



# Black Country Core Strategy Submission Document

## Consultation Statement February 2010

Prepared under Regulation 30(1)(e) of the Town and Country  
Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as  
amended)

## Contents

	Page No.
1. Introduction	1
2. Consultation Methodology	1
3. Respondents	2
4. Response to Representations	3
5. Summary of Main Issues Raised In Representations	4
5.1. The Spatial Strategy (CSP1 – 5)	4
5.2. Delivering the Vision (DEL 1 – 2)	5
5.3. Creating Sustainable Communities (HOU 1 – 5)	6
5.4. The Economy, Employment and Centres (EMP1 – 6, CEN 1 – 8)	7
5.5. Transport and Accessibility (TRAN 1 – 5)	10
5.6. Environmental Infrastructure ( ENV 1 – 8)	11
5.7. Waste (WM 1 – 5)	13
5.8. Minerals (MIN 1 – 5)	14
5.9. Regeneration Corridors and Strategic Centres	15
Appendices	
1. Publication Public Notices	16
2. List of Respondents	18
3. Publication Representation form	21

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. This report sets out the consultation process undertaken by the four Black Country local authorities following the production of the Publication document of the Black Country Core Strategy in November 2009. It shows how we consulted with statutory undertakers, key stakeholders and the general public and how we have considered their representations in preparing the Submission Core Strategy.
- 1.2. This Statement has been produced in accordance with Regulation 30 (1) (e) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended by the 2008 Regulations) (“the Regulations”).

## **2. Consultation Methodology**

- 2.1. At Publication a Consultation Statement was produced which set out the key consultation stages undertaken in the preparation of the Core Strategy between November 2006 and November 2009. This is a requirement of Regulation 27.
- 2.2. The Publication documents consisted of:
  - Core Strategy Publication Report
  - Proposed changes to LDF Proposals Maps
  - Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA / SEA)
  - Consultation Report
  - Representations Form
- 2.3. In addition all documents and reports forming the evidence base to the Core Strategy and its policies were made available online.
- 2.4. The Core Strategy documents were published and made available through a variety of ways to ensure compliance with the regulations and each local authority’s Statement of Community Involvement. This included putting the document in the main reception areas of the four Black Country planning offices and main libraries. They were also placed on the dedicated Black Country Core Strategy website.
- 2.5. Key stakeholders, organisations, groups and individuals listed on the Black Country and local consultation databases were notified about the Publication, where the documents were available and invited to make representations. Specific consultation bodies were sent a paper copy of the main document, and a CD containing the Core Strategy documents. Advertisements were also placed in the Express and Star and the Birmingham Mail on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> November 2009 to publicise the Publication (copies are attached in Appendix 1).

- 2.6. A Publication launch event was held at The Public, West Bromwich on 2nd December 2009. This was an opportunity to take key stakeholders through the Publication document and to inform them of the future stages to Adoption. The event comprised a presentation followed by a question and answer session. Participants were informed that this was their final opportunity to comment on the soundness of the Core Strategy prior to formal submission. A report of the event has been placed on the website.
- 2.7. As the Publication period included the Christmas and New Year Holiday period, it was extended to seven weeks from 30th November 2009 to 15th January 2010. Representations were invited by a variety of means including an online form, by e-mail or by post. Each respondent was formally acknowledged by Ubiquis, who were commissioned to assist the Black Country local authorities to catalogue and co-ordinate the representations.

### 3. **Respondents**

- 3.1 A total of 118 respondents made 644 representations. All representations were duly made and accepted by the local authorities. A list of the respondents can be found in Appendix 2.
- 3.2 The aim of the consultation was to comment on the 'soundness' of the Publication Core Strategy document. Respondents were asked whether they felt that it was a sound document in accordance with the three tests of soundness, namely:
  - a) The strategy is not justified in that it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or is not considered the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives;
  - b) It is not effective in that the document is not deliverable, flexible or suitable for monitoring
  - c) It is not consistent with national policy.

If they believed that the document was unsound, they were asked to identify that part of a particular policy which they considered did not meet one or more of these three tests.

- 3.3 Ubiquis has produced a report 'Black Country Core Strategy Publication Stage Consultation: Analysis of Responses' which sets out the responses received in both quantitative and qualitative terms for each of the policy areas. A copy of this report can be found on the website.

#### **4 Response to Representations**

- 4.1 The main issues raised in the representations are included in Section 5 of this report. All representations received will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for their consideration. Copies of all the representations are available on <http://www.blackcountrycorestrategy2009.co.uk/>.
- 4.2 The Black Country local authorities have produced a Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Publication document to be submitted alongside the other Core Strategy documents to the Secretary of State. This is being done in response to representations which suggested a change to the document, either from wording put forward in a representation or to clarify an issue which the local authorities agreed with. For each change the schedule will give the reason for it and put forward detailed word changes. This schedule also addresses grammatical errors and suggests amendments to improve policies based on officer recommendations.
- 4.3 The local authorities have assessed all representations, and our formal responses to the representations are available on request. Those representations which the local authorities did not agree with or which no change to the document was considered necessary will be addressed through the Examination process.

## **5 Summary of Main Issues raised In Representations**

### **5.1 The Spatial Strategy (CSP 1 – 5)**

#### **CSP1 The Growth Network**

- There is general support for this policy.
- There is a view that the housing figures should be a minimum.
- There is an issue around the location of a Regional Logistics Site outside of the Black Country.
- The linkages between the Black Country and adjacent areas are recognised and supported.
- Employment land targets should be considered to be indicative.
- There is not enough recognition of the importance of the University of Wolverhampton.

#### **CSP2 Outside the Growth Network**

- There is general support for this policy.
- The Core Strategy should have included a review of the Green Belt boundaries.
- The policy needs to consider the small local employment areas.

#### **CSP3 Environmental Infrastructure**

- Comments from developers stating that the policy requirement about protecting, enhancing and expanding the environmental infrastructure is not necessary; stating that only those developments which harm the environment should have a requirement to improve it.
- Environment Agency support policy but wanted to include a reference to all developers to use sustainable drainage in all development and to deculvert watercourses where possible.
- Woodland Trust support policy but want a specific reference to woodlands and trees in the policy.
- Staffordshire County Council thought that local landscape character assessments should be used to inform the policy and thus relate more closely to those of surrounding authorities.

#### **CSP4 Place-making**

- General support for this policy with very few objections.
- Environment Agency, whilst welcoming the policy, asked for additional wording on open space to include reference to supporting a balanced ecological environment and help mitigate flood risk.
- Woodland Trust support but wanted specific reference to trees and woodland.
- The Coal Authority requested a further bullet point to include reference to the area's mining legacy and the need to consider ground conditions and to propose appropriate mitigation measures to ensure safety and stability of development.

## CSP5 Transport Strategy

- General support for this policy with few objections, but several detail comments suggesting amendments.
- West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport sought improvements to the whole road network, including minor roads, a transport network which operates efficiently and accessibility by sustainable modes to sites. Comments also made about walking and cycling, travel planning and the definition of Smarter Choices.
- The Highways Agency was concerned about Motorway Junction capacity and noted the ongoing joint study addressing this.
- Several respondents made representations about the rail network, the need to address passengers and well as freight on the Stourbridge Walsall Line and other planned improvements,
- Comments were made about walking and cycling by Living Streets, Campaign for Better Transport.
- Two respondents queried whether car growth was inevitable.

## **5.2 Delivering the Vision (DEL1 – 2)**

### DEL1 Infrastructure Provision

- Comments were received that advocated a stronger Black Country wide approach to providing infrastructure, rather than leaving decisions up to individual local authorities which could lead to inconsistencies and differences in interpretation.
- A number of representations stated that the policy needed to provide further clarification in terms of definitions of types of infrastructure, as well as the funding and delivery mechanisms required.

### DEL2 Managing the Balance between Employment Land and Housing

- Most respondents accepted the need for the reuse of poorly used and vacant employment sites for housing and this generated broad support. Also support was expressed for the policy's clear indication of how the release of employment land to housing would be phased to ensure that adequate employment land would remain. Other representations expressed the view that there should be more focus on mixed use developments.
- Large number of representations from developers and landowners tended to criticise the policy for its inflexibility which would mean it is ineffective. They felt the criteria for the release of employment land was too onerous and stringent. Relocation of businesses was highlighted as a key issue in this respect. Comments stated that the release of employment land for housing was not backed up by a thorough assessment or was difficult to predict and that the release of Greenfield / Green Belt land would be necessary to meet housing targets.

### **5.3 Creating Sustainable Communities (HOU1 – 5)**

#### **Policy HOU1 Delivering Sustainable Housing Growth**

- There is general support for the 63,000 housing target as it is backed up by evidence and is in conformity with RSS Phase 2 requirements.
- A number of respondents feel that the housing figures should be expressed as a minimum and believe this to be in line with RSS policy. In addition it is felt that the annual housing supply should be greater in the first 10 years as per RSS Phase 2.
- One respondent feels that the housing land supply should be expressed in 5 year periods as per PPS3.
- A number of respondents feel that the housing policies are inflexible and don't allow for an alternative strategy should unviable sites not come forward. In addition, it is felt that the housing capacity hasn't been discounted enough.
- Two respondents feel that the evidence base used to identify housing capacity is not robust. In particular the employment studies have shortcomings, the Walsall SHLAA was not available on the web-site and the remaining SHLAAs were not approved.
- A review of green belt and urban extensions should be considered.

#### **Policy HOU2 Housing Density, Type and Accessibility**

- There is general support for the policy. However, a number of respondents feel that the policy shouldn't prescribe house types and that the minimum net density is not in line with Government advice in PPS3 and should be lower. In addition, a number of respondents feel that the Accessibility Standards are over prescriptive and based on a flawed evidence base.

#### **Policy HOU3 Delivering Affordable Housing**

- A number of respondents welcome the approach to provision of affordable housing with regard to viability as it provides flexibility to take into account viability issues. However, there is a concern that the affordable housing target is too low and should be expressed as a minimum.
- A number of respondents feel that the affordable housing target needs to take into account viability.

#### **Policy HOU4 Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

- A number of respondents feel that the policy should address the environmental impacts of Gypsy & Traveller sites. Some also feel that the criteria used in the policy are unrealistic.

### Policy HOU5 Education and Health Care Facilities

- There is general support for the policy. However, some respondents feel that there is a need to accommodate provision for the elderly in appropriate health care facilities.
- The University of Wolverhampton feel that there should be a separate policy for higher education facilities as part of Employment policies.

### **5.4 The Economy, Employment and Centres (EMP1 – 6, CEN 1 – 8)**

#### Policy EMP1 Providing for Economic Growth

- The main points raised on this Policy included questioning of the boundaries of the employment areas marked in Appendix 2, suggestions that available employment land should be categorised in line with the RSS and that the definitions of employment land is too narrow and should explicitly include other sectors.
- A further representation was received questioning the assertion made that there is sufficient employment land identified in the Core Strategy up to 2026 is wrong.
- Wolverhampton University made a specific representation that the Policy should give greater emphasis to recognise the importance of Higher and Further Education Institutions, especially the University itself to the importance of the Strategy.
- Support was received for the recognition of meeting logistics sector needs and the acknowledgement of the region's problems of unemployment and lack of qualifications.
- Other more general responses suggested the Strategy should do more to support leisure and employment at nodal points such as motorway junctions and arterial route junctions, support mixed use developments on appropriate lower quality employment sites to cross enable delivery of high quality employment land, and finally should indicate more clearly how the reduction in employment land is translated into policies for redeveloping existing employment areas.

#### Policy EMP2 Actual and Potential High Quality Strategic Employment Areas

- There is general support for the range of uses in high quality employment areas set out in the Policy as well as the approach taken in identifying high quality employment areas.
- However, three respondents made site specific representations to include their sites within High Quality Employment Areas saying that there was little prospect of the quantity of high quality employment land set out in the Document coming forward.
- Two respondents suggested that the definition of high quality employment land in the Document was not clear and didn't relate to RSS particularly in relation to Regional Investment Sites, Major Investment Sites and Regional Logistics Sites.
- There were two respondents who highlighted the issue that the Core Strategy needs to target infrastructure investment and improvements

into high quality areas. The point was also made to broaden the range of economic activities in high quality employment areas to maintain their viability.

- Finally one respondent questioned whether the high quality employment target for Dudley can be achieved given recent take up rates.

#### Policy EMP3 Local Quality Employment Areas

- Strong support for the protection of retained employment land was received. One respondent however, questioned whether the Policy was flexible enough in allowing sites to come forward for other uses if they become unviable for employment use.

#### Policy EMP4 Maintaining a Supply of Readily Available Employment Land.

- One respondent questioned the justification for an additional 185 Ha of employment land as set out in the Policy whilst other respondents questioned the Policy either fails to provide sufficient new land of high quality or suggest it could be made clearer how the potential supply will realistically be brought forward during the plan period.

#### EMP5 Improving Access to the Labour Market

- The focus on recruitment and training initiatives set out in Policy EMP5 is supported.
- One other response suggested that this Policy may have an adverse impact upon the viability of employment proposals and therefore needed to be more flexible whilst another response suggested that the reference to 'major' development in the Policy should be more clearly defined.

#### EMP6 Cultural Facilities and the Visitor Economy

- There was wide ranging support for the Policy including references to the inclusion of Dudley and Wolverhampton as visitor destinations, the value of the canal network in attracting visitors and the enhancement / protection of cultural facilities and links to visitor attractions.
- A number of responses suggested that the Policy does not recognise the shortage of a stadium in Dudley which could accommodate Speedway racing in order to help enhance Dudley's standing as a visitor destination.

#### CEN1 The Importance of the Black Country Centres for the Regeneration Strategy

- Representations have emphasised the importance of delivering offices in centres and that the strategic centres should be the focus for significant retail development. Barclay's Bank objects to the omission

of any intention in the centres policies of the Core Strategy to review policies that seek to restrict A2 uses.

#### CEN2 Hierarchy of Centres

- There is support for the hierarchy in general, including Willenhall's position in the hierarchy. There are objections to Dudley town centre's position in the hierarchy, to it being down graded from a strategic centre and Brierley Hill being designated as a strategic centre. Morrison Supermarkets request that the hierarchy should be amended to include the Charterfields Shopping Centre at Stallings Lane, Dudley as a small District Centre. Sainsbury's want the primary shopping area for Wednesfield Town Centre to be extended to include their store.

#### CEN3 Growth in the Strategic Centres

- There is support for the overall strategy for growth in the four strategic town centres. NJL Consulting queries the soundness of the convenience capacity figures identified. There is the suggestion for the policy to be more flexible in terms of the convenience and comparison floorspace figures. Cannock Chase and Lichfield District Councils suggest that the current wording of the policy could result in a detrimental impact on strategic centres outside the Black Country.

#### CEN4 Growth in Town Centres

- There is support that development in town centres should be of an appropriate scale to support local need. AWM support the level of office floorspace allowed in the Black Country town centres. Sainsbury's suggest that the presumption in favour of the development of town centre uses in the Primary Shopping Area has been removed. In addition Sainsbury's state that there is no justification to apply the same floorspace thresholds to all of the town centres. London Cambridge Properties (LCP) are concerned that individual retail developments of up to 5,000 sqm net of convenience goods and 15,000 sq m gross of comparison goods will be acceptable in Dudley without having to meet the criteria set out in the Policy.

#### CEN5 District Centres and Local Centres

- There is support for retail developments exceeding the thresholds only being allowed if there is a proven need. LCP believe that the appropriate size and scale of proposals should be considered on an application by application basis.

#### CEN6 Local Shops and Centre Uses

- Bigwood Chartered Surveyors objected to the threshold of 200 sqm gross floorspace being set too low.

### CEN7 Controlling Edge-of-Centre and Out-of-Centre Development

- There is support for existing centres providing the focus for future investment and expansion in the Black Country. WYG Planning & Design objected to the policy wording stating there is a clear presumption against out-of-centre development as no such presumption is provided by national policy. There is concern that the Policy is contrary to PPS4 and the policy should be amended so as not to pre-judge the outcome of sequential assessments. NJL Consulting raised concern at the phrasing of applying conditions in the policy.

### CEN8 Car Parking in Centres

- West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport would like to see a commitment in the plan to introduce car parking charges at the Merry Hill Centre.

## **5.5 Transport and Accessibility (TRAN1 – 5)**

### Policy TRAN1 Priorities for the Development of the Transport Network

- West Midlands Regional Assembly confirmed general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy, but funding issues needed to be considered. Highways Agency was specifically concerned about the funding of motorway junction improvements.
- Stephen H Spencer made representations about clearer statements, the adverse consequences of congestion, seeking clarity as to whether sustainable modes included walking and cycling, and requesting clear targets in the Plan.
- Cannock Chase District Council and RPS Planning both supported the inclusion of the M54/M6/M6 Toll link.
- Several detailed comments, including support for the proposals, made about rail and proposals for reopening rail lines and new stations.
- Comments were received about the need for high quality public transport including Rapid Transit, and several of these were supportive.
- Hagley Parish Council sought the extension of Metro proposal to link to Walsall and Stourbridge.
- Other comments were made about the detail nature of walking and cycling, especially utilitarian cycling.
- Centro wanted the inclusion of a park and ride proposal at Junction 3 M% included in the Plan.

### Policy TRAN2 Managing Transport Impacts of New Development

- The Highways Agency wished to be involved from the outset in Travel Planning.
- Staffordshire Area of the Ramblers Association supported policy.

### Policy TRAN3 The Efficient Movement of Freight

- West Midlands Regional Assembly and Cannock Chase District Council support policy.
- RPS Planning and Development concerned to ensure that sites in A460 corridor north of Wolverhampton and near M6 included in the Plan.
- Inland Waterways Association and Birmingham Canals Navigation Society wanted inclusion of water borne freight.

### Policy TRAN4 Creating Coherent Networks for Cycle and for Walking.

- Natural England, West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport, Staffordshire Area of the Ramblers Association and Aberdeen Active Property Fund support the policy.
- Staffordshire County Council emphasise need to recognise wider links and also for mention to be made of Wolverhampton Business Airport.
- Stephen H Spencer wished to see cycling and walking routes developed across the whole of the Black Country.
- One respondent asked for the LTP2 cycling target to be raised.

### Policy TRAN5 Influencing the Demand for Travel and Travel Choices.

- Birmingham City Council wanted the specific sites for strategic park and ride identified.
- Stephen H Spencer was concerned that private car use must not be seen as the prime method of transport.
- Centro stressed the need for high quality public transport.
- A private individual commented that rather than building Metro the Walsall Stourbridge Line should be re-opened for passenger rail.
- West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport stated the Strategy should encourage a shift from road use to cycling and walking.

## **5.6 Environmental Infrastructure (ENV1 – 8)**

### Policy ENV1 Nature Conservation

- Reference should be made to Cannock Chase SAC and the HRA which proposes a 12 mile Zone of Influence (which includes the northern part of the Black Country) where mitigation measures should be put forward due to the potential impacts of additional recreational pressure.
- Policy should include reference to Cannock Chase to Sutton Park Biodiversity Enhancement Area.
- Greater protection should be afforded to ancient woodland –object to the caveat in the policy permitting development where strategic benefits outweigh its nature conservation importance.
- Need additional policy to encourage a landscape-scale approach to safeguard the BC's natural environment.

- The word 'local' from 'local nature conservation site' should be deleted from the policy as other strategic development proposals such as mineral extraction can outweigh such sites.

#### Policy ENV2 Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness

- All representations received were supportive of this policy.

#### Policy ENV3 Design Quality

- Policy should include principles to reduce the urban heat island effect. Policy should support tree planting, green roofs and inclusion of green space in development.
- Make reference to Village and Town Design Statements (VDS and TDS) either in policy or accompanying text.

#### Policy ENV4 Canals

- Amend policy to include reference to the restoration of Dudley No 2 canal.
- Reference should be made to residential moorings, secure visitor or overnight stopping places.
- Reference should be made to using the canal network for sustainable movement of urban waste.
- Canal water should be protected and enhanced.
- No reference to use of Section 106 agreements to enhance not just the environment of the canals but also water depth.

#### Policy ENV5 Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage Systems and Urban Heat Island

- SUDs are not dependent on geology of area.
- Woodland Trust, whilst supporting policy in general, would like to see reference to how woodland can help deliver solutions to the climate change threat agenda.
- It is not clear why urban heat island effect has been added to this policy
- EA support opening of culverts but request that no development occurs over existing culverts.

#### Policy ENV6 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

- Natural England wish to see ANGSt standards included in CS.
- Loose wording on green belt opens the way for inappropriate sporting facilities.
- NE concerned over terms 'multifunctional green space network' and 'urban park'
- CS fails to recognise the shortage of sports stadia in the south of the BC.

### Policy ENV7 Renewable Energy

- Useful if CS notes how future changes in national policy and regulation will be addressed.

### Policy ENV8 Air Quality

- The only comment felt that there was no provision to deal with air quality across the whole of the Black Country.

### Environment Key Diagram

- Map should include rivers. Major Road Network, Motorways and Canals to be fully visible. Regeneration Corridors to be shown as background and be added to key.

## **5.7 Waste (WM1 – 5)**

### WM1 Sustainable Waste and Resource Management

- Environment Agency support Strategic Objective 9 and have commented that the policies appear to be based on robust evidence and compatible with other strategies and guidance. WMRA have accepted that the waste policies are in general conformity with the RSS and emerging RSS Phase 2 Revision.
- WMRA and Staffordshire CC question whether the Four Ashes EfW proposal can count towards “equivalent self-sufficiency” and it is suggested that the requirement in Table 17 should be increased to compensate.
- FoE queried whether there is undue reliance on energy from waste to meet targets and is seeking greater support for alternative technologies. FoE and CPRE object to reliance on Four Ashes EfW.
- Environment Agency is seeking inclusion of a target for achieving zero waste growth.
- WMRA have questioned the adequacy of the requirement and provision for CD&EW recycling, given the increased regional guideline assumption on alternatives to primary aggregates, and the ability of the Black Country to contribute through the proposed redevelopment and regeneration.

### WM2 Protecting and Enhancing Existing Waste Management Capacity

- Biffa, Cory and EMR have supported the identification of their facilities as strategic waste sites. EMR have requested that we highlight rail-linked sites.

### WM3 Strategic Waste Management Proposals

- Several stakeholders are seeking clarification/ further information on the timescale, capacity and types of technology involved in some of the proposals.
- WMRA have accepted that the approach outlined in the Justification is “arguably” in general conformity with the RSS, and feel that we should be more specific about meeting the need.

### WM4 Locational Considerations for New Waste management Facilities

- General support for guidance, although WMRA and the Environment Agency have requested a few amendments and Staffordshire CC are seeking support for CD&EW recycling facilities in the Green Belt.

### WM5 Resource Management and New Development

- No representations were made

## **5.8 Minerals (MIN1 – 5)**

### MIN1 Managing and Safeguarding Mineral Resources

- Spatial Objective 10 is supported by the Coal Authority. WMRA have accepted that the minerals policies are in general conformity with the RSS and emerging RSS Phase 2 Revision.
- There is general support for the policy approach. However, the Coal Authority has objected to the 5ha policy threshold for the urban areas, on the grounds that it is arbitrary, not evidence-led and contrary to national policy guidance.

### MIN2 Production and Aggregate Minerals

- The sub-regional aggregates apportionment review is identified as a key issue by GO-WM, WMRA, and neighbouring MPAs. There is concern that the West Midlands County apportionment might change, and that the provision made in the Core Strategy may not be an appropriate contribution.
- WMRA consider further capacity for recycling secondary aggregates may be required.

### MIN3 Maintaining Supplies of Brick Clay

- No main issues received.

### MIN4 Exploitation of Other Mineral Resources

- Several stakeholders are seeking changes to this policy as the “presumption against” working does not entirely reflect national policy guidance.

- Potters Clay & Coal Co and Wyrley Estate object to the linking of working at Yorks Bridge to the revocation of the permission at Brownhills Common and are seeking the identification of Yorks Bridge as an area of search for coal and fireclay extraction. Cannock Chase DC and Staffordshire CC object to Yorks Bridge on deliverability and nature conservation grounds.
- Supported by the Coal Authority and Cannock Chase DC.

#### MIN5 New Proposals for Mineral Development

- The Environment Agency is seeking a change to the policy to address potential impacts of mineral working on groundwater.
- Cemex consider the requirement to fully enclose mineral processing plant is not economically feasible and unnecessarily prescriptive.

#### **5.9 Regeneration Corridors and Strategic Centres**

- A number of sites, typically for housing proposals, were put forward in the regeneration corridors from developers. This had strong references to each Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). The majority of these comments have been addressed through the SHLAA preparation, or are addressed in other policy area representations.
- There was general support for the proposed land uses in the corridors, although some representations requested that housing figures be treated as minimum or be increased in certain regeneration corridors, such as RC4 and RC8.

## APPENDIX 1 – Publication Public Notices

Express & Star, Monday, November 30, 2009

### PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

#### TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2004 AS AMENDED BY THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2008

THE COUNCILS OF DUDLEY, SANDWELL, WALSALL AND  
WOLVERHAMPTON

#### NOTICE OF DEPOSIT OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

#### BLACK COUNTRY CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION DOCUMENT) DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ("THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT")

The Councils of Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton have prepared proposals for the Black Country Core Strategy Publication Document. This Strategy will set out the vision, objectives and detailed spatial strategy for future development in the Black Country up to 2026 along with specific strategic policies and targets. The document will not just consider land use, but also a comprehensive range of environmental, economic and social issues.

Copies of the Development Plan Document are available for public inspection free of charge during normal office hours from 30th November 2009 to 15th January 2010 at the following offices:

**Dudley: (Monday to Thursday 8:30am to 5pm and Friday 8:30am to 4:30pm) at:**

- (a) Dudley MBC, 3 St. James's Road, Dudley, DY1 1HZ
- (b) All main public libraries in the Dudley Borough (opening times may vary)
- (c) Dudley Council Plus, 259 Castle Street, Dudley, DY1 1LQ (Monday to Friday 8am-6pm and Saturday 9am-12pm)

**Sandwell: (Monday to Thursday 8:30am to 5:30pm and Friday 8:30am to 5pm) at:**

- (a) Sandwell Council House, Oldbury, West Midlands, B69 3DE; and
- (b) The offices of the Head of Spatial Planning, Development House, Lombard Street, West Bromwich, West Midlands, B70 8RU
- (c) All main public libraries in the Sandwell Borough (opening times may vary)

**Walsall: (Monday to Thursday 8:45am-5:15pm and Friday 8:45am to 4:45pm) at:**

- (a) The First Stop Shop, Walsall Council, The Civic Centre, Darwall Street, Walsall
- (b) All public libraries in the Walsall Borough (opening times may vary)

**Wolverhampton: (Monday to Thursday 8.30am to 5pm and Friday 8.30am to 4.30pm) at:**

- (a) Wolverhampton City Council, Civic Centre, St. Peter's Square, Wolverhampton, WV1 1SH
- (b) All public libraries in Wolverhampton (opening times may vary)

On the Core Strategy Web-site at:  
<http://blackcountrycorestrategy.dudley.gov.uk/>

Comments that relate to the soundness of the plan or whether the plan complies with legal requirements may be submitted between 30th November 2009 and 15th January 2010 in writing to:

Black Country Consultation Team  
Ubiquis  
Cliffords Inn  
Fetter Lane  
London  
ECA4 1LD

Or via email to: [blackcountrycorestrategy@dudley.gov.uk](mailto:blackcountrycorestrategy@dudley.gov.uk)

Only those comments which are made in writing and which arrive at the address or email address specified above within the seven-week period ending on 15th January 2010 will have a right to have their comments considered by the respective Councils. Comments received within the consultation period will be collated and responded to.

Further information is available by contacting the planning offices specified:

Dudley - 01384 817214  
Sandwell - 0121 569 4195  
Walsall - 01922 652478  
Wolverhampton - 01902 562177

John Miller  
Director of the Urban Environment, Dudley Council

Nick Bubalo  
Head of Spatial Planning, Sandwell Council

Tim Johnson  
Executive Director, Regeneration Services, Walsall Council

Steve Boyes  
Director for Sustainable Communities, Wolverhampton City Council

### PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2004 AS AMENDED BY THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2008**

THE COUNCILS OF DUDLEY, SANDWELL, WALSALL AND WOLVERHAMPTON

NOTICE OF DEPOSIT OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

BLACK COUNTRY CORE STRATEGY (PUBLICATION DOCUMENT) DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT ("THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT")

The Councils of Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton have prepared proposals for the Black Country Core Strategy Publication Document. This Strategy will set out the vision, objectives and detailed spatial strategy for future development in the Black Country up to 2026 along with specific strategic policies and targets. The document will not just consider land use, but also a comprehensive range of environmental, economic and social issues.

Copies of the Development Plan Document are available for public inspection free of charge during normal office hours from 30th November 2009 to 15th January 2010 at the following offices:

Dudley: (Monday to Thursday 8:30am to 5pm and Friday 8:30am to 4:30pm) at:

- (a) Dudley MBC, 3 St. James's Road, Dudley, DY1 1HZ
- (b) All main public libraries in the Dudley Borough (opening times may vary)
- (c) Dudley Council Plus, 259 Castle Street, Dudley, DY1 1LQ (Monday to Friday 8am-6pm and Saturday 9am-12pm)

Sandwell: (Monday to Thursday 8:30am to 5:30pm and Friday 8:30am to 5pm) at:

- (a) Sandwell Council House, Oldbury, West Midlands, B69 3DE; and
- (b) The offices of the Head of Spatial Planning, Development House, Lombard Street, West Bromwich, West Midlands, B70 8RU
- (c) All main public libraries in the Sandwell Borough (opening times may vary)

Walsall: (Monday to Thursday 8:45am-5:15pm and Friday 8:45am to 4:45pm) at:

- (a) The First Stop Shop, Walsall Council, The Civic Centre, Darwall Street, Walsall
- (b) All public libraries in the Walsall Borough (opening times may vary)

Wolverhampton: (Monday to Thursday 8.30am to 5pm and Friday 8.30am to 4.30pm) at:

- (a) Wolverhampton City Council, Civic Centre, St. Peter's Square, Wolverhampton, WV1 1SH
- (b) All public libraries in Wolverhampton (opening times may vary)

On the Core Strategy Web-site at: <http://blackcountrycorestrategy.dudley.gov.uk/>

Comments that relate to the soundness of the plan or whether the plan complies with legal requirements may be submitted between 30th November 2009 and 15th January 2010 in writing to:

Black Country Consultation Team  
Ubiquis  
Cliffords Inn  
Fetter Lane  
London  
EC4A 1LD

Or via email to: [blackcountrycorestrategy@dudley.gov.uk](mailto:blackcountrycorestrategy@dudley.gov.uk)

Only those comments which are made in writing and which arrive at the address or email address specified above within the seven-week period ending on 15th January 2010 will have a right to have their comments considered by the respective Councils. Comments received within the consultation period will be collated and responded to.

Further information is available by contacting the planning offices specified:

Dudley - 01384 817214  
Sandwell - 0121 569 4195  
Walsall - 01922 652 478  
Wolverhampton - 01902 552177

John Miller  
Director of the Urban Environment, Dudley Council

Nick Buhalo  
Head of Spatial Planning, Sandwell Council

Tim Johnson  
Executive Director, Regeneration Services, Walsall Council

Steve Boyes  
Director for Sustainable Communities, Wolverhampton City Council

## **APPENDIX 2 – List of Respondents**

<b>Respondent ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
001		Wates Group
002		Skelton Group
004	William Pottinger	
005	Paul Partridge	
006		Commission for the Architecture of the Built Environment
007		Paul White Associates
008		Quadrant Land Partnership
011		Barclays Bank
013		Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
014		Heathens Speedway Supporters Club
015		Staffordshire Area of Ramblers Association
016		United Steel Ltd
017	Stephen H Spencer	
018		Taylor Wimpey
019	J Bosworth	
020	M.G Andrews	
021		Advantage West Midlands
022		Cory Environmental (Central) Ltd
023		Messers Higgins
024	P.S Holford	
025		Biffa Waste Services Ltd
026	Graham Jones	
027	Mrs F.Johnson	
028	Messrs Hughes and Hawkins	
029		First City Ltd
030		CPRE (West Midlands)
031		CEPOG Support Team
032	Daniel Wakeman	
033		Cradley Speedway Website
034	Mark Humphries	
035	Ronald Homer	
036		CRASH (Cradley Raising Aid Saving Heathens)
037		National Grid
039		London & Cambridge Properties
040		Worcester Lane Ltd
042		European Metal Recycling Ltd
043		English Heritage
044		Woodland Trust
045		Lichfield District Council
046	David Harris	
047		The Coal Authority

048		Ibstock Group and Wienerberger
050		Mountcity Investments Ltd
051		West Midlands Regional Assembly
052		University of Wolverhampton
054		Solihull MBC
055		London & Cambridge Properties Ltd
056		Commercial Body Fittings Ltd
058		Living Streets Birmingham
059		Ashtenne Industrial Fund
060		Centro
061		Lapal Canal Trust
062		A.J Mucklow Group Plc
063		South Staffordshire D.C
064		Mintworth Transport Ltd
065		RPS Planning & Development
066		Persimmon Homes
067		Westfield
068		West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium
069		First Investments Ltd
070		Bovale Ltd
071		Pennine Property Investments
072		P x P West Midlands
073		Severn Trent Water
074		Staffordshire County Council
075		Warwickshire County Council
076		Environment Agency
077		Birmingham City Council
078		British Waterways
079		Sainsbury's Supermarket Plc
080		Government Office West Midlands
081		National Grid Property (Holdings) Ltd
082		Bigwood Associates Ltd
083		Natural England
084		The Wyrley Estate
085		Birmingham Canals Navigation Society
086		Mabey Group
087		Hercules Unit Trust
088	Adam Zarzycki	
089		Cannock Chase D.C
090		Highways Agency
091		Peel Holdings Ltd
092		Play England West Midlands
093		Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and The Black Country
094		Aberdeen UK Active Property Fund Asset Company (No.1)

095		West Midlands Friends of the Earth
096		Potters Clay & Coal Co.
097		Martineau Galleries Limited Partnership (MGLP)
098		National Express
099		WM Morrison Supermarket Plc
100	John A. Scott	
101		Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire)
102		Hagley Parish Council
103		J.Rigg Construction & Developments Ltd
104	S.Goodman	
105		Major Street Developments Ltd
106		The Junction Limited Partnership
107		Historic Stone
108	H & K Westwood	
109		Network Rail
110		W.M Campaign for Better Transport
111	David Attwood	
113		Aldi Stores Ltd
114		Inland Waterways Association (Lichfield Branch)
115		National Grid Property Ltd (C/o First Plan)
116	D.Postin	
117	J.Cooke	
118		Veolia Environmental Services Plc
119	S.Forbes	
120	Dave Francis	
121	Ian Attwood	
122	J.Forbes	
123		Cemex UK Materials Ltd
128		The Theatres Trust
132	R.Kitson	
133		Persimmon Homes
134		FFT Planning
136	W.Cooke	

N.B. Respondent ID Numbers do not run concurrently. There are 118 representations in total.

**APPENDIX 3 – Publication Representation Form**

## Black Country Core Strategy Publication Document - Response Form

The four Black Country authorities (Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall and Wolverhampton) are seeking your comments on our Publication Core Strategy. The local authorities consider this Core Strategy to be 'sound' – justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

At this stage of preparation of the Core Strategy we are only able to accept representations about whether the document is 'sound'. The tests of 'soundness' are set out in law and form the basis of question 3 below. For more information please read paragraphs 4.51 and 4.52 of Planning Policy Statement 12 (available from <http://www.communities.gov.uk>). Where appropriate, please provide or refer to evidence to support your response.

This form will be used as a formal representation of your support or objection to the Core Strategy. Please use a separate form for each comment you wish to make, completing all sections in block capitals, using black ink. Alternatively your comments can be submitted online at <http://www.blackcountrycorestrategy2009.co.uk>.

**All representations must be received at the address given on this form by 5pm on Friday 15 January 2010.**

---

### Representation Form

#### 1. Contact Details

Name	
Address	
Postcode	
Organisation	
Telephone	
E-mail	

**Agent Name and Address (if applicable)**

Name																				
------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Address																				
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Postcode							
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Organisation																				
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Telephone																				
-----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

E-mail																				
--------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**2. Do you consider the Core Strategy is:**

**Sound**

**Unsound**

**3. If you consider the Core Strategy is unsound, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates by placing a cross by the appropriate box**

Please select.	Test of Soundness
	The strategy is not <i>justified</i> in that it is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and/or is not considered the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
	It is not <i>effective</i> in that the document is not deliverable, flexible or suitable for monitoring.
	It is not consistent with <i>national policy</i> .

**4. To which part of the Core Strategy does your representation relate?**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Paragraph</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Regeneration Corridor / Strategic Centre</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5. Please give details of the change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 3 above. Please indicate as specifically as possible how you would like it amended to resolve your objection and to make it 'sound'. Alternatively use this space to explain your support for the Core Strategy.**

**6. Did you raise the matter that is the subject of your representation with the Black Country authorities earlier in the process of the preparation of the Core Strategy?**

**Yes – Please state at what stage**   
(e.g Issues and Options, Preferred Options stages)

**No**

**If 'No', can you briefly explain why you did not do so:**

**7. Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to participate in person at the examination?**

Written representations

Participate at the Examination in Public

**8. If you wish to participate in person at the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

Signed  
& Dated:

9. Please tick this box if you DO NOT wish to be notified when the Core Strategy is submitted, upon publication of the Inspectors Report and Adopted or receive further information, or be involved in the preparation of future plans and policies.

10. Please tick this box if you would prefer to receive information, including plans and policies, by email (please remember to update us of any changes to your email address)

Please complete and return this form **by 5pm on the 15 January 2010** to:

Black Country Consultation Team  
Ubiquis  
Cliffords Inn  
Fetter Lane  
London  
EC4A 1LD

Additional copies of this form can be downloaded from  
<http://www.blackcountrycorestrategy2009.co.uk>.

#### Respondent Information

In order to ensure that we are reaching all sections of the community when organising consultation on the Joint Core Strategy, please provide us with the following information:

<b>Gender:</b>	Female <input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/>				
<b>Age:</b>	under 20 <input type="checkbox"/>	21-30 <input type="checkbox"/>	31-40 <input type="checkbox"/>	41-50 <input type="checkbox"/>	51-60 <input type="checkbox"/>	61+ <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Ethnic Group:</b>	White <input type="checkbox"/>	Asian/Asian British <input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed <input type="checkbox"/>			
	Black/Black British <input type="checkbox"/>	Chinese/Other ethnic group <input type="checkbox"/>				
<b>Disability:</b> The Disability Discrimination Act considers a person disabled if: you have a '...longstanding physical or mental condition or disability that has lasted or is likely to last at least 12 months and this condition or disability has a substantial adverse effect on your ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities'.						
Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out under the above definition?						
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>				