH02 – Windfall developments	<p>3.27The third part of the housing supply is made up of windfall units, a total of 1,868 are being proposed. However, the delivery of this level of homes is questioned when the restrictive nature of windfall provision within the SLP is assessed. Often and as recognised within the NPPF, the provision of windfall units can help contribute to meeting anticipated housing supply needs, where this aligns with compelling evidence, they can provide a reliable source of supply (paragraph 71). Emerging Policy SH01 Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth, does indeed include for an element of windfall provision – some 1,868 homes over the plan period. However, the delivery of such windfall units will be highly restricted given the limitations placed within emerging Policy SH02 – Windfall developments. The policy allows for windfall development on previously developed land without exception, but for greenfield sites, windfall development is only allowed subject to certain conditions. These conditions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •That the site is not protected as community open space or •The site is council owned land surplus to requirements or •The development of the site will bring an under-used piece of land back into beneficial use and will not harm the environmental, ecological, or historic value of the site and the wider area, in accordance with other relevant policies in the SLP <p>3.28The justification text to the policy notes that windfall sites are likely to include surplus public land, small non-conforming employment uses and some residential intensification sites where appropriate. However, greenfield sites are only permitted where they conform with the bulleted list above. Such restrictions are overly onerous and severely limit the capability for windfall sites on greenfield land to come forwards. This is also not in conformity with the definition of windfall development contained within the NPPF (Appendix M – Glossary), which simply states that windfall sites are sites not specifically identified in the development plan. Again, placing unnecessary restrictions on the delivery of housing, for a number that is already significantly below the required capacity.</p>	Object	<p>The proposed SLP policy broadly replicate the policy tests set out within the SAD Housing Windfalls policy (H2), that "proposals for residential development on unallocated greenfield land will only be considered where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site is not protected as community open space and is deemed low quality, low value within the Council's Green Space Audit; or - The site is a piece of Council-owned land this is deemed surplus to requirements; or - The development of the site will bring an under-used piece of land back into beneficial use; or - The development of the site is infill and will meet the requirements of other policies guidance within the LDF" <p>The SAD was adopted in December 2012, and the 2024 SHLAA notes that there has been an average windfall completion of 175 units per annum over the past 10 years. Therefore the windfall assumption in the SLP is considered robust when considered alongside the proposed policy tests for greenfield windfall sites.</p>
C421	779	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	As per our comments on Policy SH01, we would welcome clarification as to whether town centre locations within Sandwell could accommodate higher density developments of 100+ dwellings.	Comment	Comment noted. Higher densities in regeneration areas, West Bromwich and other centres have been identified and represent a minimum level; suitable schemes that can deliver higher numbers will be welcomed where they represent sustainable and well-designed development.
C422	981	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	74.HBF also question why there is need for a specific mention of 4+ bedroom houses in Criteria 6 of the policy as the wording of the policy as this presupposes no need for four bed houses in the evidence which may not be the case. The plan should also be read as a whole and the matter of responding to housing need in terms of size and type of units is already covered elsewhere in the Plan.	Comment	note comment. The wording of the policy makes it clear that 4+ bedroomed houses should not be provided where this would be disproportionate compared the the evidenced local housing need, which may be for different types of housing. The Council is keen to support a range of housetypes and sizes as part of building balanced communities but this should not be at the expense of genuine and demonstrated local requirements.
C423	778	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	This policy is largely consistent with the draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP11- Housing Density, Type and Accessibility. This is supported as it provides a consistent approach to sites which are in proximity to the Dudley borough boundary.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C424	894	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	Policy SH03 WM CPRE generally support Policy SH03 on Densities, and consider the standards set out in Para 3 appropriate. We think the Policy should also require developers to show that they have sought to make the most efficient use of land within a sustainable design approach, as some densities may comfortably be higher than these minima.	Support	Noted and welcome support. The issue of differing densities is addressed under various policies in the plan and identified densities are accepted as a minimum, so where appropriate higher density development can be agreed.
C425	720	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	These requirements are considered to be overly prescriptive. The policy should acknowledge that site specific circumstances, housing mix and design approach (including in relation to public realm and car parking), will inform the appropriate density for a site. Some sites which can deliver a significant amount of high quality residential development may not meet the specific accessibility standards set out in Table 6 but are still appropriate residential sites.	Object	targets are justified as they take into account accessibility but policy is to be amended to refer to design code, which will look at where higher densities might be used. Policy looks to protect the character of an area, so higher densities may not be appropriate in all locations.
C426	846	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	<p>... The supporting text to policy SH03 should be explicit that the table which follows paragraph 7.22 is not setting an expected mix of home tenures and types for all development sites, rather it is presenting the assessed overall requirement for the Sandwell area.</p> <p>Policy SH03 should be consistent with policy SH04 and policy SH05 and be explicit that the dwelling mix and any mix of tenures will be site specific and subject to a consideration of local needs at the time of a proposed development coming forward.</p>	Comment	Noted The Housing Market Assessment is being updated and will be published as supporting evidence at Regulation 19 stage. This will provide updated information on the need for different housing types and tenures within Sandwell.
C427	980	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	<p>Policy SH03- Housing Density, Type and Accessibility</p> <p>69.This policy requires a density of 100 dwellings per hectare for areas of 'very high-density' housing areas, 45 dwellings in 'high accessible areas' and 40+ for 'moderate area'. Although the Table Six uses 100+, 45+ and 40+, so there is a need for consistency between the two.</p> <p>70.It is unclear from the policy wording if this policy only applies to allocated sites, or all development over 10 units. It is also unclear how a developer would know which target applied to their development and which standard to apply on a site not allocated in the Plan. The Plan needs to better explain and justify its approach.</p> <p>71.HBF would also question how realistic such high densities are, noting that the setting of residential density standards should be undertaken in accordance with the NPPF (para 125). HBF would also question how this policy links into other policies in the Plan including the policies that seek to protect family housing, resist HMOs, limit tall buildings, prevent intensification, resist windfalls, and require a range and mix of housing. All of these policies may prevent densification. Indeed, even the amount of land now required for on-site BNG delivery may impact on the density that is delivered.</p> <p>72.HBF suggest that density needs to be considered on a site by site basis to ensure schemes are viable, deliverable and appropriate for the site, and policy needs to include some flexibility if needed to enable it to respond to site specific circumstances.</p> <p>73.HBF would question of the density proposed are realistic deliverable and viable as the deliverability of high-density residential development in Sandwell will be dependent upon the viability of brownfield sites and the demand for high density city centre living post Covid-19. It is important that delivery of the housing requirement does not rely overly ambitious intensification of dwellings.</p>	Comment	This policy applies to all development. The suggested densities are not maxima, and will be applicable in all situations except where the character of the area determines a different density e.g. in a conservation area or adjacent to identified heritage assets such as listed buildings.
C428	1064	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	<p>Policy SH03 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility</p> <p>Within the bullet points (for section 3 of the policy) we strongly feel a minimum of 50 dwellings per hectare and not 45 is recommended as a minimum. In many other local plans across England, 50 – 60 is often applied.</p> <p>The local plan may also want to consider higher minimum housing densities for areas located along or close to high frequency public transport corridors or near to transport hubs.</p> <p>Additionally, developing a public transport accessibility criteria for residential developments – depending on their location to high frequency transport corridors, stations and centres may further be of value in the local plan. We are aware of Greater Manchester Combined Authorities Places for Everyone Plan which maximises the number of people living in the most accessible places, helping to increase the proportion of trips made by walking, cycling and public transport, and reducing the demand for car-based travel.</p> <p>Setting standards therefore to deliver on density appropriate developments at certain locations which reflect the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land may add value to this local plan. And TFWM would therefore be happy to work with Sandwell MBC on this additional policy, if they feel it is appropriate.</p>	Comment	The Council consider the proposed densities are the right ones, a Design Guide Supplementary Plan will be produced which will set out situations where very high density housing may be suitable.

C429	1101	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SHO3 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	<p>Within the bullet points (for section 3 of the policy) we strongly feel a minimum of 50 dwellings per hectare and not 45 is recommended as a minimum. In many other local plans across England, 50 – 60 is often applied.</p> <p>The local plan may also want to consider higher minimum housing densities for areas located along or close to high frequency public transport corridors or near to transport hubs.</p> <p>Additionally, developing a public transport accessibility criteria for residential developments – depending on their location to high frequency transport corridors, stations and centres may further be of value in the local plan. We are aware of Greater Manchester Combined Authorities Places for Everyone Plan which maximises the number of people living in the most accessible places, helping to increase the proportion of trips made by walking, cycling and public transport, and reducing the demand for car-based travel.</p> <p>Setting standards therefore to deliver on density appropriate developments at certain locations which reflect the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land may add value to this local plan. And TFWM would therefore be happy to work with Sandwell MBC on this additional policy, if they feel it is appropriate.</p>	Comment	The Council consider the proposed densities are the right ones, a Design Guide Supplementary Plan will be produced which will set out situations where very high density housing may be suitable.
C430	1175	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SHO3 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	To help address this shortfall, emerging Policy SHO3 Housing Density, Type and Accessibility seeks to provide substantial uplifts to minimum density requirements to maximise on the most efficient use of land. This has resulted in a range from 40dph, to 45dph to 100dph in West Brom, this are much higher than the typical 25-30dph figures. The policy notes that further detailed design requirements will come forward in relation to these densities as part of future Sandwell Design Codes. However, with the growing pressures on development to provide more than just housing, such as the 10% BNG (with onsite provision as a preference), accessibility requirements such as the minimum of 15% provision of part M4(3) dwellings for developments of 10 or more dwellings (emerging Policy SH05), the need for sites of 2ha or larger to provide new unrestricted open space at a minimum ratio of 3.63 hectares of space per 1,000 population on site (emerging Policy SH4W) all place additional demand for space on site, which may mean that the high minimum density standards cannot be met, resulting in an even lower number of housing units being capable of being provided within Sandwell.	Comment	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Land supply in the borough is limited and it is important that development makes an efficient use of land. Previous schemes in the borough have achieved densities exceeding 100 dph, and the forthcoming Design Code will provide guidance on how schemes can be designed to a high-quality whilst meeting policy requirements and achieving minimum density standards.</p> <p>The policy does note that minimum density standards will apply to the net developable area, and that consideration will be given to historic character and local distinctiveness (policy SHE2)</p>
C431	1212	Oldbury (Smethwick) Limited [238]	Planning Prospects Ltd (Mr Chris Dodds, Associate Director) [163]	Policy SHO3 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	<p>Requires all developments of 10 or more homes to achieve the minimum net densities set out (depending on locational sustainability) "except where this could prejudice historic character and local distinctiveness".</p> <p>However, it is not clear whether the minimum density requirements apply to the gross site area or the net developable area. As such, draft Policy SHO3 should be amended to ensure that the densities required apply to the net land areas to ensure that the targets are achievable.</p> <p>This required clarity is particularly important for the housing allocation sites where some of the allocation sites have a net density calculated on the net developable area but others, like SH55 for example, have a net density calculated across the whole site area and do not reflect or consider the net developable area. Consistency is needed.</p> <p>However, the ability for any site to achieve the minimum density requirement will depend upon a range of site-specific factors, such as site constraints, delivery against other policy requirements (like draft Policy SMD1's requirements to deliver sustainable design and technology and urban greening / green infrastructure for example) as well as each proposal's ability to deliver a suitable mix needed to achieve the required density, factoring in market demand and need for example, as well as viability – which is fundamental if any homes are to be delivered at all.</p> <p>Clearly the density requirement will need to balance other policy and density mix requirements, as well as both market demand and need, as well as site-specific constraints – and not just whether meeting the net density requirements would prejudice historic character and local distinctiveness.</p> <p>As such, draft Policy SHO3 must be updated to ensure that there is flexibility and should express the required densities as 'targets' rather than 'minimum' requirements.</p>	Object	Agree, will amend text to make clear that net density relates to net developable area. Amend text in SHO3 criteria 3 All developments of ten homes or more should achieve the minimum net density <u>on the net developable area</u> , set out below,Site assessment methodology allows for a reduction of gross site area of 25%, on sites of 2ha or more, to account for on site infrastructure. Going forward a reduction will also apply to sites of less than 2ha - a reduction of 5% will be applied.
C432	1282	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SHO3 - Housing Density, Type and Accessibility	Achieving higher densities within such locations could potentially yield additional urban supply, albeit it is recognised this is unlikely to be significant in the context of the scale of the housing supply shortfall. This would however be consistent with the approach set out under the former draft Black Country Local Plan (2021) Policy HOU2 where such densities were identified as appropriate for strategic and town centres. The draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP11- Housing Density, Type and Accessibility identifies that the strategic centre of Brierley Hill and its other town centres at Dudley, Halesowen and Stourbridge are in principle suitable for such high-density developments (subject to local character considerations for individual schemes). Please also see our response to Policy SDS1 – Development Strategy in respect of matters related to the housing supply shortfall.	Comment	note comment
C433	1191	Bloor Homes [231]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	The pressure to find a definitive solution to address the housing shortfall, is only further emphasised by the fact that the delivery of affordable housing on those sites within the Sandwell administrative area will fall woefully short of the affordable housing need identified. The Black Country Housing Market Assessment Report (March 2021) identified a need for 4,605 social rented properties and 1,913 shared ownership dwellings (accounting for nearly 24% of the total housing requirement). The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell and Dudley will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it.	Comment	Comment noted
C434	848	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	<p>Supported is the acknowledgement in SHO4(1) and SHO4(4) that the range of tenure be provided, and the proportion of any affordable housing should both be dependent upon any affordable housing should both be dependent upon an assessment of financial viability. SHO4 (4) effectively summarises a justifiable position that</p> <p>'the tenure and type of affordable homes sought will be determined on a site-by-site basis, based on national planning policy and best available information regarding local housing needs, site surroundings and viability considerations.'</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support
C435	702	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	Recommendation: The Council must therefore ensure that an up to date viability assessment is undertaken to inform the future plan. The new viability assessment must include a number of typologies that includes older person's housing and if older person's housing is found to be not viable an exemption must be provided within the plan in order to prevent protracted conversations at the application stage over affordable housing provision and viability. This would ensure that the plan is consistent with Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509 and Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 10-004-20190509 of PPG.	Object	noted - viability being undertaken. Await response from AV
C436	847	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	... the reference to a 'minimum proportion of affordable housing' to be provided is inconsistent with the earlier stance on viability and potentially ambiguous, given that there will be some sites where no affordable housing is financially viable. The inconsistency between dependence upon financial viability and a minimum requirement falls short of being unambiguous. This element potentially fails the test of soundness and is inconsistent with the Framework (2023).	Object	comment noted. Criteria 2, states that the minimum proportion to be provided, subject to viability is 25%. The Council does not consider this to be inconsistent.
C437	895	Campaign to Protect Rural England West Midlands Group (Dr Peter King) [213]		Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	<p>Policy SHO4</p> <p>While it is in accordance with the current government guidance, the threshold of 10 houses before affordable provision is required is too low. With a 25% affordable target, a development of 12 houses will provide 3 affordable ones, but one of 8 or 9 will provide zero. This provides a perverse incentive for developers to bring forward developments of 9 dwellings, even if the land has capacity for (say 11).</p> <p>Furthermore, a target of 25% is low. About 15 years ago Birmingham gave evidence at the Longbridge Area Action Plan EIP that they were achieving 40% affordable, as long as a proportion were of intermediate tenures. Most neighbouring councils have a higher target, often 35%, but with the ability to accept a lower proportion where a brownfield site requires high expenditure on site preparation.</p>	Object	Note comment. The approach is in accordance with NPPF. The viability of development sites in Sandwell is the subject of a report being undertaken at the moment, which will be used to determine how, how much and where affordable housing can be delivered.

C438	939	West Midlands Housing Association Planning Consortium [91]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Iwan Evans, Assistant Planner) [90]	Policy SH04 - Affordable Housing	<p>Part 6 of draft Policy SH04 seeks to secure affordable housing in perpetuity. There is currently no wording in the NPPF (2023), or within Planning Practice Guidance, that requires all affordable housing to be secured in perpetuity. National policy is silent on the requirement to secure affordable housing in perpetuity, other than the specific reference to rural exception sites in Annex 2 of the NPPF (2023), which states:</p> <p>“Rural exception sites: Small sites used for affordable housing in perpetuity where sites would not normally be used for housing. Rural exception sites seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. A proportion of market homes may be allowed on the site at the local planning authority’s discretion, for example where essential to enable the delivery of affordable units without grant funding.” (Emphasis added)</p> <p>This principle is appropriate and supported by the WMHAPC as it helps to secure land for delivery of affordable housing in rural areas where housing delivery would otherwise not be supported. However, a blanket approach to securing affordable housing in perpetuity is not supported for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, it restricts lenders’ appetite to fund development, as mortgage provision becomes more difficult with greater restrictions on individual properties. Private companies will not typically invest in developments if there is no prospect of realising the original investment and any returns. As such, affordable housing should only be secured in perpetuity on rural exception sites. The WMHAPC requests that, in line with national planning policy, the policy wording of draft Policy SH04 changed to only relate to rural exception sites.</p> <p>The WMHAPC is pleased that the supporting text to draft Policy SH04 at 7.25 on page 185 recognises the ongoing affordability challenges facing residents “Rising house prices and low average incomes over a long period have made market housing increasingly unaffordable for many Sandwell households”. Paragraph 7.25 goes on to set out an evidence-based approach to providing a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the authority:</p> <p>“The Black Country HMA (2021) identifies a requirement for 16.9% of new homes to be made available for affordable or social rent, 7% to be shared ownership and 8.2% to be First Homes. To meet this level of need over the Plan period, 32.1% of new housing would have to be affordable. Sandwell aspires to provide this level of affordable housing, through a range of schemes delivering up to 100% affordable housing funded through grant and other financial sources and supported by developer contributions where viable.”</p> <p>The WMHAPC welcomes a policy position that allows for a reasonable level of flexibility within the tenure of affordable housing sought. This would facilitate development viability and the delivery of a wide range of affordable housing products in line with local needs.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.28 of page 186 explains:</p> <p>“Beyond national requirements, the tenure and type of affordable housing required over the Plan period will vary according to local housing need and market conditions. In general, a mix of tenures will be sought on all sites of ten homes or more, to help create mixed communities across the borough.”</p> <p>The WMHAPC therefore asks the Council to provide further guidance and clarity on the source and type of local housing need evidence that would appropriately justify the tenure mix of affordable housing products to be provided.</p>	Comment	comment noted - Annex 2 - Glossary of the NPPF details 4 definitions of affordable housing with each definition stating <i>Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a affordable / discount for future eligible households.</i> Criteria 6 - The affordable housing created will remain affordable in perpetuity is in accordance with the NPPF.
C439	982	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH04 - Affordable Housing	<p>Policy SH04- Affordable Housing</p> <p>75. HBF welcomes the recognition that the delivery of affordable housing in Sandwell may raise issues of viability. Viability must be an integral part of the plan-making process, and the findings of the viability appraisal should have helped inform and test policy development. HBF are particularly concerned about the disconnect between the Nov 2023 viability study and the policies in the Sandwell Local Plan.</p> <p>76. Para ES17 of the Aspinall Verdi, Nov 2023, Viability Report says “Based on our residential market research, we recommend that the policy should be differentiated by housing market zone and greenfield/brownfield land. This reflects the range of values across Sandwell and the different risks/costs associated with greenfield and brownfield development. This approach optimises the ability of SMBC to deliver affordable housing and fund infrastructure (through land value capture) without undermining delivery.</p> <p>ES 18 The table below sets out our recommendations for the affordable housing targets, derived from the viability analysis herein. These targets assume no grant. These are in line with Sandwell’s affordable housing policy.</p> <p>New Value Zones Affordable Housing Greenfield (baseline 25%) Brownfield Affordable Housing (baseline 25%) High Value Zone 25% Medium Value Zone 15% Lower Value Zone 10%”</p> <p>77. Policy SH04 however seeks 25% affordable housing where viable and does not differentiate between greenfield and brownfield sites. The policy therefore does not reflect the evidence and the evidence does not reflect the policy.</p>	Comment	Amend policy to reflect thresholds and housing value areas in the Viability Study
C440	985	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH04 - Affordable Housing	<p>83. At a very basic level viability can be improved by reducing costs or increasing values. Sometimes, therefore changing the type of affordable housing provided can help to improve viability of a specific site, and the plan should recognise this. In this situation there could be a change of the percentages of different types of affordable housing provided, but the headline figure of how much affordable housing is provided would remain the same. Flexibility in the policy is important to allow for these kind of considerations.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C441	986	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH04 - Affordable Housing	<p>84. The geographical distribution of development may impact on the Plan’s ability to deliver affordable housing where it is most needed. HBF notes that the level of open-market housing provided may also impact on the amount of affordable housing that can be developed.</p> <p>85. It will also be important to understand if there any geographically specific viability considerations, such as whether higher levels of open-market housing are required in particular areas in order to secure increased delivery of affordable housing in that location in a way that remains viable. Similarly, brownfield city centre sites tend to be most suited for apartments or retirement living. There will therefore be a need to include green fields allocations which are more likely to deliver family housing and a higher percentage of affordable housing, in order to provide flexibility in the housing land supply and ensure a range of housing types and tenures is provided. This adds further weight to the need to consider Green Belt release(s).</p> <p>86. The HBF does not comment on individual sites, other than to say the Plan should provide for a wide range of deliverable and developable sites across the area in order to provide competition and choice and a buffer to ensure that housing needs are met in full. The soundness of strategic and non- strategic site allocations, whether brownfield or greenfield, will be tested in due course at the Local Plan Examination.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. The emerging viability study looks at land values across the borough - the Council is not looking at releasing GB land as per the Spatial Strategy adopted for the SLP, give the sensitivity of the GB and its relative scarcity.
C442	1188	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SH04 - Affordable Housing	<p>3.34. Turning to affordable housing, which is a key issue in terms of the housing supply within the borough, whereby a chronic shortfall has been identified and has historically only worsened. The 25% requirement figure contained within emerging Policy SH04 represents a 5% increase on the existing requirement, which has not been delivering to the levels expected. This demonstrates that the Council must increase its overall supply, in order to increase the supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>3.35. Indeed the proposals for land north of Wilderness Lane site include the provision 40% affordable housing, this can viably be done given the site’s greenfield nature. On brownfield sites where additional remediation costs are to be factored into viability considerations, meeting increased and even the basic affordable housing requirements is challenging, demonstrating why Green Belt release of greenfield sites would further assist in meeting the chronic shortfall in both market and specifically affordable housing needs within Sandwell.</p> <p>3.36. Reference within the policy also notes the aspiration of providing affordable housing through a range of schemes delivering up to 100% funding through grant and other financial sources. However, as reflected in the wording of the policy, this is just that – aspirational. It is likely to be particularly difficult given the already stretched nature of government funding and the lengthy process of applying for such funding.</p> <p>3.37. Wain Estates suggest that further evidence of the delivery of such schemes coming forward or having funding secured needs to be included within the evidence base to support this policy, in order to make it more robust and increase the chances of such developments coming forward.</p> <p>3.38. Appendix 1 of the previous representations submitted (see Appendix 1 of this document) contains an Affordable Housing Statement which assesses this issue in further detail.</p>	Object	Comments noted - policy to be amended pending receipt of viability work.
C443	1193	Heyford Developments [205]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SH04 - Affordable Housing	<p>The pressure to find a definitive solution to address the housing shortfall, is only further emphasised by the fact that the delivery of affordable housing on those sites within the Sandwell administrative area will fall woefully short of the affordable housing need identified. The Black Country Housing Market Assessment Report (March 2021) identified a need for 4,605 social rented properties and 1,913 shared ownership dwellings (accounting for nearly 24% of the total housing requirement). The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell and Dudley will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it.</p>	Comment	comment noted

C444	1195	Folkes [233]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	The pressure to find a definitive solution to address the housing shortfall, is only further emphasised by the fact that the delivery of affordable housing on those sites within the Sandwell administrative area will fall woefully short of the affordable housing need identified. The Black Country Housing Market Assessment Report (March 2021) identified a need for 4,605 social rented properties and 1,913 shared ownership dwellings (accounting for nearly 24% of the total housing requirement). The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell and Dudley will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it.	Comment	comment noted
C445	1203	NHS Property Services (Ellen Moore, Associate Town Planner) [237]		Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	Draft Policy SHO4 does not refer to the need for, or delivery of, affordable housing for key workers. A wider, and increasingly prominent area of focus for the NHS is to explore ways in which affordable homes for NHS staff can be planned and delivered. Independent research undertaken by Price Waterhouse Coopers (UK Economic Outlook, July 2019) identified a significant issue with housing affordability for NHS workers that is having a strong bearing on staff retention, commute times and morale. In undertaking further work to determine exactly what types of housing are needed and where, we suggest the Council consider the need for affordable housing for NHS staff and those employed by other health and care providers in the local authority area. The sustainability of the NHS is largely dependent on the recruitment and retention of its workforce. Most NHS staff need to be anchored at a specific workplace or within a specific geography to carry out their role. When staff cannot afford to rent or purchase suitable accommodation within reasonable proximity to their workplace, this has an impact on the ability of the NHS to recruit and retain staff. Housing affordability and availability can play a significant role in determining people's choices about where they work, and even the career paths they choose to follow. As the population grows in areas of new housing development, additional health services are required, meaning the NHS must grow its workforce to adequately serve population growth. Ensuring that NHS staff have access to suitable housing at an affordable price within reasonable commuting distance of the communities they serve is an important factor in supporting the delivery of high-quality local healthcare services. We recommend that the Council: ?Engage with local NHS partners such as the Integrated Care Board (ICB), NHS Trusts and other relevant Integrated Care System (ICS) partners. ?Ensure that the local need for affordable housing for NHS staff is factored into housing needs assessments, and any other relevant evidence base studies that inform the Local Plan (for example employment or other economic policies). ?Consider site selection and site allocation policies in relation to any identified need for affordable housing for NHS staff, particularly where sites are near large healthcare employers.	Comment	comment noted - ensure SHMA takes into account key worker homes?
C446	1241	Redrow Homes [239]	Harris Lamb (Mr John Pearce, Associate) [232]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	Meeting the needs of all part of the population The pressure to find a definitive solution to address the housing shortfall, is only further emphasised by the fact that the delivery of affordable housing on those sites within the Sandwell administrative area will fall woefully short of the affordable housing need identified. The Black Country Housing Market Assessment Report (March 2021) identified a need for 4,605 social rented properties and 1,913 shared ownership dwellings (accounting for nearly 24% of the total housing requirement). The release of Green Belt sites in the HMA to meet the overspill from both Sandwell and Dudley will deliver not only market, but much need affordable homes for those parts of the population that most need it.	Comment	comment noted
C447	1247	Rentplus UK Limited [244]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Jamie Roberts, Principle Planner) [243]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	In general terms, Rentplus supports the wording of policy SHO4 as drafted. It is not unduly prescriptive in terms of the tenure mix that is sought (save for point 3 in respect of First Homes, albeit that is a reflection of current national policy). Points 1 and 4 of the policy provide the flexibility to achieve a range of tenures that reflect local circumstances and can meet housing needs. That being said, we recommend that changes are made to the policy wording, its supporting text and its evidence base. Policy wording: Affordable housing in perpetuity Point 6 of policy SHO4 as drafted, requires affordable housing to remain so 'in perpetuity'. Fundamentally, this would prevent almost all affordable home ownership products from coming forwards – it is of course the expectation that these homes will be purchased in full by households who are otherwise unable to afford to purchase on the open market. A policy that would prevent these homes from coming forward would inevitably conflict with the stated vision and objectives of the SLP which are to meet a wide range of housing needs in Sandwell. Moreover, there is no requirement in national planning policy to provide affordable housing 'in perpetuity', save for at Rural Exceptions Sites. Instead, the Annex 2 definitions of affordable housing tenures set out the expectation that receipts from any sales will be recycled for further affordable housing provision. As drafted, policy SHO4 is unsound because it will be ineffective and inconsistent with national planning policy. In order to remedy this, point 6 of the policy should be deleted.	Object	as previous - look at wording around perpetuity
C448	1249	Rentplus UK Limited [244]	Tetlow King Planning (Mr Jamie Roberts, Principle Planner) [243]	Policy SHO4 - Affordable Housing	The Black Country Housing Market Assessment 2021 (the "Black Country HMA") provides an assessment of affordable housing needs in Sandwell borough. Importantly, its table 3.7 at page 51 assesses the affordability of Rent to Buy homes alongside the time taken to save for a 10% deposit. This is a welcome level of detail that is sometimes absent from similar documents commissioned by other authorities, and is a vital illustration of the contribution that Rent to Buy homes can make towards meeting the widest possible range of housing needs. In Sandwell, table 3.7 presents a powerful illustration of how Rent to Buy can help households raise a 10% deposit; transforming lengthy and likely unrealistic timeframes, into an achievable goal: •For a 1-bed home, it will take 2.7 years to raise a deposit at an intermediate rent, compared with 8.4 years in the private rented sector (a reduction of 5.7 years); •For a 2-bed home, it will take 2.9 years to raise a deposit at an intermediate rent, compared with 11.8 years in the private rented sector (a reduction of 8.9 years); •For a 3-bed home, it will take 4 years to raise a deposit at an intermediate rent, compared with 18.9 years in the private rented sector (a reduction of 14.9 years); These timescales compare well against First Homes; Table 3.10 shows that in Sandwell it will take 8.2 years to raise a deposit for a 1-bed First Home; 11.2 years for a 2-bed First Home, and 16.6 years for a 3-bed First Home. Evidently, Rent to Buy homes can help to meet the needs of a wide range of households and this underlines the importance of a diverse tenure mix. It should also be noted that the Black Country HMA assessment of the affordability of Rent to Buy is based on a 'generic' product that includes no gifted deposit. One of the key benefits of Rentplus is that it includes a 10% gifted deposit at the point of purchase, which means that an even wider range of households can access home ownership, supplemented by their own savings. Given that the Black Country HMA has considered the affordability of rent to buy homes, it is surprising that it does not seek to identify a need for such accommodation. Its table 5.4 at page 75 focuses on only the 'traditional' tenure types including shared ownership and social/affordable rent, whilst its table 5.9 identifies potential demand for First Homes. We recommend that the Black Country HMA is revised to take account of rent to buy in its overall assessment of the need for affordable housing types and tenures. Supporting text Paragraph 7.27 is right to identify the requirement at paragraph 65 of the NPPF to deliver 10% of the total number of homes on major developments to be affordable home ownership tenures. However, the final sentence of this paragraph refers only to First Homes and Shared Ownership tenures, whereas in practice any affordable home ownership tenure, including rent to buy products, can meet this need. To clarify this element of the supporting text, the final sentence of paragraph 7.27 should refer to the broader range of Annex 2 definitions instead.	Comment	Comment noted - amend justification as previously mentioned.
C449	703	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SHO5 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	For reasons discussed in our main representation M4 (2) and M4 (3) should be left to Building Regulations. However, if a policy is felt necessary the wording should differentiate between Part a) and part b) of M4(3) of the building regulations a minimum.	Object	once M2 has been adopted, the policy will be amended accordingly. need to differentiate between parts A and B - policy will be amended
C450	721	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SHO5 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	While the need to provide housing that is accessible and adaptable is recognised, we object to the requirement to build all dwellings to Category M4(2) standards and 15% to M4(3) standards as this will not be consistent with national planning policy and is not evidenced. We also object to Part 4 of Policy SHO5. The provision of self or custom build plots should be the subject of discussion with those who have expressed an interest, and allocations should be identified for self and custom build opportunities within Sandwell or sites can alternatively come forward within the windfall allowance.	Object	once M2 has been adopted, the policy will be amended accordingly. need to differentiate between parts A and B - policy will be amended. Policy SHO5 only requires supply of self-build plots where there is an unmet need from self-build registers. The Policy also allows for plots to be advertised for a reasonable period and if there is no demand they can revert to standard housing. National guidance and legislation does not allow local authorities to take into account the means of individuals when compiling / using the register.

C451	849	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SH05 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	<p>A policy requirement for a minimum proportion of new housing be designed to meet M4(2)/M4(3) standards is unclear and ambiguous in the context of provision also being said to be dependent upon whether this is financially viable. This element fails the test of soundness and is therefore inconsistent with the Framework. Categories M4(2) and M4(3) are optional requirements which local planning authorities can apply through local planning policies where there is an identified local need, and the viability of development is not compromised. M4(2) and M4(3) are optional requirements, as defined in building regulations. An optional requirement only applies where a condition that one or more dwellings should meet the relevant optional requirement is imposed on new development as per the process of granting planning permission. That requirement is rightly policy led, but the policy should be clear that any requirement is dependent upon a demonstrable need and a demonstration that development viability would not be adversely impacted upon.</p> <p>Clarity would be provided through reference to NDSS. Paragraph 130(f) of the Framework (2023) refers to creating places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. In doing so, it references NDSS9 stating that:</p> <p>'Planning policies for housing should make use of the Government's optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing, where this would address an identified need for such properties. Policies may also make use of the nationally described space standard, where the need for an internal space standard can be justified'</p> <p>Under section 1 of the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, local authorities are required to keep a register of those seeking to acquire serviced plots in the area for their own self-build and custom house building. They are also subject to duties under sections 2 and 2A of the Act to have regard to this and to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand.</p> <p>Policy SH05 (4) sets out that where there is a need for self-build and custom build plots identified in the self-build and custom build register (for the administrative area where a development site is located) at least 5% of plots should be made available for self-build or custom build, or sufficient to match the current number on the register if lower.</p> <p>Policy SH05 (4) does not acknowledge that site characteristics might justify self-build/custom build exemption, irrespective of whether there is a current register need. The potential exemption on viability or other grounds of sites from self-build/custom build requirements should be set out clearly in policy SH05 (4).</p>	Object	Once M4/2 has been adopted, the policy will be amended accordingly. Amend policy to reflect VS - reduce % and apply to medium and higher value zones. .
C452	987	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH05 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	<p>89. The requirements to meet Part M4(2) will be superseded by changes to residential Building Regulations. The Government response to 'Raising accessibility standards for new homes' states that the Government proposes to mandate the current M4(2) requirement in Building Regulations as a minimum for all new homes, with M4(1) applying in exceptional circumstances. This will be subject to a further consultation on the technical details and will be implemented in due course through the Building Regulations. The requirement to address this issue in planning policy is therefore unnecessary.</p> <p>90. HBF are of the view that this matter should be left to Building Regulations, however if a policy were to be needed, the wording needs to differentiate between Part a) and part b) of M4(3) technical standards. M43a sets out standards for wheelchair adaptable housing, where M43b relates to wheelchair accessible housing which can only be required on affordable housing where the Council has nomination rights. Any such requirements would also need to be fully considered from a viability perspective.</p>	Comment	Once M4/2 has been adopted, the policy will be amended accordingly. Amend policy to reflect VS - reduce % and apply to medium and higher value zones..
C453	988	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH05 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	<p>92. The PPG sets out some of the circumstances where it would be unreasonable to require M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings. Such factors include flooding, typography and other circumstances. HBF suggest that flexibility is needed in the application of these standards to reflect site specific characteristics, and the policy wording should reflect this. HBF do not believe this policy is sound without this flexibility, as it fails to comply with national policy and is not effective or justified.</p>	Comment	once M4/2 has been adopted, the policy will be amended accordingly. need to differentiate between parts A and B - policy will be amended - PPG states <i>Local Plan policies should also take into account site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography, and other circumstances which may make a specific site less suitable for M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings, particularly where step free access cannot be achieved or is not viable. Where step-free access is not viable, neither of the Optional Requirements in Part M should be applied.</i> Add text to bullet point 1 It is not practically achievable given the physical characteristics of the site, vulnerability to flooding; or
C454	989	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH05 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	<p>93. HBF also note that the Aspinall Verdi Viability Study 2023 says "We also propose a nuanced adjustment in SMBC's M4(3) accessibility policy, emphasising a tailored approach that considers the unique characteristics of different value zones, thereby addressing cost mitigation. Specifically, we recommend that 15% of units situated in medium and higher value zones adhere to M4(3) accessibility standards, while no such obligation is imposed on units located in the lower value zones. This approach not only ensures the equitable allocation of resources but also aligns with the distinct requirements and priorities within each value zone."</p> <p>94. However, this recommendation appears not to have been actioned and incorporated into the policy. There should be no need for developers to have to go through the process and cost of a site-specific viability appraisal when the evidence at the plan-making stage has already shown it to be unviable.</p>	Comment	Once M4/2 has been adopted, the policy will be amended accordingly. Amend policy to reflect VS - reduce % and apply to medium and higher value zones..
C455	990	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH05 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	<p>96. HBF does not consider that requiring major developments to provide for self-builders is appropriate. Instead, the HBF advocates for self and custom-build policies that encourage self and custom-build development by setting out where it will be supported in principle. The HBF considers that Councils can play a key role in facilitating the provision of land as set in the PPG. This could be done, for example, by using the Councils' own land for such purposes and/or allocating sites specifically for self and custom-build home builders- although this would need to be done through discussion and negotiation with landowners.</p> <p>97. It is considered unlikely that the provision of self and custom build plots on new housing developments can be co-ordinated with the development of the wider site. At any one time, there are often multiple contractors and large machinery operating on-site from both a practical and health and safety perspective, it is difficult to envisage the development of single plots by individuals operating alongside this construction activity.</p> <p>98. HBF agree that if demand for plots is not realised, it is important that plots should not be left empty to the detriment of neighbouring properties or the whole development. The timescale for reversion of these plots to the original housebuilder should be as short as possible from the commencement of development because the consequential delay in developing those plots presents further practical difficulties in terms of co-ordinating their development with construction activity on the wider site. There are even greater logistical problems created if the original housebuilder has completed the development and is forced to return to site to build out plots which have not been sold to self & custom builders. Therefore, if the current policy requirements are retained HBF would support the suggestion that any unsold plots remaining after the 6-month marketing period revert to the original developer.</p>	Comment	Policy SH05 only requires a supply of self-build plots where there is an unmet need from self-build registers. The Policy also allows for plots to be advertised for a reasonable period and if there is no demand they can revert to standard housing.
C456	1176	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SH05 - Delivering Wheelchair Accessible and Self / Custom Build Housing	<p>3.8 To help address this shortfall, emerging Policy SH03 Housing Density, Type and Accessibility seeks to provide substantial uplifts to minimum density requirements to maximise on the most efficient use of land. This has resulted in a range from 40dph, to 45dph to 100dph in West Brom, this are much higher than the typical 25-30dph figures. The policy notes that further detailed design requirements will come forward in relation to these densities as part of future Sandwell Design Codes. However, with the growing pressures on development to provide more than just housing, such as the 10% BNG (with onsite provision as a preference), accessibility requirements such as the minimum of 15% provision of part M4(3) dwellings for developments of 10 or more dwellings (emerging Policy SH05), the need for sites of 2ha or larger to provide new unrestricted open space at a minimum ratio of 3.63 hectares of space per 1,000 population on site (emerging Policy SH4W) all place additional demand for space on site, which may mean that the high minimum density standards cannot be met, resulting in an even lower number of housing units being capable of being provided within Sandwell.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C457	706	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SH06 - Financial Viability Assessments for Housing	<p>Please see full representation for justification. To introduce a review mechanism, there must be a clear and specific policy basis and justification for any such mechanism to be brought in. A review mechanism and any detail that will form part of it needs to be considered fully and assessed through the Local Plan process. This should include the consideration of variables eg trigger points, costs, land values, how surplus is split. The plan should also include an exemption from the review mechanism for single phased developments. PINS have repeatedly noted that review mechanisms are unnecessary for single phased sites.</p>	Object	look at whole rep
C458	991	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SH06 - Financial Viability Assessments for Housing	<p>99. As the whole plan viability methodology uses typologies, this means there may be individual sites that are not viable, for example if the costs or vales of a specific site fall outside the parameters used of a typology that was tested. Some site will be on the very margins of viability and other sites may already be unviable even without a change of circumstances. HBF therefore support the recognition of the potential need for flexibility in relation to site specific viability issues.</p>	Comment	comment noted
C459	1213	Oldbury (Smethwick) Limited [238]	Planning Prospects Ltd (Mr Chris Dodds, Associate Director) [163]	Policy SH06 - Financial Viability Assessments for Housing	<p>Sets out at its part 4) that on sites where applying the affordable housing or accessibility and wheelchair user requirements set out in Policies SH04 and SH05 can be demonstrated to make the development unviable, the maximum proportion of such housing will be sought that will not undermine the viability of the development, subject to achieving optimum tenure mix and securing other planning obligations necessary for the development to gain planning permission.</p> <p>Whilst the recognition that any such provision needs to be viable is welcome, financial viability is key for all policy requirements if much needed residential development is going to come forward. With this in mind, draft Policy SH06 must refer to other policy requirements, such as SMD1 (Design Quality) for example, and make it clear that if any policy requirements make the development unviable, the optimum provision will be sought that will not undermine the viability of the development, subject to achieving optimum tenure mix, development density and securing other planning obligations necessary for the development to gain planning permission.</p>	Object	Noted, density of the development is covered by other policies

C460	872	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SH08 - Houses in Multiple Occupation	<p>The PCCWM supports the wording of the policy and justification to Policy SH08, which reflects the representations made to the Sandwell Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>The PCCWM supports the specific reference within the policy itself, point 3(e) as follows -</p> <p>'3. Once the current level of HMO provision has been established in a relevant area, the following criteria will be applied to a new proposal:...</p> <p>e) the development would not give rise to unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts on amenity, character, appearance, security, crime, anti-social behaviour or the fear of crime.'</p> <p>The PCCWM also fully supports the footnote to this policy which recommends that pre-application and planning application advice is sought for HMO proposals from the West Midlands Police Design Out Crime Officers.</p> <p>In addition, the PCCWM supports the reference in point 6 of the Policy that states that the policy criteria will also apply to the intensification or expansion of an existing HMO.</p> <p>The justification to Policy SH08, paragraph 7.54(g) is also supported by the PCCWM. It explains that harmful impacts associated with high numbers of HMOs can include: '...g) increased anti-social behaviour and fear of crime resulting from the lifestyles of some HMO occupants, the transient nature of the accommodation and inadequately designed / maintained properties;...'</p> <p>However, in addition to the support for Policy SH08, the PCCWM suggests there is a Borough wide Article 4 Direction introduced to seek to remove the permitted development right to convert a residential dwelling to a small HMO (providing living accommodation for 3 to 6 unrelated persons), such that planning permission would be required for any proposals, alongside the proposed policy against which all HMO applications, as well as planning applications for large HMO (for which there are no permitted development rights and thereby planning permission is required) will be assessed. This is an approach taken by a number of the West Midlands authorities, including Birmingham City Council and Coventry City Council.</p> <p>An Article 4 Direction regarding permitted development for HMOs, alongside the proposed policies of the draft Sandwell Local Plan will manage the distribution and delivery of HMOs, to reduce the potential harm that arises from the over-concentration and poor quality of HMOs, and the consequential impact this has on crime and disorder and to community safety, and the increased pressure this places on Police resources.</p>	Support	Support noted. At present there is no intention to introduce an Article 4 direction, instead the Council are currently out to consultation to introduce an additional HMO licensing process for small HMOs (under 5 beds). This had already been piloted in West Bromwich. It is hoped that this will ensure that HMOs are managed well.
C461	818	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SH09 – Education Facilities	<p>Sport England supports part 5 of the policy that states new and redeveloped education facilities should include provision for wider community use of sports and other facilities where this would be in accordance with evidence of need, secured through a suitably worded community use agreement as this aligns with Sport England's approach to making most effective use of local community facilities to deliver sport and physical activity.</p> <p>Sport England supports part 7 of the policy that identifies that the loss of part or the whole of an education facility will only be permitted where alternative provision is available to meet the needs of the community since this also helps protect the supply of community available sports facilities at education sites in the Borough.</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support
C462	699	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SHW1– Health Impact Assessments	<p>For the plan to be in line with national policy and effective the following wording should be added to para 2 of the policy to recognise the health benefits of older persons housing.</p> <p>'Specialist Housing for older people has a number of health benefits and proposals for such schemes will not be required to submit a Health Impact Assessment '.</p>	Object	The reason for an assessment does not just look at the site-specific issues but also the impacts such proposals may have externally, so needs to be retained.
C463	1201	NHS Property Services (Ellen Moore, Associate Town Planner) [237]		Policy SHW1– Health Impact Assessments	<p>NHSPS supports this Policy and the requirement for HIA but would request the Policy be amended to include healthy design requirements for developments. Further details are set out below</p> <p>There is a well-established connection between planning and health, and the planning system has an important role in creating healthy communities. The planning system is critical not only to the provision of improved health services and infrastructure, enabling health providers to meet changing healthcare needs, but also to addressing the wider determinants of health.</p> <p>Identifying and addressing the health requirements of existing and new development is a critical way of ensuring the delivery of healthy, safe, and inclusive communities. On this basis, we would welcome further consideration of healthy design requirements within the Local Plan ahead of the Regulation 19 document being prepared.</p> <p>Specific policy requirements to promote healthy developments should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ?Development proposals to consider local health outcomes ?Design schemes to encourage active travel, including through providing safe and attractive walking and cycling routes, and ensuring developments are connected by these routes to local services, employment, leisure, and existing walking and cycling routes. ?Provide access to healthy foods, including through access to shops and food growing opportunities (allotments and/or providing sufficient garden space) ?Design schemes in a way that encourages social interaction, including through providing front gardens, and informal meeting spaces including street benches and neighbourhood squares and green spaces. ?Design schemes to be resilient and adaptable to climate change, including through SUDs, rainwater collection, and efficient design. ?Consider the impacts of pollution and microclimates, and design schemes to reduce any potential negative outcomes. ?Ensure development embraces and respects the context and heritage of the surrounding area. ?Provide the necessary mix of housing types and affordable housing, reflecting local needs. ?Provide sufficient and high quality green and blue spaces within developments 	Support	Note comments and welcome support. The suggested policy requirements listed in the response are all covered by policies elsewhere in the plan, and in the supporting text of this policy for the most part and there is no need to repeat them all here in detail. In addition, Table 3 of the SLP indicates where specific policies will help to deliver particular objectives, such as improving the health and wellbeing of residents and promoting social inclusion. Alongside the HW policies themselves are listed a number of other policies, such as green and blue infrastructure, active travel, the need for good design and the creation of safe, welcoming and attractive public realms etc. Amend to include reference to the elements of healthy design and Table 3
C464	764	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SHW1– Health Impact Assessments	<p>Policy SHW1 – Health Impact Assessments</p> <p>The PCCWM notes the Council's acknowledgement (in the preamble to policies on health and wellbeing, e.g. paragraph 6.6) of ensuring a healthy and safe environment that contributes to people's health and wellbeing being a key Council objective and its partners in the health, voluntary and other related sectors.</p> <p>The proposed Health Impact Assessments (HIA) cover an assessment of how proposed development will be, inter alia, '...inclusive, safe, and attractive, with a strong sense of place, encourages social interaction and provides for all age groups and abilities' (paragraph 6.14).</p> <p>The PCCWM supports the policy and its objectives.</p>	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C465	819	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SHW1– Health Impact Assessments	<p>Sport England notes the requirements of policy SHW1 and supports the referencing in para 6.14 part g) to protect and include a range of social infrastructure including sport and recreation and education facilities that are close to where people live and are accessible by inclusive active and environmentally sustainable forms of travel, thereby cross referencing to policy SHW4 (Open space and recreation) and to part h) to protect, enhance and provide new GI and sports facilities, thereby cross referencing to policies SHW4 and SHW5 (playing fields and sports facilities). We support the proportionate approach being taken dependent on the nature and scale of development proposed.</p>	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C466	700	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SHW2 – Healthcare Infrastructure	<p>Recommendation: For the plan to be in line with national policy and effective the following wording should be added to para 3 of the policy to recognise the health benefits of older persons housing.</p> <p>'Specialist Housing for older people has a number of health benefits and proposals for such schemes will not be required to provide additional healthcare infrastructure'.</p>	Object	The reason for an assessment does not just look at the site-specific issues but also the impacts such proposals may have externally, so needs to be retained.

C467	1202	NHS Property Services (Ellen Moore, Associate Town Planner) [237]		Policy SHW2 – Healthcare Infrastructure	<p>Part 3 to 6 of Draft Policy SHW2 sets out:</p> <p>3. Proposals for major residential developments of ten units or more must be assessed against the capacity of existing healthcare facilities and / or services as set out in local development documents. Where the demand generated by the residents of the new development would have unacceptable impacts upon the capacity of these facilities, developers will be required to contribute to the provision or improvement of such services, in line with the requirements and calculation methods set out in local development documents.</p> <p>4. Where it is not possible to address such provision through planning conditions, a planning agreement or planning obligation may be required.</p> <p>5. In the first instance, infrastructure contributions will be sought to deal with relevant issues on the site or in its immediate vicinity. Where this is not possible, however, any contribution will be used to support offsite provision of healthcare infrastructure and / or related services.</p> <p>6. The effects of the obligations on the financial viability of development may be a relevant consideration.</p> <p>NHSPS supports this Policy and the requirement for major residential proposals to be assessed against capacity of existing healthcare facilities and / or services, and for mitigation to be secured. With respect to the application of the calculation methods set out in local development documents, we request local NHS partners such as the Integrated Care Board (ICB) and NHS Trusts be consulted on major applications in order to confirm any proposed contributions appropriately mitigate impacts.</p> <p>The NHS, Council and other partners must work together to forecast the infrastructure and costs required to support the projected growth and development across the borough. A vital part of this is ensuring the NHS continues to receive a commensurate share of S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) developer contributions to mitigate the impacts of growth and help deliver transformation plans.</p> <p>The significant cumulative impacts of residential developments on healthcare requirements in the area should be recognised and, given their strategic importance, health facilities should be put on a level footing with affordable housing and public transport improvements when securing and allocating S106 and CIL funds, in order to enable the delivery of vital NHS projects. It is imperative that planning policies are positively prepared, in recognition of their statutory duty to help finance improved healthcare services and facilities through effective estate management.</p> <p>We request that when setting planning obligation policies, considering pre-application schemes or determination planning applications, the Council seek to address strategic as well as local priorities in planning obligations and engage the NHS in the planning process as early as possible.</p>	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C468	1200	NHS Property Services (Ellen Moore, Associate Town Planner) [237]		Policy SHW2 – Healthcare Infrastructure	<p>Part 1 and 2 of Draft Policy SHW2 sets out:</p> <p>1. New healthcare facilities should be:</p> <p>a. Well-designed and complement and enhance neighbourhood services and amenities;</p> <p>b. Well-served by public transport infrastructure, walking and cycling facilities and directed to a town centre appropriate in role and scale to the proposed development, and its intended catchment area, in accordance with Policies SCE3 and SCE4. Proposals located outside centres must be justified in terms of relevant policies such as Policy SCE6, where applicable;</p> <p>c. Wherever possible, located to address accessibility gaps in terms of the standards set out in Policy SHO3, particularly where a significant amount of new housing is proposed; and</p> <p>d. Where possible, co-located with a mix of compatible community services on a single site.</p> <p>2. Existing primary and secondary healthcare infrastructure and services will be protected, unless it has been demonstrated that the loss or partial loss of a facility or site arises from a wider public service transformation plan that requires investment in modern, fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities. New or improved healthcare facilities and services will be provided in accordance with requirements agreed between Sandwell Council and local health organisations.</p> <p>NHSPS supports the provision of sufficient, quality health facilities, and welcomes the acknowledgment in Part 2 that where the NHS can demonstrate a health facility will be changed as part of a wider public service transformation plan, this will be sufficient for the local planning authority to accept that a facility is not needed for its current use or an alternative community use, and therefore that the principle of alternative uses for NHS land and property will be fully supported.</p> <p>We request Part 1 and 2 of this Draft Policy be carried forward as drafted to Regulation 19 stage. This will ensure that the NHS can promptly and efficiently respond to the healthcare requirements of residents through the evolution of its estate. In order to enable the NHS to be able to promptly adapt its estate to changing healthcare requirements, it is essential that all planning policies enable flexibility within the NHS estate. On this basis, NHSPS would advise the Council that policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can potentially have a harmful impact on the NHS's ability to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Where such policies are overly restrictive, the disposal of surplus and unsuitable healthcare facilities for best value can be prevented or delayed, which in turn delays vital re-investment in the NHS estate.</p> <p>It is important that policies consider that some public service providers, such as the NHS, routinely undertake strategic reviews of their estates. Reviews of the NHS estate are aimed at improving the provision of healthcare services by increasing efficiencies, including through the disposal of unneeded and unsuitable properties. This means that capital receipts from disposals, as well as revenue spending that is saved, can be used to improve facilities and services.</p> <p>Where it can be demonstrated that health facilities will be changed as part of a wider NHS estate reorganisation programme it should be accepted that a facility is neither needed nor viable for its current use. This will ensure that the NHS can promptly and efficiently respond to the healthcare requirements of residents through the evolution of its estate.</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support. The Council is satisfied that there is sufficient flexibility in its policies to allow windfall sites to be considered during the lifetime of the SLP.
C469	843	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SHW3 – Air Quality	<p>Paragraph 186 of the Framework (2023) sets out that planning policies should sustain and contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants, taking in account the presence of Air Quality Management Areas and Clear Air Zones, and the cumulative impacts from individual sites in local areas. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities. Paragraph 188 of the Framework (2023) is clear that the focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than control of processes or emissions (where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes).</p> <p>Policy SHW3 includes a blanket statement that new development must be at least air quality neutral. This element of the draft policy does not reflect the Framework or the Planning Practice Guidance, in its blanket approach. The PPG sets out that plans may need to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the observed trends shown by recent air quality monitoring data and what would happen to these trends in light of proposed development and / or allocations; - The impact of point sources of air pollution (pollution that originates from one place); - The potential cumulative impact of a number of smaller developments on air quality as well as the effect of more substantial developments, including their implications for vehicle emissions; - Ways in which new development could be made appropriate in locations where air quality is or is likely to be a concern, and not give rise to unacceptable risks from pollution. This could, for example, entail identifying measures for offsetting the impact on air quality arising from new development including supporting measures in an air quality action plan or low emissions strategy where applicable; and - Opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts, such as through traffic and travel management and green infrastructure provision and enhancement. <p>The PPG continues to explain that the test is the impact of proposed development and potential impact on future occupants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the proposed development could significantly change air quality during the construction and operational phases (and the consequences of this for public health and biodiversity); and whether occupiers or users of the development could experience poor living conditions or health due to poor air quality. <p>A requirement for development being air quality neutral is justified where there are sensitive receptors such that anything other than air quality neutral would be unacceptable or a proposed development would otherwise lead to a deterioration in existing poor air quality. For the policy to pass the test of soundness it should add criteria into its air quality neutral requirement, to set out on what basis such an expectation is justified and how an applicant might demonstrate the acceptability of a development in circumstances where such a requirement is justified.</p>	Object	Comment noted. Amend policy to clarify requirement for improvements to air quality
C470	1063	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SHW3 – Air Quality	<p>Policy SHW3 – Air Quality</p> <p>While TfWM fully welcomes air quality being captured in this chapter, we would welcome embedding policies relating to air quality in all of the transport-related policies as well, due to the high percentage of responsibility that transport holds for air pollutants and policies throughout the local plan which favour growth in places which support sustainable modes and reduces the need to travel.</p> <p>Also, whilst climate adaptation and ensuring the transport system is responding to climate impacts is picked up in chapter 15: Development Management, we need to ensure we reduce our carbon footprint and climate adaptation is focused upon concerning transport in more detail, and not linked only to design but captured more generally.</p>	Support	Noted

C471	1100	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy SHW3 – Air Quality	While TFWM fully welcomes air quality being captured in this chapter, we would welcome embedding policies relating to air quality in all of the transport-related policies as well, due to the high percentage of responsibility that transport holds for air pollutants and policies throughout the local plan which favour growth in places which support sustainable modes and reduces the need to travel. Also, whilst climate adaptation and ensuring the transport system is responding to climate impacts is picked up in chapter 15: Development Management, we need to ensure we reduce our carbon footprint and climate adaption is focused upon concerning transport in more detail, and not linked only to design but captured more generally.	Comment	Noted
C472	1261	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SHW3 – Air Quality	In relation to Air Quality the Trust welcomes the inclusion of 'Emissions from Construction Sites' within the wording of policy SHW3 (sub-section 7) as this aligns to our regular requests for Construction and Environmental Management Plans within our statutory consultation responses to planning applications.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C473	1262	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	The Trust also welcomes mention of canal corridors within para 6.50 of the justification text for Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation and the restoration of towpaths as a component of enhancing green networks through the mechanisms of planning conditions and obligations.	Support	Comment noted.
C474	999	Ms Harpreet Chahal [218]		Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	Is there any way that we can make our parks more friendly and accessible to people like me over 25 who do not have children please? I drive but many of us don't and we need to tackle this obesity and lack of exercising in our community epidemic. Also please make the Dartmouth Park by the rabbit section a bit more friendly the staff at the rabbit section seemed hostile towards me when I visited this lunchtime I don't want to get into trouble for saying that and I don't want to take that matter further. West Smethwick Park is great but we need to give the female population more opportunities of exercise than just walking, indoor exercise groups and outdoor exercise equipment. We would love more friendly female only football groups at West Smethwick Park and I would be happy to join them. Lightwoods Park seems unfriendly at times except when there are major events going on there. For this park I would suggest the above the same as what I have suggested for West Smethwick Park please. The mess in Stony Lane park is a long standing joke and we need to be more hefty with the fining of adults feeding the wrong foods to the birds there.	Comment	Not an SLP Reg 18 issue - forwarded to Parks and Green Spaces for their attention.
C475	820	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	Sport England notes the contents of para 6.43 which seeks to explain the different purposes of policies SHW4 and SHW5 (which relates to playing fields and built sports facilities). Sport England also notes and supports the reference in para 6.45 to encouraging implementation of Sport England's Active Design policy, though more accurately this should be referred to as guidance rather than policy. Also, we consider that several other policies in the Plan draw from our Active Design principles, but are not expressly referenced in the policy justification for those policies. As such, we would not wish policy SHW4 to be seen as the only policy for which Active Design is of relevance since this is one of several policies where we consider that the principles of Active Design to apply. The policy makes reference to meeting local standards of provision for various open space typologies with reference to Appendix K. Appendix K lists in part 6 that this includes playing fields and sports pitches, however this also includes a note that the availability, access and quality of sports facilities/playing pitches will be assessed using data from the Council's Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (2022), with reference also made to policy SHW5 and Appendix J (which extracts some headline findings from the PPOSS. There is no reference to quantity of playing field provision in the note. As such, we consider that as drafted its unclear whether or not policy SHW4 should be interpreted to be a relevant policy in respect of playing fields or not. Since we understand that policy SHW5 is intended to be the relevant policy that addresses the need for and protection of playing fields and built sports facilities, we strongly recommend amending the drafting of policy SHW4, its reasoned justification and the appendix to make it clearer that policy SHW4 does not relate playing fields and built sports facilities. This is important because the drafting of part 7a) of the policy introduces a criterion that the loss of open space can be supported where is a robust and overriding matter of public interest at stake. This criterion does not accord policy SHW5, Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and para 99 of the NPPF, and so policy SHW4 conflicts with these policies, and so we must raise objection to it in so far as it may be seen as a relevant policy for assessing the impact on playing fields and other sports facilities. The drafting of part 7c) is also at odds with policy SHW5 and our Playing Fields Policy where it states that a financial contribution could be accepted to mitigate quantitative loss of open space. To address this we are strongly of the view that to avoid unnecessary mis-interpretation and conflict with other policies, that the policy explanation should make it clear that policy SHW4 does not apply to playing fields and sports facilities. As such, part 8h) of the policy would also need to be amended since this also makes reference to the role of supporting outdoor sport and physical activity, we would suggest this is amended to refer to informal opportunities for physical activity to make a clear distinction from the types of formal provision covered by SHW5.	Object	Note comments. Paragraph 6.43 makes it clear that the two policies address different areas and as such it is not clear why SE are concerned about confusion. Amend policy to clarify that SHW4 relates to open spaces but not sports pitches / playing fields
C476	821	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	... Sport England supports the reference in part 4ciii) to expanding community use of open space and recreation facilities at places of education where this can help meet identified needs. We also support the reference in part 4cv) to improving access for all.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C477	1151	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	We support the reference to heritage within clause 8.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C478	701	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	The open space needs of older people are much less than for mainstream housing. For older people the quality of open space either on site or easily accessible for passive recreation is much more important than formal open space. The Local Plan, should therefore provide an exemption for older people's housing schemes but consider the quality of the space instead. The following text should be incorporated into the plan: Older person's housing schemes are exempt from open space requirements so long as high quality amenity space suitable for older people is provided on site or available locally.	Object	Noted. Paragraph 12 of Appendix K states, "The quantum and typology of open space that may be applicable to a housing site will depend upon its intended occupants; for example, specialist housing for older people will not create demand for the typical amount and type of open space required for children and young people ." This is therefore recognised in the SLP and will be taken into account when decisions are taken on proposed schemes.
C479	1178	Wain Estates [62]	Turley (Mr Tom Armfield, Director) [61]	Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	3.8To help address this shortfall, emerging Policy SH03 Housing Density, Type and Accessibility seeks to provide substantial uplifts to minimum density requirements to maximise on the most efficient use of land. This has resulted in a range from 40dph, to 45dph to 100dph in West Brom, this are much higher than the typical 25-30dph figures. The policy notes that further detailed design requirements will come forward in relation to these densities as part of future Sandwell Design Codes. However, with the growing pressures on development to provide more than just housing, such as the 10% BNG (with onsite provision as a preference), accessibility requirements such as the minimum of 15% provision of part M4(3) dwellings for developments of 10 or more dwellings (emerging Policy SH05), the need for sites of 2ha or larger to provide new unrestricted open space at a minimum ratio of 3.63 hectares of space per 1,000 population on site (emerging Policy SH4W) all place additional demand for space on site, which may mean that the high minimum density standards cannot be met, resulting in an even lower number of housing units being capable of being provided within Sandwell.	Comment	Noted. The figure of 3.63ha per 1,000 population was identified in the last Green Spaces Strategy and represents the current level of provision available to residents in this highly urbanised borough. The SLP will go through a viability assessment and issues like this will be taken into account when the work is being undertaken.
C480	716	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	While FCC acknowledges the importance of providing open space for the residents of Sandwell, we object to a numerical standard being set in policy. The quality of open space, as opposed to simply the quantity, should be a key factor when considering proposals for new housing development. Additionally, the ratio of 3.63 hectares of space per 1,000 population, set out in the policy needs to be supported by clear evidence.	Object	The figure of 3.63ha per 1,000 population was identified in the last Green Spaces Strategy and represents the current level of provision available to residents in this highly urbanised borough. The SLP will go through a viability assessment and issues like this will be taken into account when the work is being undertaken. This is addressed in more detail in Appendix K, which identifies standards and explores the geographical discrepancies.
C481	844	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SHW4– Open Space and Recreation	Policy SHW4 states that: 'All new housing sites providing over ten units will be expected to contribute towards the provision of unrestricted open space, in line with the standards set out in Appendix K. Where such provision on- site would make a site unviable or where there is no physical capacity to include it, the Council will in exceptional circumstances accept a commuted sum for nearby off-site provision in lieu or for the improvement of existing facilities within walking distance.' The policy is rightly targeted at major development proposals but fails to acknowledge that the expectation of contribution to unrestricted open space should be based upon whether there is a demonstrable shortfall locally of unrestricted open space.	Comment	The figure of 3.63ha per 1,000 population was identified in the last Green Spaces Strategy and represents the current level of provision available to residents in this highly urbanised borough. The SLP will go through a viability assessment and issues like this will be taken into account when the work is being undertaken. The aim is to maintain this level of provision across the borough - it is the case that certain areas of Sandwell are much better provided for than others, but other areas, particularly in the main urban core, suffer from a significant lack of opportunities. The policy can be clarified to spell out the geographical requirements as necessary.

C482	822	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]	Policy SHW5 – Playing Fields and Sports Facilities	<p>Sport England supports part 1 of the policy which accords with paragraph 99 of the NPPF and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.</p> <p>Sport England supports part 2 of the policy which relates to provision of new built sports facilities to meet identified needs that are well-designed and in accessible locations.</p> <p>Sport England supports part 3 of the policy that relates to securing developer contributions to address the needs of new housing developments, through proportionate planning obligations or CIL.</p> <p>Sport England supports part 5 of the policy that promotes the wider community use of school playing fields and other school sports facilities such as sports halls to help meet identified needs. We would advocate that the policy wording is strengthened to reference that where appropriate this will be secured via a suitably worded community use agreement.</p> <p>Sport England supports reference in para 6.58 to using Sport England's calculator tools as a basis for determining appropriate level of contributions since this draws from data collected for the PPOSS.</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support. Amend to reference community use agreements
C483	823	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]	Policy SHW5 – Playing Fields and Sports Facilities	<p>As set out in our comments on policy SHW4, we would strongly recommend that policy SHW4 and its associated justification be amended to make it clear that SHW4 does not apply to playing fields and built sports facilities, and that the relevant policy for such provision is policy SHW5.</p> <p>...</p> <p>There is a lack of detail to identify the scale of development for which ... developer contributions would be sought and so the Council may wish to address this in the policy and reasoned justification.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the justification draws from the headline findings of the 2022 PPOSS in paras 6.59-6.64, it is recommended that a further paragraph is added to the justification to explain that the Council will review and replace the PPOSS so as to keep this evidence up to date through the Plan period.</p>	Comment	See comments on SHW4. Amend policy to refer to scale of qualifying development.
C484	635	Mr Gary Blunt [156]	Policy SID1 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks	<p>You should be looking to get 2 infrastructure providers in at the time of build. At least one of these should be open access to encourage future competition and value for money for residents.</p> <p>Efforts should also be made to fill in the not spots in existing areas to get all of Sandwell connected to future proofed full fibre infrastructure.</p>	Support	Comment noted. This is an issue for the planning application and pre-application stage and the Government has encouraged developers to liaise with providers at an early stage in the design process.
C485	747	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]	Policy SID1 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks	<p>But you did this without consulting residents within the high rises, imagine waking up to strange men outside your front door drilling holes and blocking of your access, without any prior knowledge that your landlord (sandwell council) have taken it upon themselves to install broadband right above your front door with a company that has no physical buildings within the UK and their headquarters are in Slovakia and the deals they provide are rubbish incomparable to existing UK broadband providers.</p>	Comment	Comments noted. Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C486	922	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	Policy SID1 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks	<p>The Trust welcomes mention of the potential for use of canal towpaths for the provision of 5G network infrastructure within sub-section 3d of Policy SID1 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks and requests additional wording as follows, 'To be delivered through the reasonable use of planning conditions or S106/CIL obligations.' (ACTION REQUEST).</p>	Comment	Note and welcome support. Add text to policy
C487	992	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Policy SID1 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks	<p>Policy SID1 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises and 5G Networks</p> <p>100. There is no need for the first section of this policy on Fibre to the Premises broadband because this matter has been addressed through the Part R update to building Regulations that came in last year on 26 December 2022, which ensures development provides gigabit ready physical infrastructure.</p>	Comment	Noted. Part R of revised Building Regulations introduce gigabit broadband infrastructure and connectivity requirements for the construction of new homes in England. As a result, Policy SID1 part 1 will be deleted and reference will be made in the supporting text to the requirements of the revised regulations.
C488	801	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]	Policy SMI1 - Minerals Safeguarding	<p>Dudley MBC supports the principle of this policy, which is broadly consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP80 Mineral Requirements and Policy DLP81 Mineral Safeguarding. The policy approach also helps to ensure cross boundary consistency in identifying appropriate locations for non-minerals developments which do not prejudice existing minerals-related operations. Dudley MBC will continue to work with Sandwell MBC on cross boundary strategic minerals matters, including via the West Midlands Aggregates Working Group and as part of the production of Local Aggregates Assessments for the West Midlands Metropolitan Area.</p>	Support	Comment noted - DTC work to continue via th West Midlands Aggregates Working Group
C489	1168	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]	Policy SMI1 - Minerals Safeguarding	<p>Are there minerals sites that are being proposed for allocation or safeguarding? If so, how has the historic environment been considered in this process?</p>	Comment	Comment notes - There are no proposed mineral sites or mineral safeguarding areas in Sandwell in the Plan
C490	1169	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]	Policy SMI2 - Managing the Effects of Mineral Development	<p>Clause 5) b should set out an approach for what happens if a mineral working site is not appropriate due to the harm to the historic environment or if there are mitigation measures required to overcome any harm. The clause for cumulative impacts could also apply for the historic environment where there are already approved mineral workings in a historic landscape.</p> <p>Paraq 13.012 - This para would benefit from additional detail.</p> <p>The policy would benefit from a clause on remediation so that the long term future of any minerals working site is appropriate in its environment.</p>	Object	Comment - look at the policy and the potential of inserting a "Historic Environment" clause
C491	648	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]	Policy SNE1 – Nature Conservation	<p>You do not define "harm". In terms of Sheepwash, the delivery of the proposed 500 plus houses at Rattlechain would do serious harm to wildlife habitat at our site, as well as at Rattlechain. Wildlife Cannot exist in human habitation settings like this without loss, and this cannot be mitigated fully as you claim. We have already lost wintering stonechat from Rattlechain since the sewage works development at Temple Way. Wildlife corridors are not just canals as you appear to think, but linked passageways in trees and flora between sheepwash and rattlechain/Temple Way. Housing would impede this linkage.</p>	Comment	Comment noted
C492	768	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]	Policy SNE1 – Nature Conservation	<p>Dudley MBC supports references to the protection of Fens Pool Special Area of Conservation. We would expect this to be addressed as part of the Habitats Regulation Assessment process for the SLP and individual development proposals, as necessary.</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support
C493	685	Mr John Davison [192]	Policy SNE1 – Nature Conservation	<p>This section could be strengthened. For birds, new buildings can accommodate nest provision. Starlings, for instance, find their food in grassland areas but there may not be suitable nests. Buildings on the fringes of habitat could be required to include universal nesting bricks (swift bricks) and bat bricks.</p>	Comment	Noted. Policy SNE2 identifies opportunities for providing support to nesting and roosting birds

C494	1122	Palmer Timber Limited [230]	Miss C Buchanan [202]	Policy SNE1 – Nature Conservation SNE1 - Nature Conservation Wildlife Corridor/SLINC In the emerging Local Plan, the site has been given a designation as wildlife corridor. This designation encompasses not only the areas of surrounding trees and shrubbery which forms a boundary to the site, but the employment/ industrial land also. We object to this proposed policy and consider this designation to be inappropriate and unnecessary. We also consider the proposed Nature Conservation policy SNE1, conflicts with policy SEC3 - Local Employment Areas. 2qwas The Palmers Timber Site, Station Road, as previously stated, has been in employment use for a significant period of time and is currently in active use. We consider the site should retain its current designation as a residential site as discussed above, however, against the proposed policy SEC3, policy SNE1 is overly prescriptive and would hinder employment related development/ redevelopment on the site with the requirements for policy SNE1 4, 5 and 6. We consider this to be contrary NPPF paragraph 81 which states, "Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development." The requirements of policy SNE1 and the impacts they could potentially have on the site could result in negative outcomes to Palmers Timber Limited and their continued future use of the site. Should my clients wish to expand their business and increase development on site, the proposed policy may hinder their ability to further the business, therefore potentially requiring an alternative site being sourced. Thus, resulting in the loss of an important business/ employer in the area and resulting in a vacant site at risk of becoming derelict. The site is heavily developed with significant areas of concrete/ tarmac which is use as parking areas and storage. There are a number of very large industrial/ employment buildings which are all in active use. There are several large vehicle movements throughout the site regularly. There is no part of the built development which acts as a wildlife corridor/ SLINC that would require a formal designation over the whole site [see attachment for aerial view of Palmer Timber Site] The above ariel photography highlights the stark contrast between the surrounding flora and the built development of the site. We also question and object to the designation of the SLING/wildlife corridor surrounding the developed part of the site, as we do not consider there is significant justification for the land to be designated as SLINC	Object	Noted. Should a site be allocated for development in the local plan, the potential impacts on environmental allocations can be assumed to have been taken into account when that decision to allocate was made. As a result, while mitigation, enhancement and BNG requirements will still need to be addressed, the site itself can be considered to be acceptable in principle for development. Development or redevelopment within the boundary of the existing site is also likely to be acceptable in principle, depending on the details of the proposals. The specific designation referred to is a very longstanding one dating back many years to former versions of the local plan for Sandwell. It does not appear to have been the case that the wildlife corridor designation has had any impact on the use of the site nor on any development that may have occurred in the interim.
C495	650	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats You cannot measure biodiversity! You cannot take away from one area to give to another without destroying habitats in that area. We object in the strongest terms to giving "credits" to privately owned estate. Menzies no longer exists and that school is run by a company educational provider. The millpool is so polluted it would cost millions to desilt.	Object	Comment noted
C496	665	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats We would encourage Sandwell MBC to consider requiring more than the minimum 10% biodiversity net gain in new developments.	Comment	Comment noted
C497	679	Mrs Peta Sams [191]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats Although out of your immediate area I am commenting as I run Shropshire Swift Group - quite close. Good to see provision of bricks for urban birds but clearer wording would ensure all these species get the help they need. Too often provision doesn't work out as wording was not sufficiently clear. Swift bricks should be specified - they are a universal brick for a range of small bird species and are suitable for all types of development. These should be in addition to bat boxes and installed following best practice guidance for location ad number BS42021 can help here.	Comment	Comment noted
C498	913	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats This section contains a number of policies in relation to Nature Conservation (SNE1), Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats (SNE2 including Biodiversity net gain, Local Nature Recovery Network Strategy, and Local opportunities for habitats and wildlife); Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands, And Hedgerows (SNE3); Geodiversity and the Black Country UNESCO Global Geopark (SNE4); and The Rowley Hills (SNE5). In relation to Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats the Trust considers that the value of the canal network to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will manifest itself as the implementation of BNG gains traction in 2024 and beyond. For example, canals are part of the local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and as such will provide an increasing value and essential role in the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. Canals more broadly play a crucial role within Sandwell for nature conservation and provide large populations of urban dwellers with access to nature. As such Sandwell's canals should be recognised for the crucial role they facilitate in priority species movements and recovery through the West Midlands. More specifically, and as an example, the Great Canal Orchard project potentially includes spaces for BNG orchards both as pockets and linear habitats along the canal, incorporated into developments where national priority habitats are not already present. Orchard trees also provide air quality improvements, a role in flood prevention, shade for climate adaption, free healthy fruit resources for communities, and potential for green economy gain if scaled up. Species recovery strategies under the Environment Act 2021 consider species of importance for Sandwell to include water vole, otter and soprano pipistrelle bats along canal corridors. As commented elsewhere in this response, water quality should be protected and improved, air quality must be protected from degradation and more broadly improved, and dark corridors should be protected from light pollution where these protected species are present, or could be recoverable. Accordingly, we seek on-going engagement in the evolution of BNG-related policy wording throughout the plan preparation stages over 2024, including Examination stages (ACTION REQUEST)	Comment	Comment noted
C499	769	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats The Biodiversity Net Gain site proposals include Warren Halls Park Strategic Open Space, which represents a cross boundary opportunity with Bumble Hole Nature Reserve within Dudley borough. Bumble Hole Local Nature Reserve is identified as a potential Biodiversity Net Gain Receptor Site within the draft Dudley Local Plan. The draft Dudley Local Plan identifies the Saltwells Local Nature Reserve as a potential Biodiversity Net Gain Receptor Site, which borders onto Mousesweet Brook Local Nature Reserve/SINC within Sandwell borough. This site is not identified within the SLP as a Biodiversity Net Gain site. There may be an opportunity for cross boundary working in relation to this area if the site was identified within the SLP. Dudley MBC will continue to work jointly with Sandwell MBC to identify any such opportunities going forward. Dudley MBC welcomes the opportunity to explore and share active travel link improvements along Mousesweet Brook, Mushroom Green and Black Brook leading to Cradley Heath transport interchange (rail/bus station).	Comment	Comment noted and support welcomed. While sites beyond the boundary of the local plan area cannot be specifically included in the SLP and policies map, SMBC would welcome the opportunity to undertake cross-boundary working on ecological matters with Dudley MBC and other LA partners and will look to amend the introductory wording of the policy to reflect this.
C500	954	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats 32. HBF has been involved in a significant amount of work, being led by the Future Homes Hub, on BNG preparedness for some time and note that it is somewhat unfortunate that the timing of the release of the draft Planning Practice guidance from DLUHC and the Draft DEFRA BNG Guidance has seen this information released midway through your consultation period. 33. HBF note that there is a new information for the Council to work though and consider the implications of, in order to make the necessary changes to the Biodiversity Net Gain policy, so that it complies with the latest policy and guidance as it finalised. 35. There are clearly some areas of the Sandwell Local Plan BNG policy and guidance that will need revising and updating, particularly because the (draft) PPG is clear that there is no need for Local Plan policies to repeat national guidance. For example, HBF would suggest criteria two and eight are not necessary as they are merely repeating national policy.	Comment	comment noted. Amend policy to delete sections 2 and 8
C501	705	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group (Mr Michael Priaulx, Chair) [188]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats Nest boxes should be swift bricks in accordance with best-practice guidance - they are a universal nest brick for small bird species, and BS 42021 and CIEEM provide clear best practice guidance.	Comment	Comment noted. Amend reference in policy.

C502	957	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	42.##BF question the wording of criteria six, as it should be for the BNG plan to set out what happens if monitoring shows any BNG measure are ineffective. For large and complex sites where the development is phased, the guidance is clear that the 10% must be delivered at the end of the development, and this may not result in 10% BNG on each phase.	Comment	Comment noted. According to advice from PAS an Overall Biodiversity Gain Plan that sets out how biodiversity gain will be achieved across the whole site on a phase-by-phase basis must be submitted to and approved by the planning authority before any development can be begun for outline planning permissions and phased development. The approval of reserved matters for outline planning permissions are not within the scope of biodiversity net gain (as they are not a grant of planning permission). The 10% (or as agreed) level of BNG should be agreed as part of the planning permission in the BNG Plan and delivered by the end of the development.
C503	662	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	- Section 3c: This would be an opportunity to mention the Local Nature Recovery Network, and how realising this will aid in movement of species across Sandwell and the wider Black Country - Section 3d: This reads like developments will be expected to deliver priority habitats exclusively. This point requires some more nuance.	Comment	Comments noted. Amend wording to qualify reference to priority habitats
C504	678	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Policy supported. There is a local site, identified as a wildlife corridor, which received permission in 2022 after the developer had cleared vegetation in advance of a planning site visit.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C505	686	Mr John Davison [192]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Installing integral bricks (in groups) for swifts is welcome. Installing bat bricks is welcome. Both apply irrespective of the type of development.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C506	690	Mr Kabir Kaul [195]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	It's great to see "integrated nesting bricks / boxes" included in Policy SNE2 section 13. The focus should be on integral Swift bricks - they are a universal nesting brick, suitable for all the other bird species mentioned in section 13. They are suitable for all developments, and should follow best practice guidance such as BS 42021:2022, with regard to location and numbers per dwelling. Universal Swift nest bricks should be installed in addition to bat boxes.	Comment	Noted and welcome support
C507	697	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Biodiversity Net Gain - We welcome that the council is seeking a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain in line with the Environment Act 2021. We also welcome that SNE2 identifies a number of open spaces where biodiversity units may be purchased off site within the borough when developers are not able to deliver BNG onsite.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C508	770	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Dudley MBC supports the use of the Black Country Local Nature Recovery Network Strategy to maximise cross boundary benefits.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C509	771	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Dudley MBC welcomes the opportunity to explore and share active travel link improvements along Mousesweet Brook, Mushroom Green and Black Brook leading to Cradley Heath transport interchange (rail/bus station).	Support	noted and welcome support
C510	833	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Paragraph 8 (c) of the Framework refers to improving biodiversity and paragraph 174 (d) to providing net gains for biodiversity. Draft policy SNE2(1) states that 'All development proposals in Sandwell shall deliver a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity value when measured against baseline site information. Where achievable, a higher net gain may be agreed. Losses and gains will be calculated using the extant national Biodiversity Metric...' Vulcan agrees with policy SNE2 and reflecting the forthcoming mandatory requirement for a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain across all major development.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C511	724	RSPB (Royal Society for the Protection of Birds) (Mr Jamie Murph, Senior Conservation Officer) [190]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	The RSPB welcomes the inclusion of a Swift-specific measure in Policy SNE2 (Item 13) and suggests some refinements to ensure maximum benefit for wildlife and to follow established precedent from other Local Plans. The RSPB also suggests that a Supplementary Planning Document is produced to complement this Policy, which will provide detailed guidance on how to incorporate nesting opportunities for Swifts and other Red-Listed bird species within development proposals. We would very much welcome the opportunity to work with Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council on this, as it presents a brilliant opportunity to improve the fortunes of Swifts in Sandwell.	Comment	Noted and welcome support. The reforms to plan-making now in force remove the legal powers that enable the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). LPAs should review any current SPDs and decide whether the information they contain should go into the local plan or whether it can become 'Local Guidance.'
C512	688	Miss Clair Amos [194]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	With regard to Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats "13. All major development proposals with an eaves height or roof commencement height of 5m and above are required to provide integrated nesting bricks / boxes for swifts, house martins, house sparrows, starlings, and / or bats as appropriate, to help preserve endangered species and urban biodiversity in Sandwell." swift bricks should be specified they're a universal nest brick suitable for range of small bird species, suitable for all developments, follow best-practice guidance such as BS 42021 for location and numbers. should be in addition to bat boxes	Comment	Noted. Amend wording to reflect comments.
C513	663	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	Section 14: This part of the policy seems quite weakly worded. All development should aim to deliver ecological enhancement in some form. Whilst a minimum BNG requirement goes some way to delivering ecological enhancement, valuable enhancement features (such as bird/ bat boxes, insect hotels, etc) are not accounted for in BNG measurements. There should be support in planning policy to ensure that these features are still being provided in new developments.	Comment	Noted. The aim of this section of the policy is to encourage proposals who are not bound by BNG requirements to consider including ecological uplift where possible. The Council cannot enforce such provision but does want to encourage householders and others to think about how they might increase ecological value in residential areas. The policy's previous point requires major developments over a certain size / height and that will require planning permission to include provision for nesting birds as part of their application.

C514	955	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	<p>37. It is the HBF's opinion that the Council should not deviate from the Government's requirement for biodiversity net gain as set out in the Environment Act. There are significant additional costs associated with biodiversity gain, which should be fully accounted for in the Council's viability assessment. It is important that BNG does not prevent, delay or reduce housing delivery.</p> <p>38. Any requirements to go beyond 10% BNG needs to be clearly demonstrated with evidence including considering the implications of the policy approach as part of the whole plan viability appraisal. In particular, HBF would question how the viability of more than 10% BNG can be established when the market for off-site credits, and therefore the costs of delivering the 10% mandatory BNG system are still emerging.</p> <p>39. HBF note that work undertaken by DEFRA to inform the national percentage BNG requirement found that a 20% net gain requirement would add c.19% to the net gain costs, over and above the minimum requirement of 10%. The report concluded that:</p> <p>"While this suggests that varying the level of net gain between 5% and 20% has very limited impact on the outcome, there is a trade-off between cost implications for developers and the likelihood of net gain being delivered at a national level (e.g. less costly/likely at 5% net gain compared to 10%, and vice versa for 20%). Our chosen policy approach, which sets out that 10% is the right level to demonstrate net gain, considers this trade-off among other issues."</p> <p>40. HBF also notes that the proposed policy wording and supporting text in the Local Plan will need to reflect both that the Environment Act which requires 10% Biodiversity Net Gain, and the emerging policy, guidance and best practice on how Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain will be implemented. There is an important policy distinction to be made between the national mandatory requirements and any optional further requests from LPAs to go further and faster. In particular the 10% national target is non-negotiable from a viability perspective, but policies seeking over 10% can be challenged on viability grounds. This distinction needs to be recognised within the Local Plan.</p>	Comment	Noted. The SLP does not require anything above 10% and suggests a higher level of BNG may be sought where appropriate, but this would effectively be on an agreed basis and is not required formally.
C515	956	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	<p>41. HBF suggest particular care is needed in terminology to ensure the Sandwell policy reflects the national policy and guidance. For example, on-site and off-site biodiversity is referred to as units, and the statutory national credit system of last resort is referred to as credit. It is important for the wording of the policy to accurately reflect the legalisation and guidance.</p>	Comment	Noted. There is a reference to national credits in part 4 of the policy, which is correct in terms of the intended usage. References elsewhere in the policy are to units - the rest of the SLP will be checked and corrected as necessary during editing.
C516	958	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Policy SNE2 – Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats	<p>43. It is also important to note that Local Nature Recovery Strategies are new initiative, and one has yet to be prepared that covers Sandwell. As the LNRS emerges it will be important for this Local Plan to be kept under review and further public consultation on the interaction between the two documents and/or changes to Local Plan policy to reflect the LNRS may be needed.</p>	Comment	There is an LNRS that covers Sandwell as well as the whole of the Black Country and it is included in the SLP in the appendices. In turn, work is being undertaken on a West Midlands LNRS, led by the West Midlands Combined Authority, which will provide a further strategic layer of guidance and requirements.
C517	666	Mr Alexander Lane [180]	Policy SNE3 – Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	<p>Section 10: Which trees are classified as 'large-canopied' for the purposes of this policy? A list should be provided either here or in the Tree Strategy document.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Amend justification to identify suitable examples of large-canopied trees.
C518	668	Dr Michael Hodder [48]	Policy SNE3 – Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows	<p>This policy should also state that replacement trees should not be planted where they would impact on sites identified / designated as archaeologically important</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Amendment made to Policy SNE2 part 5
C519	834	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	<p>Policy SNE3 – Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</p> <p>Policy SNE1 (11) includes a blanket statement that 'Development should be designed around the need to incorporate trees already present on site, using sensitive and well-designed site layouts to maximise their retention'.</p> <p>There should be acknowledgement that there will not be the justification for the retention of some trees, particularly in the context of poor specimens and wider development benefit. The policy text should be consistent with the Framework (2023), which says planning policies should ensure '...that existing trees are retained wherever possible' (paragraph 131).</p> <p>The policy also sets out at SNE1 (9) that '...tree planting on new development sites should make a minimum contribution of 20% canopy cover and a recommended contribution of 30% canopy cover across the site, especially in areas where evidence demonstrates that current levels of canopy cover are lower than the local average.'</p> <p>It is noted that this is based upon the Emergency Tree Plan for the UK – The Woodland Trust 2020 but there is no basis in the Framework (2023) or Planning Practice Guidance for the introduction of blanket thresholds for canopy cover.</p> <p>The same observation is made in respect of SNE1 (18) and its requirement that '...removal of trees, suitable replacement trees must be provided onsite. Where sufficient suitable onsite replacements cannot be provided, off-site planting or woodland enhancement, including support for natural regeneration, in the near vicinity of the removed tree(s) must be provided, in line with the mitigation hierarchy set out in Policy SNE2.'</p> <p>The requirement for replacement trees and the number to be provided should be the subject of site-by-site assessments, alongside a measured consideration of biodiversity net gain.</p>	Object	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The health or safety of extant trees on site should be assessed by a qualified person - the policy does not prevent the removal of trees that are unsafe. The clearance of sites prior to development would be contrary to the regulations around BNG - wider development benefit will be taken into account when a decision is made on a scheme, but the emphasis should be on retaining as many trees as possible.</p> <p>Amend policy justification to allow for poor quality trees to be discounted from canopy cover calculations</p> <p>From the Black Country iTree study - " ...leaf area is the driving force of tree benefits, increasing their capacity to sequester carbon and filter pollution etc. In order for this to be realised trees need to be able to achieve larger canopy."</p> <p>Work undertaken by the Urban Forestry and Woodland Advisory Committee (FWAC) Network, advisers to the Forestry Commission on urban forestry, recommended that a minimum standard for tree canopy cover is set for a local area, with evidence showing that 20% is an appropriate minimum target. The overall tree cover in the Black Country is around 15.4% (iTree study, 2022), and Sandwell's Tree strategy indicates that Sandwell's canopy cover stands at around 18%.</p> <p>Given the council's wider objectives around improving the health and wellbeing of local residents as well as improving the ecological value of local habitats and addressing climate change, it believes that increasing canopy cover on development sites will generate positive benefits. Although the issue of canopy cover is not addressed in the NPPF or PPG, this does not prevent the Council from requiring developments to provide for such a requirement where there is suitable evidence and is a local priority (Sandwell Tree Strategy). Given the information provided by the iTree study, the evidence of poorer health outcomes in Sandwell and the guidance provided by the Woodland Trust, The Council feels this approach is warranted.</p> <p>With regard to off-site replacements, this can be undertaken as part of BNG provision or as stand-alone green infrastructure enhancement and as such will be subject to site-related considerations.</p>
C520	713	FCC Environment [47]	Savills (Miss Andrea Caplan, Associate) [45]	<p>Policy SNE3 – Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</p> <p>We object to the requirement for 20% tree cover and 3-to-1 replacement of trees on development sites, on the basis that the policy requirements could greatly limit the development area available and also the space for the delivery of other specific types of biodiversity habitats that are needed to provide a 10% gain. This will negatively impact on the net developable area of housing sites. On the basis that Sandwell cannot currently meet its identified housing needs, these proposed policy requirements may result in an even greater housing shortfall and additional sites will be required to meet that shortfall.</p>	Object	<p>Noted. A 3:1 replacement will only be required where trees are felled, with the intention being to retain trees on site in the first place through appropriate layout and design. Additional tree planting on site can be undertaken as part of a mandatory BNG calculation, which would help deliver greater canopy cover. The Government's Ash Dieback advice also states that "When restocking trees outside of woodland (standalone trees or areas less than 0.5 hectares (ha)), the ratio of restocking should be at least 3 to 1 to allow trees to establish." Sandwell's Tree Strategy identifies that ash trees are the second most prevalent species of tree in the borough, at 7.4%, and that an estimated 20,000 trees are likely to be lost in Sandwell in coming years. Given this, the importance of establishing a reasonable ratio to replace and maintain the tree stock in the borough becomes more important.</p>
C521	698	The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy Stone [200]	Miss Natasha Styles [199]	<p>Policy SNE3 – Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</p> <p>Requiring a 20% tree canopy cover and a recommended contribution of 30% canopy cover across the site and requiring 3 new trees for every tree lost on site, especially for small brownfield sites is not deliverable or realistic and could compromise sustainability development and is therefore contrary to NPPF. Any requirement would also need to be fully evidenced and the requirement incorporated into the viability study.</p> <p>Recommendation: The council should therefore reconsider this element and ensure any such policy approach introduces more flexibility or is deleted.</p>	Object	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A 3:1 replacement will only be required where trees are felled, with the intention being to retain trees on site in the first place through appropriate layout and design. Additional tree planting on site can be undertaken as part of a mandatory BNG calculation, which would help deliver greater canopy cover.</p> <p>The SLP Viability work has considered this policy alongside other aspects of the natural environment that have a potential impact on sites and should it be determined that this is a major factor in site viability, the ratio can be revisited. The Government's Ash Dieback advice also states that "When restocking trees outside of woodland (standalone trees or areas less than 0.5 hectares (ha)), the ratio of restocking should be at least 3 to 1 to allow trees to establish." Sandwell's Tree Strategy identifies that ash trees are the second most prevalent species of tree in the borough, at 7.4%, and that an estimated 20,000 trees are likely to be lost in Sandwell in coming years. Given this, the importance of establishing a reasonable ratio to replace and maintain the tree stock in the borough becomes more important.</p>

C522	959	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Policy SNE3 – Provision, Retention and Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows 44. HBF would question how the Council arrived at the requirement for 3 replacement trees for everyone lost and what (if any) assumptions have been relation to the size and standard of trees. HBF considers that a three for one replacement policy could impact on the land uptake for any development and may have implications for the density of developments, which in turn has the potential to have an impact on the viability of developments. 45. HBF suggest further flexibility is needed in the policy, for example hedgerow removal may be an essential to gain access to a site, but BNG policies which require 10% net gain from the pre-development baseline so any loss would already have to be compensated. HBF suggest the Council should give more thought to how the suite of environmental policies are intended to work together so that developers are completely clear what is expected of them, and to ensure that the policies do not serve to make development undeliverable. The interrelationships between the BNG policy and other environmental policies needs to be fully considered and explained.	Comment	The Woodland Trust advocate a ratio of 3:1 in their statement, "CUTTING DOWN TREES: LAW AND LEGISLATION", dated May 2021. Such a ratio will allow for failures where they occur and still result in sufficient replacement trees to establish. The Government's Ash Dieback advice also states that "When restocking trees outside of woodland (standalone trees or areas less than 0.5 hectares (ha)), the ratio of restocking should be at least 3 to 1 to allow trees to establish". Sandwell's Tree Strategy identifies that ash trees are the second most prevalent species of tree in the borough, at 7.4%, and that an estimated 20,000 trees are likely to be lost in Sandwell in coming years. Given this, the importance of establishing a reasonable ratio to replace and maintain the tree stock in the borough becomes more important. Other councils around the UK have adopted a 3:1 replacement strategy for felled trees. The SLP Viability work has considered this policy alongside other aspects of the natural environment that have a potential impact on sites and should it be determined that this is a major factor in site viability, the ratio can be revisited. The Council is seeking to retain trees on sites, so the issue of replacements will not need to be considered where layouts are planned around retention.
C523	1135	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SNE4 - Geodiversity and the Black Country UNESCO Global Geopark We welcome a policy on the UNESCO Geopark and recognition of the important cultural heritage of the area and the contribution it has made in historical terms. Clause 1) consider re-phrasing to ensure that the significance of the asset and its integrity is fully protected and conserved for future generations.	Comment	Comment noted
C524	773	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy SNE4 - Geodiversity and the Black Country UNESCO Global Geopark Dudley MBC supports this policy, which is consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP35 Geodiversity and the Black Country UNESCO Global Geopark.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C525	1136	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SNE5 - The Rowley Hills This policy would benefit from strengthening the reference to the historic environment context of the area, including non designated heritage assets and heritage features as well as the heritage components of landscape.	Comment	Comment noted. Amend to strengthen references as suggested
C526	836	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SNE6 – Canals Policy SNE6(d) refers to development proposals '...promoting high quality design, including active frontages onto the canal and improving the public realm...'. The policy should acknowledge that such aspirations should be pursued where possible. Canalside development also offers the potential for waterfront views particularly from residential properties, and this should be stated in the context of seeking to achieve high-quality urban design and cross-referencing urban design policies.	Comment	Comment noted
C527	881	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SNE6 – Canals The PCCWM objects to the omission of reference to the need to consider crime, anti-social behaviour, and the fear of crime when considering development proposals on the canal network. The policy justification acknowledges that 'The network has significant value for nature conservation, tourism, health and wellbeing and recreation, and the potential to make an important contribution to economic regeneration through the provision of high-quality environments for new developments and a network of pedestrian, cycle and water transport routes.' The success of the policy will to some extent be dependent upon people being and feeling safe. It is therefore proposed that the following additional wording (shown in bold) be added as a modification to the policy: '3) Where opportunities exist, all development proposals within the canal network must:...	Object	Comment noted. Amend text
C528	914	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]		Policy SNE6 – Canals The Trust welcomes the inclusion of canal-specific Policy SNE6 – Canals within the draft plan, and further that it enhances the previous ENV4 policy wording within the adopted Black Country Core Strategy. In particular, clear reference has been added in relation to the importance of assessing impact on structural integrity, maintaining opportunity for canal restoration, and in identifying the role the canal network can play in delivering good design. We further welcome mention of delivery of integrated sustainable travel through towpath and way-faring enhancements. In relation to design quality, the canal network presents also opportunities for positive placemaking and the reduction of anti-social behaviour. In terms of additions the Trust requests the following: -Amend 'reinstate and/or upgrade towpaths,' to 'reinstate, introduce and/or upgrade towpaths and access points' within sub-heading 2(g) -Add 'To be delivered through the reasonable use of planning conditions or S106/CIL obligations' to the end of 2(g) -Add 2(h) for 'use of canals for surface water management purposes, provided that SuDS and other mitigation measures are built into a scheme' -Add into 3(a), "and delivery of the wider well-being agenda" -Include an additional sub-section specifying, 'Facilitate continued access to Trust assets for inspection and maintenance purposes' -In relation to Residential Moorings, add to 10 that moorings also should not be permitted near existing uses which currently give rise to adverse amenity impacts, noise for example, in accordance with 'agent of change' principles -The justifying text on 4.101 should identify that the assessment of 'all necessary boating facilities' should consider bin storage, collection and waste disposal, water and power supplies, and car parking provision on a case-by-case basis to allow greater flexibility in relation to site-specific needs. Para 4.101 should also state that need for parking and access requirements for residential moorings is to be assessed against other relevant SLP policies and SLP car parking standards on a case-by-case basis. -The justification text within 4.102 and 4.103 should state that the identified Trust and non-Trust residential mooring sites may not remain in existence for the whole duration of the Plan until 2041, and up-to-date statistics for our own moorings are available from us on request. (ACTION REQUEST)	Comment	comment noted. Amend text as suggested, note reference to CIL / s106
C529	835	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SNE6 – Canals Policy SNE7 is positively written, and Vulcan supports the reference to the canal network being a focus for future development through its ability to deliver a high-quality environment and enhanced accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists, and other non-car-based modes of transport.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C530	1137	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SNE6 – Canals We support the recognition of the historic nature of canals as heritage assets/ role within the wider cultural heritage agenda and welcome reference within the policy and justification text in this area.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C531	733	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy SNE6 – Canals Support, particularly 2g - this should also cover new links onto, and across the canal to improve accessibility and reduce severance	Support	Noted and welcome support. Amend text as suggested
C532	640	Mr Donald Payne [165]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network Section STR1b Mention is made of the midlands Rail Hub but there is no mention of necessary capacity improvements on the "Stour Valley" line. (Birmingham to Wolverhampton). Section STR1e Dudley Port interchange needs to be step-free to cater for families with buggies and PRM using mobility scooters and wheelchairs. Section 11.16 and 11.38 should include re-opening Walsall to Lichfield via Aldridge and Brownhills to provide a direct passenger route from Wolverhampton to the East Midlands and North-East, avoiding Birmingham	Comment	Noted. The Walsall to Lichfield proposal is outside of Sandwell's boundary.
C533	742	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network There should be no funding for schemes that increase capacity for cars - focus should be on public transport and active travel. Improvements to these will promote mode shift, and subsequently benefits for remaining car users.	Comment	Noted

C534	790	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network Dudley MBC supports this policy and there are several cross-boundary projects referenced, consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP67 The Transport Network. We are supportive of the reference to the Dudley Port Integrated Transport Hub, which will link into the Metro extension for Brierley Hill-Wednesbury and provide access to the national railway network for Dudley borough residents. The Council would welcome continued joint working on the relevant evidence base for transport matters, including transport modelling to address cross boundary matters consistently.	Support	Noted and welcome support.
C535	1005	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network Permeability Across Motorways and Key Route Network: We recommend a thorough consideration of permeability across the motorway and key route network for pedestrians and cyclists. Ensuring safe and convenient crossing points is crucial for promoting active travel and creating an integrated transport network.	Comment	Noted
C536	1025	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network We strongly welcome this policy and broadly agree with it. However, our comments on Sandwell’s issues and options document still stand, where we requested stronger acknowledgement to exploring road space re-allocation for active travel and public transport. Our assessment of the challenges being faced by the region suggests this will be difficult to realise unless there are conscious efforts to reduce overall car dependency.	Comment	Noted. The Council will investigate road space reallocation to facilitate public transport and active travel wherever physical constraints permit it. However, due regard will be given to the Council’s obligations as Local Traffic Authority under the Network Management Duty contained in the Traffic Management Act 2004.
C537	1026	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network We would further welcome the plan capturing our ‘15 minute neighbourhood’ concept, together with exploiting the opportunities at regional interchanges to ensure that people can access other services (e.g. health and leisure) by public transport, with this being our ‘45 minute region’ concept.	Comment	Noted
C538	1088	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network We strongly welcome this policy and broadly agree with it. However, our comments on Sandwell’s issues and options document still stand, where we requested stronger acknowledgement to exploring road space re-allocation for active travel and public transport. Our assessment of the challenges being faced by the region suggests this will be difficult to realise unless there are conscious efforts to reduce overall car dependency. We would further welcome the plan capturing our ‘15 minute neighbourhood’ concept, together with exploiting the opportunities at regional interchanges to ensure that people can access other services (e.g. health and leisure) by public transport, with this being our ‘45 minute region’ concept. Paragraph 11.17 should also reference and fully reflect the new West Midlands LTP Core strategy. And likewise, paragraph 11.20 should reference the Bus Service Improvement Plan which outlines a number of positive bus measures being introduced over the next few years to increase patronage and deliver on modal share targets. While several measures in this local plan are clearly moving in a positive direction towards achieving this ambition, only by continuing to work in partnership, in areas like local plans/transport plans, we can collaboratively be “bolder” in the actions we take to support and drive behaviour change and respond to those difficult challenges, which in turn will then deliver on shared local, regional and national ambitions using a range of transport, land use and wider public policy levers. While we fully agree that the impacts of Covid 19 have had significant impacts on patronage levels and taking several years to recover, which is talked about in the opening paragraph for this policy, we would welcome some statistics on this and the tone to be framed in a more positive manner, to not diminish the importance of public transport and the opportunities which lie ahead for us. But appreciating that bus services have been particularly impacted by rising fuel and inflationary costs as well as driver shortages and threatening their operational costs and viability. But with continued funding through the transport levy, from our local authority partners we remain positive in delivering a strong public transport network. Whilst we further appreciate indirect references to our KRN Action Plans, elements of these are now considered (in parts) outdated, and we would welcome a greater emphasis placed on good partnership working with TFWM to deliver on these elements. We further welcome reference to Park and Ride facilities where appropriate, but noting TFWM should be involved in any conversations regarding any development work which explores new Park and Ride locations, to ensure they are strategically located, take advantage of the links between the SRN and KRN, and help to reduce the number of private vehicle journeys. It would also be helpful to have reference to Strategic Road Network Designated Routes for Unplanned Events (DRUEs). These routes could be indicated within Figure 13 and referenced in paragraph 11.31. Finally, we welcome reference to coaches and their role in providing affordable long-distance connectivity. However, there is no policy or action detailing the promotion of coaches which we feel should be included.	Support	Noted. Please see responses to related representations. The Council will investigate road space reallocation to facilitate public transport and active travel wherever physical constraints permit it. However, due regard will be given to the Council’s obligations as Local Traffic Authority under the Network Management Duty contained in the Traffic Management Act 2004 The SLP will continue to refer to plans and strategies that have been adopted at the time of publication.
C539	1117	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network Policy STR 1 has identified the need for improvements at M5 J1 and J2 to be delivered during the plan period. Following the identification of the improvement measures, we welcome you to have discussions with National Highways at an early stage. We note that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) – Part 1 (Infrastructure Assessment Need) has been submitted along with the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan. Part 1 of the IDP reflects an understanding of baseline infrastructure capacity and needs within Sandwell and ensures that the implications of future growth upon infrastructure are understood. We understand that Part 2 of the IDP will include an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule and will be published alongside the upcoming Regulation 19 Pre- submission version of the Local Plan. We appreciate that National Highways will be consulted on any infrastructure improvements identified for the SRN in the area and we look forward to engaging with you at the early stage itself. For information, there is currently no committed funding for this area within the RIS2 and RIS3 planned period and therefore we are keen to understand the monetary implications and what can and cannot be achieved via developer contributions.	Comment	Noted. Sandwell welcomes ongoing engagement with National Highways
C540	1162	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy STR1 – Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network How has the historic environment been considered in the process of highlighting transport infrastructure needs? Have any assessments been undertaken about the potential for harm to heritage assets, as a result of proposed transport initiatives?	Comment	Noted. Site allocations will be reviewed in light of potential impact on heritage assets.
C541	1060	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR10 – Transport Innovation and Digital Connectivity The comments regarding how traffic signals can respond to levels of congestion and prioritise sustainable transport modes is supported. Yet at the same time, we would welcome further information that discusses the proven benefit of this at M5 J1 and how getting signals on UTC allows greater direct influence from signal engineers to support the network at times of need, via integration with Sandwell UTC and greater coordination with the RTCC.	Comment	Noted
C542	1097	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR10 – Transport Innovation and Digital Connectivity The comments regarding how traffic signals can respond to levels of congestion and prioritise sustainable transport modes is supported. Yet at the same time, we would welcome further information that discusses the proven benefit of this at M5 J1 and how getting signals on UTC allows greater direct influence from signal engineers to support the network at times of need, via integration with Sandwell UTC and greater coordination with the RTCC.	Comment	Noted
C543	791	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy STR2 – Safeguarding the Development of the Key Route Network (KRN) Dudley MBC supports this policy which is broadly consistent with the draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP68 The Key Route Network. This ensures a consistent approach to cross boundary matters related to the KRN.	Support	Note and welcome support

C544	1032	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR2 – Safeguarding the Development of the Key Route Network (KRN)	<p>This is a strong policy and we fully welcome this, together with continued partnership working to develop strategies for the KRN. The KRN is important for making journeys across our region and will we continue working closely with Sandwell to ensure that this network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provides safer and reliable journey times to ensure a consistent customer experience. •Reflects the 'Sustainable Transport User Hierarchy' (as referenced in our 6 Big Moves) and rebalancing the needs of people, place, and vehicles. •Ensures the KRN is resilient to existing and future challenges, and adaptable to emerging innovations to capitalise on future opportunities. 	Support	note and welcome support
C545	1033	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR2 – Safeguarding the Development of the Key Route Network (KRN)	<p>In terms of public transport, we welcome the importance placed on this mode but we recommend the narrative be strengthened around journey numbers rather than trips, which TfWM can provide on request.</p>	Comment	Noted, and offer of support welcomed.
C546	1089	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR2 – Safeguarding the Development of the Key Route Network (KRN)	<p>This is a strong policy and we fully welcome this, together with continued partnership working to develop strategies for the KRN. The KRN is important for making journeys across our region and will we continue working closely with Sandwell to ensure that this network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provides safer and reliable journey times to ensure a consistent customer experience. •Reflects the 'Sustainable Transport User Hierarchy' (as referenced in our 6 Big Moves) and rebalancing the needs of people, place, and vehicles. •Ensures the KRN is resilient to existing and future challenges, and adaptable to emerging innovations to capitalise on future opportunities. <p>In terms of public transport, we welcome the importance placed on this mode but we recommend the narrative be strengthened around journey numbers rather than trips, which TfWM can provide on request.</p> <p>In paragraph 11.23 the RTCC is the Regional Transport Coordination Centre and not the Regional Transport Control Centre, so please alter this.</p> <p>In paragraph 11.24 reference is further made of providing "fast" public transport. Whilst this was likely intended to suggest that public transport could compete with private transport in terms of journey time, we would not encourage the use of this word. The Regional Road Safety Partnership is working toward Vision Zero and a safe system approach and believes all road users have a responsibility to use the network safely, so more appropriate wording like "reliable", "dependable" or "consistent" public transport is recommended.</p> <p>Finally, in paragraph 11.27 it mentions collaboration of all four authorities in their role as LHAs in managing the network efficiently. Presumably this is referring to the four Black Country Authorities, but we would also welcome the importance of Sandwell working collaboratively with its neighbouring Local Highway Authorities such as Birmingham City Council and National Highways.</p>	Support	Noted
C547	1115	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]	Policy STR2 – Safeguarding the Development of the Key Route Network (KRN)	<p>Based on our review of the Draft Local Plan and the Policies Map, we have identified a few sites from that may have the potential to impact the operation of the SRN in the area. The table overleaf (Table 1) (See Attachment) contains the list of potential new housing sites that are likely to have an impact on the SRN in terms of traffic and / or boundary related matters. Please note that we have not included the employment sites in this table as the anticipated land-use and size of developable area are unavailable at this stage. Nonetheless, impacts are expected from employment sites identified in Policy SEC 1-2,3,5,7,9 and 10 as a minimum.</p> <p>Should the housing sites listed in Table 1 proceed to the final Local Plan, further assessment work may be required to ascertain the impact on the SRN and to determine the need for any mitigation if required. Whilst we have identified the immediate SRN junctions in close proximity to the housing site allocations where a likely impact is anticipated, it should be noted that the assessments should not be limited to these junctions only and a wider extent needs to be considered based on the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p>Any potential site that is anticipated to have an impact on the SRN in the area is recommended to be subject to consultation with National Highways, and appropriately assessed in line with the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 01/2022 to determine the extent of their potential impacts on the SRN in the area. Depending on the scale of likely impact on the SRN in the area, the applicant/developer may need to identify suitable mitigation measures (if required). It is to be noted that the cumulative impact of the proposed site allocations also needs to be assessed in line with the Circular for understanding the likely traffic impacts on the SRN in the area in terms of capacity & safety and identifying any possible mitigation measures (if required).</p> <p>We wish to continue to liaise with Sandwell MBC during the development of the Local Plan to understand which sites will be allocated and the potential impacts of these allocations on the SRN. National Highways recommends that a robust transport evidence base in the form of a Strategic Transport Assessment (STA) be produced to support the development of the Local Plan. To support this key piece of work we would recommend the setting up of a Transport Working Group, who can work with Sandwell MBC as the Local Planning Authority to agree the methodology, assessments and infrastructure requirements to support the Plan's development and adoption.</p>	Comment	Noted. Further transport modelling work will be undertaken to support the next stage of plan preparation.
C548	1163	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]	Policy STR2 – Safeguarding the Development of the Key Route Network (KRN)	Comments above apply. [same comments as for STR2]	Comment	Noted
C549	743	Mr Jon Green [58]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	All new developments should be implemented with basic Low Traffic Neighbourhood and 15 minute city principles - ie no through traffic and local amenities close by.	Support	Noted
C550	1009	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	<p>Linking Developments to the Network:</p> <p>The plan should emphasize how new developments will link to the existing network. Consideration should be given to creating secondary networks to fill gaps, ensuring a comprehensive and well-connected active travel infrastructure.</p>	Comment	Noted
C551	1010	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	<p>Car Parking Ratios in New Developments:</p> <p>Given Sandwell's high ratio of car parking in new developments, we recommend exploring policies that support and incentivise active travel, potentially reevaluating parking requirements to encourage walking and cycling.</p>	Comment	Noted Various policies seek to incentivise active travel and encourage walking and cycling, including STR5 and STR6
C552	1037	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	It is welcoming to see a stronger stance being applied to achieving accessibility for new development and the joined-up approach this policy lends itself to, which in turn, will contribute to the reduction of private vehicle journeys and good built-in public transport and active travel alternatives for all new developments.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C553	1038	TfWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	<p>While still no direct reference is made to the 'Triple Access System' of accessibility which includes: physical mobility, digital connectivity, and land use planning nor reference to our Big Move 2: Accessible and Inclusive Places, we can see this policy pays consideration to helping provide enhanced accessibility whilst also addressing the negative impacts of mobility on people and places. Through the Black Country LTP Area Strategy, we will further hope together, be able to capture some of these elements.</p> <p>Under this policy, we would also like to ensure that all new development includes safe active travel infrastructure that makes connections to wider cycling and walking networks, as well as providing sustainable access and infrastructure to Park and Ride sites.</p>	Comment	Noted. The SLP addresses physical mobility, digital connectivity and land use planning

C554	1090	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	<p>It is welcoming to see a stronger stance being applied to achieving accessibility for new development and the joined-up approach this policy lends itself to, which in turn, will contribute to the reduction of private vehicle journeys and good built-in public transport and active travel alternatives for all new developments.</p> <p>While still no direct reference is made to the 'Triple Access System' of accessibility which includes: physical mobility, digital connectivity, and land use planning nor reference to our Big Move 2: Accessible and Inclusive Places, we can see this policy pays consideration to helping provide enhanced accessibility whilst also addressing the negative impacts of mobility on people and places. Through the Black Country LTP Area Strategy, we will further hope together, be able to capture some of these elements.</p> <p>Under this policy, we would also like to ensure that all new development includes safe active travel infrastructure that makes connections to wider cycling and walking networks, as well as providing sustainable access and infrastructure to Park and Ride sites.</p> <p>Provision of secure cycle parking at new developments is also important with infrastructure being aligned to LTN1/20 and Manual for Streets 2 guidance. The justification section could also provide more details of the risk exposure to cyclists and pedestrians, especially where the KRN provides facilities for fast, high-volume traffic. Providing near miss data (especially at junctions or where collisions involve cyclists and pedestrians) as well as undertaking spatial analysis (which appreciates the top deciles of areas of deprivation) will further be important, as these account for over 50% of all Killed and Seriously Injured in the region, with a reasonable proportion occurring in Sandwell. This data will then help justify a policy for these issues and TFWM can support in obtaining this data insight.</p>	Support	Noted. The SLP addresses physical mobility, digital connectivity and land use planning
C555	1113	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]	Policy STR3 – Managing Transport Impacts of New Development	<p>We acknowledge that the Draft Local Plan has specifically focussed on policies to tackle climate change by reduction in carbon emissions, improving sustainable modes of transport, development of energy efficient buildings, etc.</p> <p>Policy STR3 sets out the need for planning applications to demonstrate how the development ensures adequate accessibility and connectivity, measures to improve sustainable transport, and requirement to produce a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan where necessary, and we welcome this. References have been made in Policy STR3 on how developers are expected to create an environment that encourages walking, cycling and public transport when designing their schemes.</p>	Comment	Noted and support welcomed
C556	792	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	Dudley MBC supports this policy which is broadly consistent with the draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP70 The Movement of Freight. This ensures a consistent approach to cross boundary projects related to this topic, including the reopening of the Stourbridge-Walsall-Lichfield railway line (as referenced at paragraph 11.38 of the SLP). The draft Dudley Local Plan also references this project (at paragraph 16.32).	Comment	Noted and support welcomed
C557	1040	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	We welcome our previous comments on freight and logistics now being incorporated under a separate policy in its own right. We therefore welcome this policy, and the role new technologies could play in delivering more efficient, and sustainable alternatives, together with the use of rail to fulfil the increase in freight / HGV journeys, alongside that of e-commerce vehicles.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C558	1041	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	Incorporating a policy which supports new infrastructure on existing railway land, to grow and improve the existing local rail network is welcoming but the policy should also ensure it safeguards new depots or stabling sidings which would then support additional, and longer trains.	Comment	Noted. Review policy to ensure it safeguards relevant rail infrastructure
C559	1042	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	There is omission however of policies for suitable HGV parking provision to cater for the area's anticipated use, including as appropriate stop over provision, and amenity facilities to serve the needs of HGV drivers.	Comment	Noted
C560	1043	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	Under this policy, the safety of pedestrians should also be captured, as 68% of fatal and serious collisions are a result of heavy goods vehicles.	Comment	Noted
C561	1044	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	While in the justification section it promotes the use of e-cargo bikes, low emission vehicles and the use of micromobility to transport goods, emphasizing this in the policies would further be welcomed, especially for last mile journeys.	Comment	Noted. Add text around last mile journeys to policy
C562	1045	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	Finally, under this policy we would suggest reemphasising the need for greater consideration being placed on time-based policy for freight vehicles using the KRN and other roads, so that there are fewer clashes between peak commuter traffic and freight movements.	Comment	Noted
C563	1091	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	<p>We welcome our previous comments on freight and logistics now being incorporated under a separate policy in its own right. We therefore welcome this policy, and the role new technologies could play in delivering more efficient, and sustainable alternatives, together with the use of rail to fulfil the increase in freight / HGV journeys, alongside that of e-commerce vehicles.</p> <p>Incorporating a policy which supports new infrastructure on existing railway land, to grow and improve the existing local rail network is welcoming but the policy should also ensure it safeguards new depots or stabling sidings which would then support additional, and longer trains.</p> <p>There is omission however of policies for suitable HGV parking provision to cater for the area's anticipated use, including as appropriate stop over provision, and amenity facilities to serve the needs of HGV drivers.</p> <p>Under this policy, the safety of pedestrians should also be captured, as 68% of fatal and serious collisions are a result of heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>While in the justification section it promotes the use of e-cargo bikes, low emission vehicles and the use of micromobility to transport goods, emphasizing this in the policies would further be welcomed, especially for last mile journeys.</p> <p>Finally, under this policy we would suggest reemphasising the need for greater consideration being placed on time-based policy for freight vehicles using the KRN and other roads, so that there are fewer clashes between peak commuter traffic and freight movements.</p>	Support	Noted
C564	1114	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	Policies STR4 (The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics), STR5 (Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking) and STR6 (Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices) sets guidelines on improving the sustainable transport. We appreciate the effort taken in developing these policies and consider this to be aligned with the expectations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Highways' Net Zero Strategy.	Comment	Noted and support welcomed
C565	1263	Canal and River Trust (Mrs Tracy Humphreys, Area Planner - West Midlands) [12]	Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics	Similarly, the Trust welcomes mention of encouragement of use of the waterways within sub-section 1 of Policy STR4 – The Efficient Movement of Freight and Logistics as a sustainable alternative to road-based freight movement.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C566	696	Mr Greg Ball [25]	Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	The development of a cycle network is welcome, but an alternative is proposed to Route 118 in Tipton Green.	Comment	Noted
C567	744	Mr Jon Green [58]	Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	Support fully	Support	Noted and welcome support.

C568	772	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	Dudley MBC welcomes the opportunity to explore and share active travel link improvements along Mousesweet Brook, Mushroom Green and Black Brook leading to Cradley Heath transport interchange (rail/bus station).	Support	Noted and support welcomed. Sandwell MBC will continue to work with Dudley MBC in relation to potential active travel improvement corridors that cross both administrative boundaries
C569	793	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	The approach is broadly consistent with the draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP71 Active Travel. Dudley MBC supports the principle of this policy and welcomes the opportunity to continue joint working on the delivery of relevant cross boundary projects, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Birmingham New Road (A4123)/Burnt Tree (A461). •Tipton Road (A4037)/Birmingham New Road (A4123). •Birmingham New Road (A4123)/Sedgley Road (A457). Management of major works at the following locations will be key to sustainable travel and minimising disruption across the network: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Birchley Island (A4123)/Churchbridge (A4034) (in close proximity to Dudley borough). •Wolverhampton Road (A4123)/Hagley Road West (A456) (in close proximity to Dudley borough) to rail stations such as Dudley Port station (i.e., A4123/A461 scheme), Tipton rail station, Old Hill station & Coseley station will be very helpful to both Sandwell and Dudley borough residents. Please also see our response to Policy SNE2- Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitats in respect of opportunities for active travel links.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C570	824	Sport England (Mr Stuart Morgans, Planning Manager) [29]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	Sport England supports the various measures set out in this policy to promote walking and cycling as an easy choice for Sandwell's local communities, and are pleased to see the reference in paragraph 11.46 to the associated benefits to health and well-being. We would advocate the importance of part 2) which could be strengthened in terms of the ensuring that links from new developments to the network are high quality and accessible to all.	Support	Noted
C571	1006	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	Interactions of Multi-Modal Journeys: The plan should emphasise the importance of seamless interactions between various modes of transportation. Integration between walking, cycling, and public transport is essential for creating a cohesive and user-friendly transport system.	Comment	Noted. This is referenced in the Air Quality policy
C572	1007	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	Inclusion of National Cycle Network: The draft plan lacks explicit mention of the National Cycle Network. We recommend its inclusion as a key element in the cycling chapter to highlight the importance of regional and national connectivity for cyclists.	Comment	Noted. Add NCN to key diagram
C573	1046	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	This policy is strongly welcomed, but its justification should take note that our KRN represents a significant number of journeys being made and is inclusive of bike journeys. Our ambitions focus heavily on delivering a segregated cycle network that matches the KRN, either directly, or via parallel routes, to serve our region's centres, and so it is promising to see the proposed cycle routes delivering on this ambition. Exploring further where there could be opportunity for innovation in this space would also be welcomed such as side road zebra crossings, table junctions or shared streets, with policies promoting the trialing of these.	Comment	Noted
C574	1092	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	This policy is strongly welcomed, but its justification should take note that our KRN represents a significant number of journeys being made and is inclusive of bike journeys. Our ambitions focus heavily on delivering a segregated cycle network that matches the KRN, either directly, or via parallel routes, to serve our region's centres, and so it is promising to see the proposed cycle routes delivering on this ambition. Exploring further where there could be opportunity for innovation in this space would also be welcomed such as side road zebra crossings, table junctions or shared streets, with policies promoting the trialing of these.	Support	Noted
C575	1211	Oldbury (Smethwick) Limited [238]	Planning Prospects Ltd (Mr Chris Dodds, Associate Director) [163]	Policy STR5 – Creating Coherent Networks for Cycling and Walking	The draft Plan Proposals Map indicates that a cycle path is proposed to be routed along the Cape Arm but the Map itself is unclear if this route is proposed to the north of the Cape Arm or to the south, and suggests it is actually to be located within the canal. The Grove Lane Masterplan shows the cycle path on the southern (hospital) side of the Cape Arm and its route should be clarified within the Local Plan Proposals Map. If this route is delivered on the northern side of The Cape Arm it will further reduce the net density / deliverability from SH55. That said, the area on the southern side, adjacent to the Midlands Metropolitan Hospital site, would readily connect over Cranford Street onto the cycle path which has been delivered through the residential development to the north, and thus connect onto the wider network running along the Birmingham Canal further to the north – suggesting the southern side of The Cape Arm is preferable for the cycle path.	Comment	Noted. The exact route of the cycle path is TBC and will be subject to future public consultation
C576	745	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Support, but should also mention Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and EV charging provision	Support	Noted
C577	1012	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Public Transport Accessibility for All: The plan should emphasise the importance of making public transport accessible to all, including individuals with disabilities. This involves not only physical accessibility but also ensuring that information and services are inclusive.	Comment	Noted
C578	1013	Sustrans (Mr Alistair Crisp) [220]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Promotion of Active Travel Initiatives: We would encourage the inclusion of initiatives to actively promote walking and cycling, such as public awareness campaigns, community events, and educational programs to foster a culture of active transportation.	Comment	Noted
C579	1047	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Again, we fully welcome many of these policies and are extremely supportive of those measures which prioritise sustainable and active travel options which help contribute to a more reliable performance along our KRN and local roads.	Support	Noted and support welcomed
C580	1048	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Adding a policy which focuses on the importance of the reallocation of road space and providing greater priority at junctions to sustainable transport users may be worth exploring under this section, to strengthen this policy concerning demand for travel.	Comment	The SLP seeks to investigate road space reallocation wherever physical constraints permit it with the caveat that the Local Plan must have due regard to the Council's statutory network management responsibilities as Local Highway Authority. The SLP continues to promote accessible neighbourhoods and design concepts that promote alternative modes of transport to the private car.
C581	1049	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Yet it should be noted for new Park and Ride sites (where these maybe explored), our Park and Ride Strategy states "we will give priority to key intercept locations, rather than local park and ride expansions". In fact, we put measures in place to discourage people from making short car trips to those local station / stops and encourage people to walk, wheel or use public transport instead, and ensure any car parking is available for people only who are travelling from further afield with investment in sustainable modes of travel being the first priority. This approach is taken, as over two thirds of our current users are travelling 2 miles or less. Based on this evidence and our own policies in this area, the policy relating to park and ride should be re-worded to say: "identifying appropriate intercept park and ride sites on current public transport routes to ease traffic flows into centres and surrounding areas" and we should not be expanding local park and ride sites in already busy local, residential areas.	Comment	Noted
C582	1050	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	The policy could also be elaborated further concerning the need for more appropriate traffic calming measures and modal filters along residential roads. This would improve road safety and discourage cut-through driving.	Comment	Noted

C583	1051	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	The work undertaken by TFWM's Behaviour Change Hub could also be touched upon through providing key travel planning information, advice and travel clinics as well as support where there is disruption.	Comment	Noted
C584	1093	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	<p>Again, we fully welcome many of these policies and are extremely supportive of those measures which prioritise sustainable and active travel options which help contribute to a more reliable performance along our KRN and local roads.</p> <p>Adding a policy which focuses on the importance of the reallocation of road space and providing greater priority at junctions to sustainable transport users may be worth exploring under this section, to strengthen this policy concerning demand for travel.</p> <p>Yet it should be noted for new Park and Ride sites (where these maybe explored), our Park and Ride Strategy states “we will give priority to key intercept locations, rather than local park and ride expansions”. In fact, we put measures in place to discourage people from making short car trips to those local station / stops and encourage people to walk, wheel or use public transport instead, and ensure any car parking is available for people only who are travelling from further afield with investment in sustainable modes of travel being the first priority. This approach is taken, as over two thirds of our current users are travelling 2 miles or less.</p> <p>Based on this evidence and our own policies in this area, the policy relating to park and ride should be re-worded to say: “identifying appropriate intercept park and ride sites on current public transport routes to ease traffic flows into centres and surrounding areas” and we should not be expanding local park and ride sites in already busy local, residential areas.</p> <p>The policy could also be elaborated further concerning the need for more appropriate traffic calming measures and modal filters along residential roads. This would improve road safety and discourage cut-through driving.</p> <p>The work undertaken by TFWM's Behaviour Change Hub could also be touched upon through providing key travel planning information, advice and travel clinics as well as support where there is disruption.</p>	Support	Noted The Council will investigate road space reallocation to facilitate public transport and active travel wherever physical constraints permit it. However, due regard will be given to the Council's obligations as Local Traffic Authority under the Network Management Duty contained in the Traffic Management Act 2004.
C585	1164	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy STR6 – Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices	Is there any information available at present about potential park and ride sites?	Comment	The Council will adhere to the West Midlands Park and Ride Strategy. No new Park and Ride sites are identified in the SLP
C586	1052	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR7 – Network Management	We are supportive of this policy and are happy to support Sandwell MBC in this duty through the sharing of TFWM assets and resources, as well as exploring innovative approaches together.	Comment	Comment noted and support welcomed
C587	1094	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR7 – Network Management	We are supportive of this policy and are happy to support Sandwell MBC in this duty through the sharing of TFWM assets and resources, as well as exploring innovative approaches together.	Support	Comment noted and support welcomed
C588	794	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		Policy STR8 – Parking Management	Dudley MBC supports this policy which is consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP73 Parking Management. It helps to ensure a cross boundary consistent approach to this matter, which is of relevance in relation to strategic centre and town centre parking provision. We support the use of a shared Black Country evidence base to inform this policy. The most up to date Car Parking Study has been finalised and this, or any further updates, should inform the next stage of the SLP.	Support	Noted and welcome support
C589	852	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy STR8 – Parking Management	<p>STR8 (1c) references maximum standards and ‘...ensuring that a consistent approach to maximum parking standards is enforced in new developments as set out in the guidance and standards contained at Appendix L...’</p> <p>The policy should also reference the Framework (2023) and its support for walking and cycling as set out within paragraph 106(d) ... and paragraph 110(c) ...</p> <p>Whilst Policy STR8 refers to “...ensuring that a consistent approach to maximum parking standards is enforced in new development as set out in supplementary planning documents”, paragraph 108 of the Framework (2023) states that:</p> <p>‘Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport...’</p>	Comment	Noted. Add reference to NPPF
C590	1053	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR8 – Parking Management	While many of these policies on parking management are strongly welcomed, there are no policies which promote parking provision for alternatives to car ownership, such as the use of zero emission vehicles (ZEV) car clubs or car sharing as examples.	Comment	Noted
C591	1054	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR8 – Parking Management	<p>Parking issues are also not specific to town centre car parks but are issues along key corridors such as the KRN. Therefore, parking should be seen as a bigger concern, beyond just town centres.</p> <p>Within our LTP Core Strategy, we promote the managing of car parking more carefully (both in terms of availability and price). While we appreciate removing car parks all together and using the land for other uses, or raising car parking prices can often be contentious at first, they will often encourage more people to use public transport in the longer term. Where many places have undertaken these policies and raised revenue for reinvestment in more sustainable modes of travel, more positive results for both high streets and the wider locality have been achieved so we feel this policy could be strengthened much further.</p>	Comment	Noted. The SLP includes parking standards for new development
C592	1055	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR8 – Parking Management	There is further nothing relating to the enforcement of pavement parking laws to give that space back to people walking or wheeling or better enforcement of parking, moving traffic offences and Traffic Regulation Orders together with the digitisation of these to make them more accessible to the wider public or to enable more efficient loading and deliveries, noting proposals in the government's Plan for Drivers documentation. This should also coincide with a simplification of on-street waiting and loading restrictions across Sandwell – and an agreed alignment across the West Midlands – to ensure drivers are not confused. This will help make enforcement easier and ensure greater compliance from road-users, ensuring there are fewer disruptions on our road networks caused from indiscriminate parking. If the policy section could capture these additions, we feel this could make a significant difference.	Comment	Noted
C593	1056	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR8 – Parking Management	Finally considering a workplace parking levy to encourage more people to leave their cars at home when they commute could also be something the local plan explores.	Comment	Noted
C594	1095	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Startegy and Place Manager) [93]		Policy STR8 – Parking Management	<p>While many of these policies on parking management are strongly welcomed, there are no policies which promote parking provision for alternatives to car ownership, such as the use of zero emission vehicles (ZEV) car clubs or car sharing as examples.</p> <p>Parking issues are also not specific to town centre car parks but are issues along key corridors such as the KRN. Therefore, parking should be seen as a bigger concern, beyond just town centres.</p> <p>Within our LTP Core Strategy, we promote the managing of car parking more carefully (both in terms of availability and price). While we appreciate removing car parks all together and using the land for other uses, or raising car parking prices can often be contentious at first, they will often encourage more people to use public transport in the longer term. Where many places have undertaken these policies and raised revenue for reinvestment in more sustainable modes of travel, more positive results for both high streets and the wider locality have been achieved so we feel this policy could be strengthened much further.</p> <p>There is further nothing relating to the enforcement of pavement parking laws to give that space back to people walking or wheeling or better enforcement of parking, moving traffic offences and Traffic Regulation Orders together with the digitisation of these to make them more accessible to the wider public or to enable more efficient loading and deliveries, noting proposals in the government's Plan for Drivers documentation. This should also coincide with a simplification of on-street waiting and loading restrictions across Sandwell – and an agreed alignment across the West Midlands – to ensure drivers are not confused. This will help make enforcement easier and ensure greater compliance from road-users, ensuring there are fewer disruptions on our road networks caused from indiscriminate parking. If the policy section could capture these additions, we feel this could make a significant difference.</p> <p>Finally considering a workplace parking levy to encourage more people to leave their cars at home when they commute could also be something the local plan explores.</p>	Comment	Noted
C595	746	Mr Jon Green [58]		Policy STR9 – Planning for Low Emission Vehicles	Fully support. Parking for EVs should be EV only, to avoid blocking by ICE's, and encourage a mode shift. EV infrastructure should never be placed on the pavement as an obstruction to pedestrians.	Support	Noted

C596	853	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	<p>Policy STR9 – Planning for Low Emission Vehicles</p> <p>During 2019, the Department for Transport and Office for Zero Emission Vehicles (OZEV) ran a joint consultation on proposals to alter existing residential and non-residential building regulations to include provisions for electric vehicle charging points and associated infrastructure. Government outlined that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For proposed new residential buildings with more than 10 associated parking spaces, developers will need to ensure that ducting infrastructure is installed for every parking space; For proposed non-residential buildings (and buildings undergoing a major renovation or a material change in use) with more than 10 parking spaces, developers will need to ensure that at least one charge point is installed and ensure that ducting infrastructure is installed for at least 1 in 5 parking spaces; and from 2025, existing non-residential buildings with more than 20 parking spaces will need at least 1 charge point to be installed. <p>Policy STR9 states that the UK government has committed to banning the sale of petrol and diesel cars by 2030. The Prime Minister had pushed this back to 2035. Despite this, the resultant societal shift from petrol and diesel internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles to ULEVs will require widespread support from local authorities. It is projected that there will be an additional 42,500 ULEVs within the Black Country by 2025 and a significant proportion of these will be on Sandwell roads.</p> <p>Vulcan is supportive of encouraging a move away from fossil fuel vehicles through the introduction of all-electric and hybrid alternatives, as part of the West Midlands Combined Authority commitment to setting a 'net zero' emissions target by 2041, with a climate action plan being approved by the WMCA board in January 2020. This is in part facilitated through amendments to the Building Regulations 2010, and it is suggested that there is no explicit need for policy STR9 given that this is part of the national agenda on sustainability.</p> <p>Policy TRAN 8 [?] is also ambiguous in that it refers to new developments including adequate provision for charging infrastructure, without defining what adequate infrastructure means. Paragraph 16 of the Framework (2023) sets out that development plan policy should be '...clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals'. The reference to adequate provision is without clarity. This element fails the test of soundness and is therefore inconsistent with the Framework (2023).</p>	Object	Noted Amend wording in Low Emission Vehicles policy
C597	1057	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		<p>Policy STR9 – Planning for Low Emission Vehicles</p> <p>While we welcome the suggested policies proposed under this section including accommodating Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging networks, more fundamental shifts in behaviours, including a reduction in car usage will also be required. It should be further noted that ZEVs tend to be larger and heavier and produce higher levels of PM2.5 than conventional cars and many models require more space for parking, and therefore we should not seek to incentivise individuals to use an ZEV, over public transport and active travel modes.</p>	Comment	Noted
C598	1058	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		<p>Policy STR9 – Planning for Low Emission Vehicles</p> <p>It will also be important these policies align to WMCAs (Draft) ZEV Charging and Refueling Strategy, where Sandwell Council was a key partner in its development. This includes ensuring the location of EV charging points are strategically located.</p>	Comment	Noted
C599	1059	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		<p>Policy STR9 – Planning for Low Emission Vehicles</p> <p>Finally, TFWM would like to note that EV chargers can often be seen as part of the ever growing "street furniture clutter". Therefore, with the importance of road space reallocation, priority should always be given to active travel and rapid transit before accommodating EV charging on the KRN and local road networks.</p>	Comment	Noted
C600	1096	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		<p>Policy STR9 – Planning for Low Emission Vehicles</p> <p>While we welcome the suggested policies proposed under this section including accommodating Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) charging networks, more fundamental shifts in behaviours, including a reduction in car usage will also be required. It should be further noted that ZEVs tend to be larger and heavier and produce higher levels of PM2.5 than conventional cars and many models require more space for parking, and therefore we should not seek to incentivise individuals to use an ZEV, over public transport and active travel modes.</p> <p>It will also be important these policies align to WMCAs (Draft) ZEV Charging and Refueling Strategy, where Sandwell Council was a key partner in its development. This includes ensuring the location of EV charging points are strategically located.</p> <p>Finally, TFWM would like to note that EV chargers can often be seen as part of the ever growing "street furniture clutter". Therefore, with the importance of road space reallocation, priority should always be given to active travel and rapid transit before accommodating EV charging on the KRN and local road networks.</p>	Comment	Noted
C601	963	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]		<p>Policy SWA1 – Waste Infrastructure Future Requirements</p> <p>Paragraphs 13.17 to 13.28 set out estimated arisings and whether capacity gaps (surpluses) will exist in future. This is essentially the key findings of the 'Updated waste needs assessment to support preparation of emerging Local Plans for each Black Country Authority – Sandwell'. This report provides an updated assessment of the likely future waste management capacity gaps (and surpluses) for Sandwell based on 2021 data. WMRTAB notes that a previous study had been prepared in 2022 for the Black Country following advice from WMRTAB that waste needs assessments should be based on the latest available data. WMRTAB notes that more recent data, for 2022, is now available via the Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator 2022 that was published in November.</p> <p>WMRTAB notes that paragraph 13.17 of the Draft SLP states that 'under current projections, the quantity of waste Sandwell is projected to manage increases from 1.75mt in 2021 to 2.2 mt in 2040 – 41, equating to an increase of 26% or 1.2% per annum. An ongoing emphasis on waste reduction has seen a 7.5% reduction in waste per household since 2006 - 07 and this trend could have a significant influence on future waste growth. However, there are emerging changes in the need for different types of waste management capacity.'</p> <p>Paragraph 13.20 of the Draft SLP states that 'the BCWS waste projections also considered net waste imports. Around 1.35 million tonnes of waste were received at permitted waste sites (including landfill sites) and operational incinerators in Sandwell in 2021 (BCWS Table 2.10). The total imports into Sandwell originating from the West Midlands Region was 746 tonnes, representing 68% of the total waste received'. WMRTAB supports the recognition of Sandwell's role in managing waste from other areas.</p> <p>[see comment about the '746' error above – this should read 746,000]</p> <p>Paragraph 13.39 further notes that the 'quantity of waste Sandwell is projected to manage (included imported waste) is predicted to increase from 1.75 million tonnes (mt) in 2021 to 2.1 mt in 2040-41, equating to an increase of 23% or 1.1% per annum. However, this does not appear consistent with data in paragraph 13.17 which states (inconsistencies highlighted):</p> <p>'Under current projections, the quantity of waste Sandwell is projected to manage increases from 1.75 mt in 2021 to 2.2 mt in 2040 – 41, equating to an increase of 26% or 1.2% per annum. An ongoing emphasis on waste reduction has seen a 7.5% reduction in waste per household since 2006 - 07 and this trend could have a significant influence on future waste growth. However, there are emerging changes in the need for different types of waste management capacity.'</p> <p>WMRTAB recommends that the figures highlighted are checked to ensure they are consistent, or an explanation of the inconsistency is provided. In any event WMRTAB supports the approach to recognising waste imports in calculation of arisings to be planned for.</p> <p>Future waste management 'capacity gaps' for the Black Country (Sandwell, Dudley, Wolverhampton and Walsall) are identified over the plan period. The Draft SLP states, at paragraph 13.26, that Table 4.9 of the Black Country Waste Study (BWCS) 'predicts that the following additional waste management capacity will need to be delivered in the Black Country between 2021 and 2041 to maintain net self-sufficiency':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Re-use / recycling (non-hazardous municipal waste) – 813 kt to 4tpa [Note that a value of '4 tonnes per annum' suggests that data is being presented with 'spurious precision' which national policy advises against]. b. Energy recovery (residual municipal waste) – 335 to 663 kt tpa' <p>The BCWS (updated 2022) (Updated waste needs assessment to support preparation of emerging Local Plans for each Black Country Authority – Sandwell) identifies a range of waste management capacity</p>	Comment	Comment noted - check figures used
C602	795	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		<p>Policy SWA1 – Waste Infrastructure Future Requirements</p> <p>It is noted that the updated supporting evidence base for Sandwell and SLP Policy SWA1 sets out the waste infrastructure capacity gaps for the plan period. The draft Dudley Local Plan and its supporting evidence base has also identified waste infrastructure capacity gaps, particularly for those facilities which the borough is unlikely to be able to accommodate due to its urban nature e.g., landfill, anaerobic digestion and composting facilities. Dudley MBC would welcome further discussions under the Duty to Cooperate in relation to cross boundary waste matters, particularly given the existing waste movements between our local authorities. Dudley MBC will continue to work with Sandwell MBC on cross boundary strategic waste matters, including via the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (WMRTAB).</p>	Comment	Comment noted - further DTC work to be undertaken with Dudley
C603	1165	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		<p>Policy SWA1 – Waste Infrastructure Future Requirements</p> <p>We would recommend re-phrasing clause 3) f) to ensure that the policy protects the significance of heritage assets including their setting and inappropriate waste developments will be resisted. The policy may further benefit from some additional text on this issue in the reasoned justification text.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - look at re-phrasing clause 3
C604	796	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		<p>Policy SWA2 – Waste Sites</p> <p>Dudley MBC supports the principle of this policy, which is broadly consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP76 Waste Sites. Dudley MBC supports the identification of strategic waste sites, applying a consistent approach in terms of how these are defined, and the use of the shared evidence base for the Black Country (Waste Study, 2020). The policy approach also helps to ensure cross boundary consistency in identifying appropriate locations for non-waste developments which do not prejudice existing waste-related operations.</p>	Support	Comment noted
C605	797	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]		<p>Policy SWA2 – Waste Sites</p> <p>We note that the Edwin Richards Landfill identified as a Strategic Waste Disposal Installation is also a proposed major housing allocation (allocation reference SH37) in the plan period. As this site is currently a recipient of relatively significant levels of waste from Dudley borough, we would welcome further information on the proposed timescales for its closure as part of our Duty to Cooperate discussions in respect of strategic waste matters</p>	Comment	Comment noted - continued DTC with Dudley MBC

C606	968	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]	Policy SWA2 – Waste Sites	<p>Paragraph 13.39 of the Draft SLP states that the 'The Sandwell Local Plan is a strategic plan and therefore it focuses on safeguarding strategic waste sites. The approach of protecting existing/safeguarding waste facilities from other development which may impact on their operation is implemented by Policy SWA2 (Waste Sites). WMRTAB notes that this is an important consideration, especially in an area where it is difficult to find suitable land for waste management development. In addition, it is further noted, in paragraph 13.25, that: 'The Council will look to identify development sites for waste infrastructure, with priority placed upon the safeguarding of existing and allocated sites for continued use.'</p> <p>Policy SWA2 states that (with emphasis added):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sandwell will safeguard all existing strategic and other waste management facilities from inappropriate development, to maintain existing levels of waste management capacity and meet Strategic Objective 17, unless it can be demonstrated that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. there is no longer a need for the facility; and b. capacity can be met elsewhere; or c. appropriate compensatory provision is made in appropriate locations elsewhere in the Black Country; or d. the site is required to facilitate the strategic objectives of the Sandwell. 2. This policy will also apply to all new waste management sites that are implemented within the lifetime of the plan. <p>New development near existing waste facilities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Proposals for housing and other potentially sensitive uses will not be permitted near to or adjacent to an existing waste management site where there is potential for conflict between the uses, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. unless a temporary permission for a waste use has expired, or the waste management use has otherwise ceased, and the site or infrastructure is considered unsuitable for a subsequent waste use; b. or redevelopment of the waste site or loss of waste infrastructure would form part of a strategy or scheme that has wider environmental, social and / or economic benefits that outweigh the retention of the site or infrastructure for the waste use and alternative provision is made for the displaced waste use; c. or a suitable replacement site or infrastructure has otherwise been identified and permitted. 4. Waste Site Impact Assessments will be expected to demonstrate that at least one of the above criteria applies. Applications should also identify any 'legacy' issues arising from existing or former waste uses, and how these will be addressed through the design of the development and the construction process. <p>WMRTAB generally supports the approach in the Draft SLP to safeguarding existing waste management capacity but has the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 1 of Policy SWA2 mentions 'other waste sites' but it is not clear what these are. Should this make it clear that this means all other waste sites which are allowed to operate by planning legislation? • The identified 'strategic waste sites' and 'other waste sites' appear to have the same level of safeguarding protection and so it is unclear why a distinction has been made between strategic and other waste sites. If the intention is to safeguard all waste sites, regardless of whether they are considered strategic or not, then WMRTAB recommend that the policy states this clearly. • Clause 1. d. appears to introduce a contradiction as the 'strategic objectives' include Draft SLP Strategic Objective 17 that states: 'To manage waste as a resource and minimise the amount produced and sent to landfill, including ensuring that the reliance on primary minerals during construction and development are kept to a minimum and that greater use is made of recycled or alternative building materials'. In addition, paragraph 13.2 outlines the key objective for waste services: 'Sandwell is to minimise its generation across all sectors and increase the reuse, recycling and recovery rate of waste'. 	Comment	Comment noted - look at potential re-phasing of the policy	
C607	1208	Environment Agency (Keira Murphy) [173]	Policy SWA2 – Waste Sites	<p>We welcome the general principles of this policy. We recommend sections 1 and 2 of the policy consider safeguarding process and remanufacturing facilities that can consume waste to supply useful recovered raw materials and new products. This would help in implementing a Circular Economy as mentioned earlier in paragraph 13.11. In relation to this promoting traditional disposal facilities up the Waste Hierarchy into recovery capacity, for example, adding a pre-sorting line to a waste to energy facility or allowing a skip-waste sorting operation at a closed landfill would be beneficial.</p> <p>We welcome paragraph 3 of the policy in principle in the aim to avoid potential conflict between the uses of an existing waste site with proposals for housing and other sensitive uses by not permitting (with exceptions). However, we suggest the term 'near to' is not very precise and the policy could be made more robust by providing an indicative minimum distance. The proximity may vary depending on the source and receptor, and it's worth noting that anaerobic digestion facilities produce gases very similar in nature to landfill gas. Please consider the Environment Agency guidance relating to development near landfill sites due to the hazards of landfill gas migration as well as amenity impact.</p>	Support	Comment noted - look at re-phasing "near to"	
C608	1004	Chance Heritage Trust [56]	Iceni Projects (Katie Inglis, Associate Director) [215]	Policy SWA2 – Waste sites and adjoining Employment Land	<p>The Soho Foundry site neighbours an established recycling facility, allocated under Policy SWA2, known as Simm's Metals. The allocation of this waste facility and the surrounding employment land, for waste and continued employment uses represents a significant missed opportunity to redevelop all the land bound by Foundry Lane, the B4136 and the canal as a wider heritage-led regeneration scheme. It is recommended that the Council considers options for the wider regeneration of this area.</p>	Object	Comments noted - The BC Waste Study assessment of the area concluded - A significant area of brownfield land characterised by a mix of traditional and more modern employment uses including heavy industry, storage areas, and waste sites. The site is very well related to the motorway network being under 5 minutes drive time from the M5 and accessible via the A456 and A4252 dual carriageways. The internal roads possess straight frontages with good visibility. The highway effects of additional development in this area should not be significant. There has been some recent housing development to the south and west of the site and further proposals at its southern boundary on Rolfe Street. Although these are close to some existing waste uses and may constrain the potential of these boundaries to accommodate further waste uses, the majority of the area is unaffected and a safeguarding policy will ensure that its potential to accommodate a wide range of facilities remains secure.
C609	799	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]	Policy SWA3 – Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities	<p>We note that the Sandwell Local Plan Policies Map identifies a 'Preferred Area of Search' for new waste facilities, which is a cross boundary area with Dudley borough at Bloomfield Road/Budden Road, Coseley. Whilst it is identified on the Policies Map, it is not listed in Table 13 of the supporting justification text to Policy SWA3 nor in Appendix E (where these sites are listed again). We would welcome clarification that the site is allocated and recommend it is included in the site-specific list of allocations within the SLP. Dudley MBC supports the principle of this allocation as it aligns with the draft Dudley Local Plan allocation detailed in Policy DLP77 and identified on the Policies Map. We would expect any site-specific proposals to take account of cross boundary considerations e.g., highway impacts, as part of the detailed planning application process.</p>	Comment	Comment noted	
C610	1166	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]	Policy SWA3 – Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities	<p>We have not been able to comment on specific proposed waste sites at this time. We will assess these in the new year and would welcome a meeting with the Council to discuss proposed allocations and any impacts these may have on the historic environment. If any proposed allocations could impact on the historic environment, we would expect to see a heritage impact assessment as evidence base.</p>	Comment	Comment noted	
C611	800	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]	Policy SWA3 – Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities	<p>We note that the Sandwell Local Plan Policies Map identifies a 'Preferred Area of Search' for new waste facilities, which is a cross boundary area with Dudley borough at Bloomfield Road/Budden Road, Coseley. ... We note that there are several housing allocations proposed within proximity of this preferred area (Bradleys Lane/High Street, Brown Lion Street, and The Boat Gauging House). We would expect these sites to have been assessed in terms of their potential to prejudice any existing and proposed waste operations at this location, taking account of cross boundary allocations and safeguarded sites within Dudley borough.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - check that the proposed housing allocations will not have an affect the Preferred Aea for New Waste Facilities.	
C612	965	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]	Policy SWA3 – Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities	<p>WMRTAB notes that no specific sites for new waste management facilities have been allocated in the Draft SLP. Paragraph 13.47 (Identification of Preferred Sites) states: 'it is not proposed to allocate specific sites for waste in the Local Plan because no new sites likely to be deliverable within the plan period have been identified, apart from sites that already have planning permission (NPPF, 16, 35, Annex 2). To have sufficient confidence to allocate a site, it would need to be actively promoted for a waste management use by the Council, a landowner and / or a commercial waste operator'.</p> <p>However, paragraph 13.38 of the Draft SLP states: 'The identification and delivery of new waste management facilities will make a significant contribution towards meeting new capacity requirements set out above and will meet the aims and objectives of the Plan.'</p> <p>Policy SWA3 states: 'The preferred locations for waste management facilities are the Local Employment Areas shown on the Sandwell Local Plan Policies Map.'</p> <p>Paragraph 13.57 goes into further detail explaining that (with emphasis added): 'Several broad locations suitable for the development of new waste management facilities in Sandwell have been identified in Table 13 of Policy SWA3'</p> <p>WMRTAB acknowledge that the choice of the 'Preferred Areas' identified in the BWCS 'as being most suited to the development of new waste recovery, treatment, and transfer infrastructure' was based on a series of locational considerations and constraints to identify the most appropriate likely future location for new waste facilities.</p> <p>WMRTAB understand Sandwell has undertaken numerous Call for Sites exercises during the preparation of the current Local Plan and as part of its involvement in the former Black Country Plan.</p> <p>WMRTAB acknowledges that the approach of not allocating specific sites reflects the local circumstances/nature of the Black Country whereby waste sites frequently feature within general employment areas across the urban area and these are located within large urban areas that are constrained in terms of opportunities for new developments overall. WMRTAB recommends that the approach, of not allocating specific sites and relying on general areas and areas of employment land, be robustly justified within the evidence base.</p>	Comment	Comment noted - The evidence contained in the BC Waste Study (appendix M, 2020) identified the proposed "Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities" and the employment land work undertaken through the EDNA and BEAR show that there are a lack of available employment across the Borough for development.	
C613	798	Dudley MBC (Mr Carl Mellor) [70]	Policy SWA3 – Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities	<p>Dudley MBC supports the principle of this policy, which is consistent with draft Dudley Local Plan Policy DLP77 Preferred Areas for New Waste Facilities and is based upon a consistent evidence base for the Black Country (Waste Study, 2020).</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support	

C614	1167	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SWA4 – Locational Considerations for New Waste Facilities	This policy would benefit from a clause on the historic environment.	Comment	Comment notes - look at incorporating a "Historic environment" clause into the Policy
C615	854	Vulcan Property II Limited [114]	Vulcan Property II Limited (Miss Madeleine McCoy) [154]	Policy SWA5 – Resource Management and New Development	10.0The requirements of policy SWA5 in respect of minimising waste in new development, re-use of materials following redevelopment and/or remediation and use of alternatives to primary aggregates in construction are couched in terms of as far as possible and wherever possible. Paragraph 16 of the Framework (2023) is clear that development plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous. Draft policy SWA5 should be redrafted with clear targets and the requirements of applicants providing justification for the approaches to waste management and the use construction materials in any given development project	Comment	Comment noted
C616	1161	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Policy SWB1 - West Bromwich Town Centre	This policy would benefit from a clause on the historic environment.	Comment	Comment noted. The policy relates to the West Bromwich Masterplan which includes analysis of the character and historic significance of the town.
C617	879	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Policy SWB2 – Development in West Bromwich	The PCCWM objects to this Policy as it does not cross reference other relevant policies of note, including those relating to town centres, therefore the Policy should cross reference policies such as Policy SCE1 'Sandwell Centres' etc. For example, point 4 should reference an amended Policy SDS5.	Object-suggested amendments accepted	"..1. It is a priority for West Bromwich to serve identified housing and employment growth aspirations (Policy SDS1, Policy SDS2). The diversification of West Bromwich to provide a re-purposed, well-balanced mix of appropriate uses will be supported (Policy SCE1), in particular:" Sugg extra text in red. "Retail 3. Existing convenience and comparison retail provision will be protected and appropriate new development for these uses supported, to meet both local shopping needs and large-scale provision serving the wider catchment; this should be focused on re-purposing vacant floorspace and re-using existing sites within the centre in the first instance" (Policy SCE1). Sugg extra text in red. SWB2 "Leisure. Leisure uses, especially large-scale public and commercial facilities such as cinemas, hotels, and a wide range of high-quality family venues and activities, will be supported where they help to diversify the centre, encourage linked trips and enhance the evening economy and visitor experience (Policy SDS5). Sugg extra text in red.
C618	942	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]		Previous consultations on the Sandwell Local Plan	Legal Compliance In response to the Sandwell Local Plan Issues and Options consultation earlier this year HBF underlined the importance of ensuring that any 'rolled forward' policies in the draft Black Country Plan remain appropriate and are fully supported by the evidence base. HBF is pleased that our earlier comments have been taken on board. It is important that any of the "previously seen" policies in the draft Black Country Plan, which are now being proposed to be rolled forward and "adapted" in the Sandwell Plan, and the evidence supporting them, are subject to full public consultation. HBF remain of the view that the issue of the housing need for Sandwell, the housing requirement for Sandwell, the potential unmet need of Sandwell and Green Belt designations, are key issues that impact on the fundamental Strategic Policies that will be an essential part of good plan-making in Sandwell. HBF is pleased that some additional information has now been made available as part of this consultation. However, it will remain important that the evidence base continues to be updated, and made available, as the plan-making process continues.	Comment	Support noted and welcomed. Sandwell will continue to update and expand its supporting evidence and will endeavour to ensure that the draft Regulation 19 version of the SLP is as up to date as possible.
C619	709	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Priorities and Objectives, Ensuring delivery of the	Can you ensure that Sandwell will carry out their due diligence when it comes to awarding contracts to construction companies and that these companies can do what they are offering within the time frame, more importantly the budget and warranties and guarantees that are longer than 12 months if its something that has been structurally built. Can we also have transparency with the actual costs of works down to the last penny and any other additional costs that may have incurred because of companies not delivering on what they bid for.	Comment	Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C620	903	Clowes Developments (UK) Limited [214]	Harris Lamb (Sam Silcocks, Director) [206]	Priorities and Objectives, Table 3 – Priorities,	Objective 8 "grow a prosperous and resilient local and regional economy". Whilst Harris Lamb supports this objective again the substantive and significant proposed shortfall in employment supply, particularly in the context of the wider FEMA and the local authorities beyond which evidently have a strong functional relationship with Sandwell e.g. South Staffordshire.	Comment	Comment noted on employment , will work with the other local authorities in the Black Country FEMA and those with strong economic links to Sandwell to meet the need.
C621	683	Mr John Davison [192]		Priorities and Objectives, Table 3 – Priorities,	To Objective 11 add 'access to wildlife'	Comment	Noted. The objective here is to promote and support active and healthy living - biodiversity is covered in a separate objective (Objective 3) and there is no need to duplicate it in Objective 11.
C622	658	Mr Alexander Lane [180]		Priorities and Objectives, Table 3 – Priorities,	- Objective 3: Could be revised to 'To protect and enhance Sandwell's natural environment, natural resources, biodiversity, wildlife corridors geological resources, countryside and landscapes, whilst ensuring that residents have equitable access to interlinked green infrastructure' - Objective 6: Should include wording on ensuring new development should aim to maximise biodiversity benefit and ensure they tie into wider ecological networks. - Objective 7: Clarity is sought on what 'resilience' means in this context? Presumably resilient to climate change?	Comment	Noted. Amend Objective 3 to include reference to equity of access. Re Objective 6 - biodiversity is covered in Objective 3, while this objective relates specifically to issues around housing. There is no need to duplicate references where they are covered elsewhere in the objectives. Re Objective 7 - reference to resilient communities relates to their general wellbeing in terms of health, social networks, community facilities and opportunities.
C623	708	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Priorities and Objectives, Table 3 – Priorities,	Regarding housing within the boroughs, the thought proses going forward has been to reduce the age of who can be offered a flat within a high rise down to 25 years old. Whilst I'm not against young people being given homes, its just that they will move in single or potentially a young couple and they will then go on and have a family but Sandwell Council states in its own policies that they would never move children into high rises, but they are being born into a life of high rises, that seems unfair.	Comment	Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C624	752	Miss Helen Davies [203]		Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network	We welcome this policy. However, our comments on Sandwell's issues options document still stand, where we requested stronger acknowledgement to exploring road space re-allocation for active travel and public transport. Our assessment of the challenges being faced by the region suggests this will be difficult to realise unless there are conscious efforts to reduce overall car dependency. We would further welcome the plan capturing our '15 minute neighbourhood' concept, together with exploiting the opportunities at regional interchanges to ensure that people can access other services (e.g. health and leisure) by public transport, with this being our '45 minute region' concept.	Comment	The SLP seeks to investigate road space reallocation wherever physical constraints permit it with the caveat that the Local Plan must have due regard to the Council's statutory network management responsibilities as Local Highway Authority. The SLP continues to promote accessible neighbourhoods and design concepts that promote alternative modes of transport to the private car.
C625	740	Mr Jon Green [58]		Proposals	Support these proposals. Should also look at ways to reduce parking, particularly on street as it obstructs vehicles and would provide opportunity for cycle lanes - numerous studies show cyclists will spend more at a high street than car drivers. Could relocate parking into Aldi and Atkins Lane - not sure if the whole bus interchange is really required? Could do a smaller one - never see more than 2 buses there (one parked, one loading/unloading)	Support	Noted
C626	1274	National Highways (Kathryn Simmonite, Assistant Spatial Planner) [227]		Regeneration Areas	We note that the new development allocations are focussed within the Regeneration Areas and Centres, which is likely to lead to a more efficient use of land and in improving the sustainable travel options.	Comment	Noted
C627	732	Mr Greg Ball [25]		Retail and Town Centre Uses	The recent closure of Wilkos will affect the quoted retail statistics. The vacant building, though relatively new presents a dead frontage. Redevelopment could open up views of the Thame and perhaps allow an area of open space.	Comment	
C628	867	Matthew Nairn [211]		Sandwell Parking Standards	The section on parking, it is good you have thought about this but more must be made of this. You go around the Sandwell area and see the standard of parking and it leaves alot to be desired.	Comment	Comment noted
C629	1123	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]		Sandwell Spatial Portrait	Para 72 - Consider re-phrasing and celebrating the industrial heritage of the area and how that has shaped the local identity of the area. Para 73 - Amend to 'Registered Parks and Gardens'. Consider amending heritage conservation areas to conservation areas and the setting of heritage assets or something similar. Heritage assets themselves are 'irreplaceable' and should be conserved and protected and the Local Plan to provide a 'positive strategy' for this. Their need to be protected is more than a recognition of their past use but as how heritage has shaped our identity and how they continue to remain relevant today and can contribute positively to the economy and social wellbeing. It would be useful in this section if heritage can also be referenced as a component of landscape.	Comment	comment noted. Amend text as suggested

C630	761	West Midlands Police [96]	The Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Gail Collins) [95]	Sandwell Spatial Portrait	<p>Sandwell Spatial Portrait – paragraphs 27-77 and Challenges and Issues – paragraph 78</p> <p>This section of the draft Local Plan sets out the background to the Borough and includes key statistics. There is no reference at all in paragraphs 27 to 77 of the crime statistics for the Borough, whereas statistics/ profiles are given for health, economy and skills, employment, transport, broadband and 5G etc. This is considered a significant omission, given crime and disorder are key indicators of relevance in painting a spatial portrait of the Borough. Indeed, it is noted in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal under Table 2.1: Summary of SA Objectives confirms under point 11 that the reduction of poverty, crime and social deprivation and secure economic inclusion are a Sustainability Appraisal objective, however, no crime statistics are provided against which to measure the success of the objectives. Furthermore, Table 9.1 of the Sustainability Appraisal includes in its recommendations at (11) Equality, ensuring that development proposals take into account crime and safety, and promote safe and accessible neighbourhoods, helping to reduce crime and fear of crime. These recommendations need better translating into the policies of the draft Sandwell Local Plan.</p> <p>An understanding of the crime profile of the Borough, in accordance with the requirement under paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF 2023, ensures that planning policies and decisions, amongst other requirements, "...create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience."</p> <p>In this respect, it is considered that the crime profile should be included, and to that end, the existing crime statistics from West Midlands Police (2022), i.e. the last full calendar year, are set out below. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) population projections indicate that the expected number of households across the West Midlands for 2022 was 1,163,039. For the Sandwell area alone, the projected number of households is 129,512.</p> <p>In 2022, the total number of recorded Police incidents (i.e. those occasions when West Midlands Police were called upon to deploy 1 or more Officer(s) to an incident) was 635,972 for the entire force area. The actual number of crimes recorded, resulting from these incidents, was 364,950 crimes (which equates to 0.55 incidents/0.31 crimes per household, across the entire WMP force area).</p> <p>The table below sets out these figures, along with those incident and crime figures relating to Sandwell by way of comparison, as highlighted, which coincidentally are very similar to the incidents/crimes per household for the whole force area.</p> <p>On the basis of the above crime statistics, the following proportional factor can be applied to reliably predict the potential additional incidents/crimes which would be likely to occur within a calendar year upon completion as a result of the planned new population growth in the borough of Sandwell.</p> <p>The proposed numbers of new homes of 11,167 (supply) and 29,500 (need) would represent 8.5% and 22.8% increases in the number of households within Sandwell, respectively. If the same percentage increases are applied to the actual incident and crime statistics for the area, the predicted proportional additional and total incidents/crimes likely to occur within a calendar year are as set out in table One.</p>	Comment	Noted. Amend portrait to include short section on crime and safety.
C631	1085	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Sandwell Spatial Portrait	<p>Paragraph 60 under the header "Sandwell's Spatial Portrait" it refers to the Strategic Road Network. However, this does not acknowledge the Major Road Network or Key Route Network that operates within Sandwell.</p> <p>When describing the road network across Sandwell, it should be noted that the WMCA have recently begun a review of the Key Route Network (KRN) and subject to approval, the following changes will be implemented and will affect Sandwell. These being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The removal of the B4171 Birmingham Road from its junction with A4100 Henderson Way (Rowley Regis) to its junction with A459 Castle Hill (Dudley) •NEW KRN: Sandon Road from its junction with A4030 Bearwood Road (Smethwick) to its junction with A4040 Barnsley Road (Birmingham) <p>Capturing opportunities through our levelling up zones as part of the ground-breaking Deeper Devolution Deal should also be noted, especially for those across the wider Black Country.</p> <p>Therefore, making sure the Sandwell Local Plan picks up on these changes would be welcomed.</p>	Comment	Same rep as 1022 and 749
C632	749	Miss Helen Davies [203]		Sandwell Spatial Portrait	<p>It refers to the Strategic Road Network. However, this does not acknowledge the Major Road Network or Key Route Network. When describing the road network it should be noted that the WMCA have recently begun a review of the Key Route Network (KRN) and subject to approval, the following changes will affect Sandwell. These being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Removal of the B4171 Birmingham Road from its junction with A4100 Henderson Way (Rowley Regis) to its junction with A459 Castle Hill (Dudley) •NEW KRN: Sandon Road from junction with A4030 Bearwood Road to its junction with A4040 Barnsley Road 	Comment	same rep as 1022, David Harris
C633	1022	TFWM (Mr David Harris, Transport Strategy and Place Manager) [93]		Sandwell Spatial Portrait	<p>Paragraph 60 under the header "Sandwell's Spatial Portrait" it refers to the Strategic Road Network. However, this does not acknowledge the Major Road Network or Key Route Network that operates within Sandwell.</p> <p>When describing the road network across Sandwell, it should be noted that the WMCA have recently begun a review of the Key Route Network (KRN) and subject to approval, the following changes will be implemented and will affect Sandwell. These being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The removal of the B4171 Birmingham Road from its junction with A4100 Henderson Way (Rowley Regis) to its junction with A459 Castle Hill (Dudley) •NEW KRN: Sandon Road from its junction with A4030 Bearwood Road (Smethwick) to its junction with A4040 Barnsley Road (Birmingham) <p>Capturing opportunities through our levelling up zones as part of the ground-breaking Deeper Devolution Deal should also be noted, especially for those across the wider Black Country.</p> <p>Therefore, making sure the Sandwell Local Plan picks up on these changes would be welcomed.</p>	Comment	same rep as 749, Helen Davies
C634	717	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		SMETHWICK	<p>3.39 we have just spent however many years sitting under the shadow of the hospital being built and i mean quite literally the hospital now blocks out our sunlight and if the high rise is given the go ahead to be built it will block out even more peoples sunlight. Also this information is not getting out to the residents within this area, I dont have a solution as to how you engage or inform the residents but i know that it is seriously lacking in this area regarding the regenerations.</p>	Comment	Noted. The Council has adopted the Smethwick to Birmingham Corridor Framework prepared in partnership with other public sector bodies, and has adopted the Grove Lane Masterplan to guide development around the hospital. Both documents were prepared following a period of public consultation. The Council has launched a new website which provides news on regeneration projects in the borough - https://regeneratingsandwell.co.uk/ Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C635	704	Miss Miss Garrehy [201]		Sub-regional Context	<p>When it comes to transport within the Black Country specifically Cape Hill and Smethwick, during the last consultations when West Bromwich got its regeneration regarding the bus station moving and the new boundary was drawn up. These 2 areas were suddenly excluded from being part of the Black Country, which in turn meant residents within the area were no longer able to purchase and use the black country bus tickets or passes and subsequently had to pay more for bus travel. Is this something that can be looked into as to why they were excluded.</p>	Comment	Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C636	725	Mr Greg Ball [25]		SWOT	<p>As a user of several of Sandwell's centres, I find Blackheath the best for range of stores plus cafes etc. However the road system and lack of crossing points create a disjointed centre. Hopefully the new bus interchange will make it easier to change between East-West routes and the 3 and 4.</p>	Comment	Pedestrian access will be considered as part of the implementation of the new bus interchange. Email sent to respondent 06.03.2024
C637	861	Mr Kevin Priest [210]		Table 10 – Sandwell's Hierarchy of Centres	<p>The whole of this plan seems to be based on a similar theory to trickle down economics whereby investment will be primarily targeted for West Bromwich and then that will attract further funding and investment to other areas.</p> <p>West Bromwich is mentioned 197 times in the plan, far more frequently than any other town. West Bromwich is the strategic centre, tier 1. All of the other towns and areas fall into tier 2 or 3.</p> <p>Lots of investment went in New Square, decimating the remainder of the town centre. The Kings and Queens Square are mostly empty units and it's a walkway through to the New Square. There wasn't any benefit to the rest of Sandwell. How will this local plan do things differently?</p>	Comment	West Bromwich is far from the only recipient of investment. Eg, Rowley Regis has gained Towns Fund monies for a Satellite Education Hub, a New Bus Interchange, improvements to Britannia Park, Haden Hill will have a new Leisure Centre, Smethwick has new Metropolitan Hospital under construction, an Aquatics Centre, Oldbury will get a new park at Brandhall, while Wednesbury has its Heritage Action Zone, Friar Park its Urban Village et al. However, WB is the Strategic Centre of Sandwell due to its size and more comprehensive retail offer. SLP looking to repurpose existing vacant Centres floorspace to residential to bolster existing retail offer, it also seeks to restrict additional retail floorspace in edge of centre and out of centre locations as Centres Study shows no capacity going forward to 2039. With specific regard to WB, the Retail Diversification Fund project is looking to repurpose Queens Square and former M & S site, re locate the indoor Market to the High Street, these are ongoing projects. While Queens Square has many vacancies, Kings Square however, has very near full occupancy.
C638	647	Friends of Sheepwash Local Nature Reserve (Mr IAN CARROLL, Chairman) [21]		Table 4 - Summary of regeneration projects	<p>The proposal for the Dudley port garden city 2034 does not accord with the housing allocation Rattlechain timeline of 2040. You have therefore no chance of delivering this based upon the known constraints and fact that the owners of the Rattlechain lagoon, (Rhodia/Solvay), separate to the owners of those promoting their land at SH35 (SA 85) have yet to make their plans for this site known.</p>	Object	Noted. The delivery date for Dudley Port Garden City will be revised to reflect to latest trajectory for Rattlechain.
C639	669	Dr Michael Hodder [48]		The Historic Environment	<p>I welcome the statements made under the heading "The Historic Environment"</p>	Support	Noted and welcome support
C640	681	Mr John Davison [192]		Vision for Sandwell	<p>To the Vision, I would add 'biodiversity'</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Amend to include ref to biodiversity
C641	682	Mr John Davison [192]		Vision for Sandwell	<p>add 'biodiversity'</p>	Comment	Comment noted. Amend to include ref to biodiversity

C642	945	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Vision for Sandwell	<p>Vision for Sandwell</p> <p>8. HBF support the need for the Vision for Sandwell to include reference to the need for new homes to meet housing need, as included within Ambition 7 but suggest this should be amended to be more explicit about the requirement to meet the development needs of the area. HBF would suggest that both the Vision and Objective Six should be more explicit about the need to plan for both open market and affordable housing to meet housing needs and support the Council's growth aspirations.</p>	Comment	Comment noted. The Council is clear that it will not be possible to meet Sandwell's housing need in full, and it is not possible to ascertain when / if this might change. The Vision is intended to set out what the realised aims and objectives of the SLP would look like, and as such there is no requirement for it to mention a need to meet housing targets - the SLP's capacity to provide additional housing is assumed and a reference to housing need targets in this context would be incongruous.
C643	936	West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (Mr Ian Blake) [217]	Waste - Introduction	<p>The Draft SLP notes that there is significant movement of waste into and out of Sandwell as follows:</p> <p>13.20 The BCWS waste projections also considered net waste imports. Around 1.35 million tonnes of waste were received at permitted waste sites (including landfill sites) and operational incinerators in Sandwell in 2021 (BCWS Table 2.10). The total imports into Sandwell originating from the West Midlands Region was 746 tonnes, representing 68% of the total waste received.</p> <p>[N.B. WMRTAB notes paragraph 2.8.7 of the updated Black Country Waste Study for Sandwell states that 'The total imports into Sandwell originating from the West Midlands region (excluding the waste originating in Sandwell) was 746,000 tonnes' and so the '746' value included in paragraph 13.20 shown above is an error.]</p> <p>13.21 More than 80% of the waste received at permitted waste facilities in Sandwell (excluding incinerators) in 2021 by tonnage originated within the former West Midlands region (BCWS Appendix J, Table J4). However, the originating authority of 29.5% of this waste is not known. 15% of the waste is recorded as originating from within the Black Country, and 15% from Birmingham.</p> <p>13.22 Similarly, more than 80% of the waste received at permitted sites in England which was recorded as having originated in Sandwell in 2021 (by tonnage) did not travel beyond the former West Midlands region. Outside the West Midlands, the East Midlands, Southwest and East of England were the three largest importers of waste into Sandwell, importing 9% of total waste.</p> <p>13.23 In 2021 nearly 608kt of waste originating in Sandwell were exported to permitted sites in England and Wales.'</p> <p>The distribution of waste arising in Sandwell to authorities in the West Midlands is set out in Figure 2.3 of the updated Back Country Waste Study for Sandwell (2023) 2 which is set out below: (See attachment)</p> <p>2 BCWS (Updated waste needs assessment to support preparation of emerging Local Plans for each Black Country Authority – Sandwell) (updated September 2023). bca-waste-study-update-september-2023- (sandwell.gov.uk)</p> <p>In light of the above, WMRTAB notes that meaningful dialogue between Sandwell and other Waste Planning Authorities is likely to be important to ensure it meets its obligations under the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>The Sandwell Duty to Cooperate (DTC) Statement (published November 2023),3 paragraph 61 'Effect of new development on waste disposal', notes that 'The Council has been involved in waste discussions through the West Midlands Resource Technical Advisory Body (RTAB), a body set up to support and promote cooperation between Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) and others. The Council sent DTC letters out to those Waste Planning Authorities where waste movements were above the agreed thresholds for waste movements. Letters were set out on the 19th April 2023 and were followed up on the 25th May 2023. Staffordshire, Dudley and Walsall Councils consider the matter to be significant enough to warrant a SoCG, whereas Cheshire East and Chester Council would like further discussions on the matter'.</p> <p>It is understood that engagement related to ensuring compliance with the DTC is ongoing and that application of the WMRTAB Duty to Cooperate protocol has revealed that there are very few waste movements to WPAs which exceed the 20% threshold for movement to one authority and there are no movements within the last year that exceed the 40% threshold. At this stage WMRTAB notes that while the DTC statement has been prepared, the DTC statement does not represent the views of the DTC signatories that has taken place to date and whether there are any other parties in terms of the DTC statement.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of this section in the Plan. Are there any tools or opportunities from this project that could be replicated elsewhere in the Borough?</p>	Comment	Comment noted - further DTC work to be undertaken
C644	1160	Historic England (Mrs Kezia Taylerson) [102]	Wednesbury Town	<p>We welcome the inclusion of this section in the Plan. Are there any tools or opportunities from this project that could be replicated elsewhere in the Borough?</p>	Support	Note and welcome support.
C645	1251	Mr Ghalam Gadair [247]	West Bromwich	<p>Therefore as part of the Development plan Sandwell Council needs to honour its pledge for the regeneration of the Lyng estate around the Newhall Street area which was referred to has phase two following the barretts housing development. We currently sit next to an industrial area which has changed for the worse and the new business do not operate in a sensible manner taking into their impact on the area. We suffer from air and noise pollution open car storage on public highway by the garages, car repairs on the road, cars being delivered outside residents properties, garages are storing cars outside their premises for dismantling, ASB issues, issues around drugs and alcohol and people defecating outside residents properties as well as dogs.</p> <p>We as residents are fatigued in reporting issues and there is a lot of apathy due to no action following commitments. From my conversations and meeting with the local residents we request the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regeneration of the local area with residents involvement. 2. Thought to go into the design of the area and what type of new builds should be built. 3. For open spaces and urban parks to sit near residential properties 4. If there is to be a mix of industry and new builds there needs to be borders differentiating separate existence as well as new business to be clean and non impacting on local area. 5. To look at flag ship ideas such as special advance schools for children with Autism 6. Carbon capture initiatives 7. To reduce congestion, and overbuilding of flatted accommodation has there is a general parking problem in the area. 8. To introduce new conceptual designed urban detached properties with drives to raise the bar if architecture. <p>As a local representative of the area I can only voice concern at the lack of resources and regeneration of the area when the Barratt homes were built in phase one of the Lyng development local people and the new buyers were promised phase two and the industrial units will be demolished to introduce the regeneration of the area however instead from one car repair unit we now have 8 who fight to store cars outside on the highway making the area look like an open scrap yard, and in turn residents suffer daily harassment and threats from the business owners, we need change and investment it can be achieved.</p> <p>If the will is there and given the area is in the middle of West Bromwich it's an ideal area for investment and positive and healthy change.</p>	Comment	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Work undertaken to date has indicated that the regeneration of the Lyng industrial estate in West Bromwich to residential development is financially unviable and would require substantial public investment, including extensive support to relocate existing businesses. As such, the estate regeneration is considered undeliverable in the near future and the site is not identified for residential development in the Local Plan.</p> <p>However, the industrial estate has been designated as policy SEC4 land. This policy designation means that continued employment use is supported, but should conditions be met the redevelopment of the Lyng to residential would also be supported.</p>
C646	1001	Ms Harpreet Chahal [218]	West Bromwich Town Centre	<p>Also please sort out Bearwood Road where the main shops are it has been a dumb for years. Start planning some efficient community centres and efficient shops instead of whats already there like too many charity shops, too many cafes, too many inefficient private shops please. West Bromwich town centre is very similar too.</p>	Comment	comment noted.
C647	680	Mr John Davison [192]	What is driving the Vision for Sandwell?, Ambition 1	<p>By setting out to have buildings with integral features such as swift bricks, we can address the decline in wildlife.</p>	Comment	comment noted
C648	657	Mr Alexander Lane [180]	What is driving the Vision for Sandwell?, Ambition 1	<p>- Ambition 1: consider changing 'equality' to 'equity'</p> <p>- Ambition 7: Opportunities for biodiversity need to be integrated into these new developments and will be key in creating the 'attractive neighbourhoods' this ambition aspires to.</p> <p>- Ambition 8: Design and inclusion of greenspaces will, again, be key in making the Borough a place where people choose to bring up their families. Having access to good natural spaces, in itself, a form of leisure and entertainment.</p> <p>- Ambition 10: This ambition doesn't really say anything meaningful, and could be removed from this list.</p>	Comment	noted. These Ambitions are not set through the SLP itself but represent the Council's wider vision. The aim is to demonstrate how the SLP will help to deliver them. It is not possible for the SLP to amend these aspects of the Council's Vision 2030 but when the strategic Vision is reviewed, there will be an opportunity to ensure the aims and objectives of the SLP are represented in any revised text, to ensure both strategies are integrated and mutually reinforcing.
C649	948	Home Builders Federation (Mrs Rachel Danemann, Planning Manager - Local Plans (Midlands & South West)) [75]	Why does Sandwell need a Local Plan?	<p>Paragraph 22 of the NPPF requires that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption. HBF note that the current plan period is to 2041 but would still question if the plan period is long enough to cover [housing and employment land need] requirement. This Reg 18 consultation closes at the end of 2023 and then the representations need to be considered an analysed, a submission plan prepared and consulted, examination, main modifications consultation, inspectors report and adoption by the Council.</p>	Comment	Comment noted on employment land need and whether the plan end date of 2041 is long enough to meet the need.