Spatial Options for the Black Country

Local Development Framework Workshops Report
A Vision for the Region

The Black Country Partnership of Councils are preparing new planning policies, as part of their Local Development Frameworks (LDFs), which will shape the future of the region over the next 20 years until 2026.

These documents create a vision for the future of the Black Country as a thriving community, with services, employment and homes for its many inhabitants. At the centre of this suite of policies is the Core Strategy, which records this vision, guiding future planning policies and in turn, the type of development and building which shapes lives, communities and places.

Involving the communities, key stakeholders and other interested parties from within the region is vital to achieving a vision which recognises and serves the needs of its inhabitants, and the Partnership have sought to consult throughout the development of their LDFs.

Consulting on Spatial Options

This document records a key stage in the process, the consideration of Spatial Options for development. Following previous consultations, the Partnership held a workshop on 17th October for key stakeholders from across the Black Country to discuss how a vision for the future could be shaped through development of 15 'Regeneration Corridors' and town/city centres. These areas will be focuses for development in the future.

On behalf of the Partnership, Dialogue, an independent company specialising in community consultation facilitated the workshop. This report summarises the views of participants, and will feed into the future development of the LDF planning policies.
Dialogue is one of the leading specialist community relations consultation and communications consultancies in the UK. Dialogue has experience of helping not only public sector bodies and local authorities but also communities and end users.

Dialogue understands local issues and effectively consults on development proposal policies and related planning issues. Dialogue seeks to not only capture all feedback and comments but also communicates this, and any resulting actions, back to everyone involved in the consultation process through reports such as this, and other methods.

Dialogue has worked on more than 150 communications and consultation projects over the past five years and we acknowledge that our approach needs to be tailored to ensure that consultation is always relevant and accessible to each community.

**Workshop Aims and Approach to Consultation**

In preparing for the workshops and to deliver them in the most effective manner, Dialogue sought to:

- engage key delivery organisations on their views for future development across the Black Country
- explore the issues and constraints that shape and restrict the possible options for future development of the Centres and Regeneration Corridors
- encourage discussion and consideration of all viewpoints

To accurately record and analyse the response of workshop participants.
Workshop Overview

The workshop encouraged invited key stakeholders from across the Black Country to discuss how a vision for the Black Country could be shaped through development of 15 Regeneration Corridors.

Held in the morning of 17th October at Walsall Football Ground, the Partnership invited stakeholders representing business, private sector landowners and developers, the voluntary sector and public bodies from across the region.

Two Options for Development

Whilst identifying the 15 Regeneration Corridors and Centres, a simple question was posed, presenting two options for development in each corridor:

Either ...

• **Option 1** - Concentrate development within the Centres and Regeneration Corridors to safeguard local employment opportunities.

Or ...

• **Option 2** - Dispersed development within the Centres and Regeneration Corridors to provide greater housing choice.

The meaning of these two options, the means to achieve them, and their consequent outcomes were debated by participants throughout the day.

Delegates considered this whilst discussing the opportunities and constraints to delivering the vision for growth and regeneration across the Corridors and Centres of the Black Country.

(It should be noted that, for some Corridors, choosing either option would result in the same outcome and it was often the case that a mixed approach was favoured).
Workshop Activities

There were three activities at the workshop:

- **Introduction and Presentation** by Partnership officers

- **Facilitated Group Discussions**
  Discussing opportunities and constraints for delivering each Regeneration Corridor until 2026, by considering two options for development.

- **Post-It Note Exercise**
  Participants were able to add further comments onto maps of the Black Country and the Regeneration Corridors in free time at the end of the event.

A small number of delegates took part in the Post-It Note Exercise and this report focuses on the core activity which is the Group Discussion.

**Discussion Methodology**

Following the officers’ introduction, Dialogue’s facilitators introduced themselves and the group activities, encouraging all participants to contribute and discuss as much as possible.

Participants were split into five groups, with half considering Corridors 1-7 (tables 1-3) and the remainder (table 4 and tables 5 and 6, which were combined) looking at Corridors 8-14.
Each table was given:

- Maps of the two options for each Corridor, identifying key considerations, development sites, transport links, resources and possible outcomes for the two different scenarios

- Group comment forms for recording comments and views:
  a. opportunities and constraints for development
  b. a final choice of which option to take
  c. further comments

Every table was accompanied by planning policy officers from the Partnership’s four local authorities. Dialogue’s facilitators worked with each table to encourage participation from all delegates and consideration of the widest range of views.

Throughout the workshop, Dialogue noted key comments and discussions, and these have been considered in producing this report.

At the end of the session, there was time for groups to consider corridors which they had not discussed in their allocated time.
This section summarises the key views raised by each table considering spatial options for the development of the Black Country.

Whilst not everyone agreed on which option was appropriate for each Corridor, (indeed, many tables struggled to decide on a single path for development), there were several key issues and opportunities which were raised throughout the workshop.

**Key Issues**

- **Mixture of Options**

More often than not, workshop groups did not agree on a final option, 1 or 2, for each Regeneration Corridor they discussed.

This was not through lack of consideration. On several occasions, participants were not able to achieve a consensus on a development option. More often than not, a final choice was left open ('no answer') because it was felt that an approach which combined both was the most achievable, and as such, the desired solution.

- **Transport and Infrastructure**

Transport links (both roads and public transport services) featured high on the list of considerations for the Black Country.

Whilst there were a number of locations considered to have excellent access and good prospects (e.g. Corridor 12), securing adequate access and efficient transport links was often raised as the most important consideration when seeking to deliver the corridors - failing to do this would be a constraint in many areas.
• **Need for Further Detail Many Participants Explained**

Several participants said that it was difficult to make fully detailed comments on the different corridors and planning policies that might shape them without further information.

It was explained that as the process moved on, this detail would be available for interested parties to respond to, however, the workshop provided an opportunity to feed into the broad principles of the vision for the Black Country at an early stage.

• **Land Assembly Issues and Joined Up Strategy**

Several participants pointed out that many key strategic sites within the Regeneration Corridors and Centres were controlled by a number of different landowners (for example, many local employment areas are held by different small businesses) that could create difficulties when seeking to assemble land for development.

It was suggested that local and regional authorities (such as the Regional Development Agency) could play a role in delivering land through various initiatives, including preparing and remediating sites for developers (which would support higher land values).
Corridor 1 (Pendeford - Fordhouses)

There was a general consensus that this area was a 'premier' location for employment with public transport links (improved bus services and nearby park and ride facilities were mentioned) and good roads to the south (but not to the north).

Supporting this, several participants identified good quality land in the corridor with a number of large sites that would be suited to delivering large developments. This was deemed suitable for higher value business or employment uses (some mentioned investment from Advantage West Midlands could secure this).

However, some considered the corridor to be too isolated from the rest of the Black Country, particularly in need of a new railway station on the Wolverhampton - Strayford line and a link road for the M54 and M6.

The presence of Greenbelt and SSSI/natural conservation areas were noted as constraints to development.

Table 3 chose option 2 for development, Tables 1 and 2 did not decide on a single strategy.
Corridor 2 (Stafford Road)

Reactions to this corridor were mixed, without a strong consensus on what it might deliver for the region.

Two tables identified the Goodyear site presenting strong opportunities for future development, particularly noting it could support the delivery of high density housing. Table 3 went into further detail and suggested that the east of the corridor was better suited to residential development and the west, to employment.

Several other opportunities were also identified including the Science park, which was considered to be one of the best quality employment sites in the UK, with room for further development.

There were no major concerns for the vision highlighted, though some expressed concern that like many areas, dispersed ownerships would make land assembly difficult. In relation to this, the role of the Development Agency in delivering a vision and attracting funding/partners for the corridor was highlighted.

Some also felt that existing employment land should be protected and jobs held by locals safeguarded.
**Corridor 3 (South of Wolverhampton City Centre)**

This corridor’s proximity to Wolverhampton was considered to be a great advantage and could be used to trigger an ‘urban renaissance’, if the question of the ring road could be addressed.

There was concern that the ring road would cut off this area from the city centre and the benefits it brings, i.e. the road would constrain development. In addition, the future growth of Wolverhampton city centre in this direction was a key consideration.

In particular, some suggested mixed tenure housing development with table 2 identifying a mix of industrial development and offices as appropriate for delivering change. In line with this, the New Deal for Communities was identified as playing a key role in the regeneration of the area.

Some participants considered the corridor to have a 'poor' environment, which was unattractive for housing and investment. However, it was suggested that removing or migrating existing employment uses would be difficult to achieve immediately with a number of different land owners (particularly small businesses) involved.

Table 3 chose option 1 for development, tables 1 and 2 did not agree on a single approach.
Corridor 4 (Bilston Corridor)

All three tables that considered this corridor identified the canal and its surrounding environment as a prime site for development, though there were several points of discussion regarding what would be most appropriate.

Table 2 identified the canal for housing development and other contributors suggested its environment could be improved with initiatives to encourage increased biodiversity that would make the area more attractive. Table 1 said that the wider area around the canal should be improved by choosing option 2.

There was some concern that developing in the canal corridor would impact on the environment, and that development should be sensitive to this issue. Table 2 suggested the immediate area could be used for higher quality (lower density) housing development.

Participants were not keen on development focusing purely on housing within this area, and favoured a more mixed approach.

Tenure of housing was a key issue, with table 3 suggesting there was a need for family homes and that smaller 1-2 bed apartments were not required. Again, fragmented land ownerships was noted, presenting an obstacle to a joined-up approach, and site specific policies to control this were encouraged (such as an area action plan).

Table 2 chose option 2 for development, and though table 1 discussed this, the other tables did not agree on a final strategy.
Corridor 5 (Loxdale - Moxley)

It was agreed that there were plenty of brownfield site development opportunities in this corridor, though many of these were on poor quality or contaminated land and would have to be remediated at cost to landowners or public bodies. Moxley Tip was used as an example of this.

Following this, several participants felt it would be difficult to convert local employment land into high quality investment/business opportunities and that restructuring existing local employment to match this would also take time.

Table 3 identified that the area was not currently seen as 'attractive' and that any future zoning for development would have to be twinned with a greater promotional/marketing programme from the Black Country Councils and public bodies.

It was generally agreed by the three tables that there was little difference between option 1 and option 2 when considering development in this area.
Corridor 6 (Darlaston - Willenhall - Wednesfield)

There was no clear development strategy favoured for this corridor, however key themes of discussion included the need to improve transport links and communications, with local railways and roads requiring extra attention in particular.

Whilst there were a number of opportunities identified at Ashmore Lake, Darlaston Green, Darlaston town centre and the industrial land north of Willenhall, it was noted that several sites in the area would require some remediation.

Road access and transport links were a concern, with congestion on the J10 highlighted and roads in Darlaston Green considered poor.

Table 2 chose option 1 for development and was the only table to make a decision.
Corridor 7 (Bloxwich - Birchills - Bescot)

There was some enthusiasm for development of Corridor 7, especially from table 2. Housing development following the canal to take advantage of its attractive environment was suggested by tables 1 and 2. Table 3 also identified the Bloxwich Lane - Dudley Fields area for development.

The proximity of railway lines (and noise pollution) was identified as constraint to housing development in the area, as noted above, housing development along the canal corridor (and the attractive waterside location it could present) could be explored as an alternative location.

Strong infrastructure in the corridor was considered as a major advantage that would support regeneration initiatives, though table 2 considered the area was already a 'success'.

Corridor 8 (Hill Top)

Participants felt that a mix of housing was needed to help bring investment into the corridor.

Participants wanted to see both transport links and wider infrastructure improved in the corridor before there could be further housing development. However, table 5 and 6 did highlight good access to the M6 as an opportunity.

The need for improvements to the A41 were raised in the discussion as was the lack of a Metro stop to service new employment. Participants also highlighted the potential of the canal for the movement of freight and also short travel.

There were concerns about the expense involved in the remediation of the polluted areas of the corridor, as well as concerns about the local waste plant. Table 4 was particularly concerned over the parking of lorries in the corridor. It was felt that lorries parking in residential areas add to the traffic problem in the corridor.
Corridor 9 (Tipton - Dudley Port - Brades Village)

Corridor 9 was widely seen as suitable for housing led development (providing a mix of tenures) with strong existing communities to build upon and a District Centre that could be used as a way to attract investment, visitors and new residents.

Transport was a key source of concern with participants highlighting badly congested roads. Linked to this, the groups wanted infrastructure improvements to support further development and improve the area as a location for investment.

As with other corridors, the local canals were highlighted as a possible area for improvement to bring in investment. There was a desire to attract the right types of businesses to the area. It was felt this would both supply jobs to a highly skilled work force as well as bring investment into the area.

Corridor 10 (Pensnett - Kingswinford)

Participants considered this best suited to housing and increased density residential development that would be attractive to A/B workers with access to Himley and Wolverhampton. However again, issues were raised with transport infrastructure and capacity, addressing these was seen as crucial. There was also concern regarding heavy contamination of certain areas of the corridor.

In particular, a need for new rail links was raised and road infrastructure development desired to support development in Pensnett (west to east transport links were considered weak).
Corridor 11 (Dudley - Brierley Hill - Stourbridge)

The corridor was widely seen as a good area for residential development by both tables, where less dense housing would be achievable. In the discussion participants noted that future development should not threaten employment in the corridor.

Affordable housing provision was an important consideration, but in the discussion there was a concern to see a variety of tenures and options made available. In particular, participants were keen to avoid purely high density developments in the area.

The proposed Metro line was again highlighted as a source of opportunity for the area. Table 4 wanted to see a coordinated car parking strategy for the area from the local boroughs.

Corridor 12 (Oldbury - West Bromwich - Smethwick)

Both tables were enthusiastic about the future of this corridor, identifying several opportunities for future development and attractions to investment, so much so that table 4 suggested the corridor could be extended.

In particular, introduction of the Metro was considered a major benefit and trigger for development, though existing infrastructure was already strong. The new hospital area was identified as a prime location for further development.

Participants wanted to see greater use of and investment in local rail lines which it was felt would help to reduce carbon emissions (via reducing car travel) as well as help bring investment to the area.
**Corridor 13 (Rowley Regis - Jewellery Line)**

There was not a great deal of discussion on this corridor, but it was identified that future housing development would need to provide a mixture of tenures.

Table 5 and 6 felt the key issue in this corridor was the density of development the corridor could support. Participants suggested that the key factor to consider was the capacity of train services and town centres (providing shopping and services to residents).

**Corridor 14 (Coombs Wood - Halesowen)**

Table 5 and 6 identified this as a strong area for further employment development and felt there was potential for growth in the corridor with both options producing similar results.

Transport was the main constraint highlighted, in particular the need for a link from the M5 to Halesowen Roundabout. Table 4 went as far as to recommend overnight car parking on industrial estates to relieve pressure on local roads.
When considering most of the corridors, groups tended not to conclude on a specific option for development. This was in part due to requests for further information/detail (available at a later stage in the LDF process) and a desire to discuss more detailed issues for development rather than overall strategy.

The responses were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Table 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>(1 to the west, 2 east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.b.* choice of option depends on Ring Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Table 5/6</th>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mix of both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By holding a workshop for key stakeholders across the Black Country, the Partnership of Councils sought to involve key delivery organisations in developing a vision for the future of the region.

It was recognised that the event took place at a relatively early stage in the planning process, however, there was useful discussion of the issues and opportunities across the region.

Some participants said they would be able to provide a more informed and detailed response to the Regeneration Corridors and Centres once the process had moved forwards and further information was available.

However, considering each corridor and the broad themes which emerged across the workshop, the participants have provided valuable local information and opinion which will be considered as part of the Local Development Framework process going forward.
Appendix 1 Corridor 1 Pendeford - Fordhouses

Table 1

Opportunities
• Premier location for employment (high quality)
• Large footprints
• AWM investment

Constraints
• Lack of railway stations / public transport (PnR in S.Staffs)
• Pendeford Road - heavy traffic

Option Chosen - 'Not Relevant'

Additional Comments
Potential to expand into S. Staffs - current proposal of Brinsford
Investment/funding - delivery
Table 2

Opportunities
- Public transport - it’s important to link site to existing links
- There are major proposals to improve busses and a park & ride site planned just outside the area
- Road links - good to south but M54 & M6 need a link road
- Access planned to IS4 site - bus terminals

Constraints
- Need a road link to the North

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
Strategic gateway location
No real difference between options 1 & 2
Inevitability will cater for some people who will live outside BC
Table 3

**Opportunities**
- Large area of land available for higher value uses
- Wton - Stafford Line - possibility of new station / park & ride
- Wton - Shrewsbury Line
- Opportunity for 'clean' waste / resource recovery technologies?
- Already largely reclaimed
- Opportunity to improve / enhance ext nature conservation sites

**Constraints**
- Remove from rest of BC / poorly served by public transport
- Could suck people in from outside area rather than service BC (regional site) or benefiting BC
- SSSIs / nature conservation sites

**Option Chosen - 2**

**Additional Comments**
Already largely Option 2
Very important to serve by public transport
Corridor 2
Stafford Road

Table 1

Opportunities
- High density housing on the Goodyear site/Stafford Road corridor can take advantage of good public transport links/proximity to the city centre (if option 1 is taken)
- Science park is one of the best employment sites in the UK
- Waste recovery facility will move waste up hierarchy
- Public transport opportunities for waste movement

Constraints
- Crown Lane/Wolverhampton municipal waste management centre is potentially expensive/difficult

Option Chosen - 2

Additional Comments
N/A

Table 2

Opportunities
- Goodyear site - mixed for housing
- Extension of Science park

Constraints
- Issues related to southern end of corridor adjoining the town centre

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
N/A
### Table 3

**Opportunities**
- Development Agency input
- Area Action Plans

**Constraints**
- Land assembly - fragmented ownership
- Prejudices comprehensive approach
- Deliverability - land acquisition by public agencies

**Option Chosen** - None

**Additional Comments**
- Delivery line defines area - to the west access for employment is better
- To the east more suitable for residential
- Delivery - Area Action Plans?
- Allocations and phasing are important - lead in times. Land assembly etc
Corridor 3
South of Wolverhampton City Centre

Table 1

**Opportunities**
- Pedestrian link across ring road will significantly improve access to the city centre

**Constraints**
- Poor quality industrial and housing area
- Moving employment uses from this area is not practical
- 'Severed' from the city centre by the ring road

**Option Chosen** - Neither

**Additional Comments**
The group questioned the need to expand the city centre
Question whether option 1 is deliverable (moving employment land)

Table 2

**Opportunities**
- Longstanding regeneration area - New Deal
- Is there a third option?
- Best solution is for a mix of industry and offices

**Constraints**
- Penn Road is congested
- Existing ring road if Wolverhampton centre expands

**Option Chosen** - depends on ring road

**Additional Comments**
Need to accommodate/make provision for city centre growth
Table 3

Opportunities
- Urban renaissance - raise profile, high quality
- Link to town centre
- Mixed communities / tenure - range of housing

Constraints
- Poor environment for a gateway to Wolverhampton
- Barrier created by ring road

Option Chosen - 1

Additional Comments
Residential may be a wasted opportunity adjoining the ring road.
## Table 1

**Opportunities**
- Improvement of canal - wider benefits - option 2 should be aiming to improve whole of canal as well (cycle route)
- Potential to improve connections to contribute to 'urban park' linkages to other areas

**Constraints**
- Impact of option 2 on tarmac aggregates recycling facility? (encroachment of housing)

**Option Chosen** - Neither

**Additional Comments**
Improvements to canal should not just be dependent on housing - employment should also contribute.
Table 2

**Opportunities**
- Area of greatest choice in Wolverhampton
- Canal - opportunity for high quality homes
- Option 2 - better for sustainable transport
- Biodiversity along the canal - improve and promote
- Canal - green infrastructure asset

**Constraints**
- BC works
- Stability of land
- Potential loss of biodiversity to housing development
- No need for infrastructure strategy at present

**Option Chosen - 2**

**Additional Comments**
Not too many apartments
### Table 3

**Opportunities**
- Canal side - Quality environment would retain those who may leave
- Mechanism to achieve this - bring forward asap e.g. Area Action Plan to handle significant change or interim document prior to detailed planning policy

**Constraints**
- Flats/Apartments - too many flats - inflexible
- Fragmented ownership etc - coordination? No Area Action Plan proposed
- Introduce improved mechanisms to control fragmented ownerships?

**Option Chosen** - None

**Additional Comments**
- New family homes - release older, more affordable houses
- Aspiration for larger homes
- Affordability a key issue
- Rising land values as a result of plans
- Infrastructure improvements are key, canal is the greatest asset
- Linkages to suburbs in all directions required
Table 1

Opportunities
• This is an opportunity - long term, to use brownfield land, regenerate and improve environment. But may come at some cost.

Constraints
• It will take time to reclaim Moxley Tip (capping/gas remediation)
• Remediation of older sites will be expensive

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
Query whatever Moxley Tip should be considered for development

Table 2

Opportunities
• Lot of disused/under-used land that could be regenerated
• Good road access - BC route

Constraints
• Number of small businesses in area - multiple site ownerships
• Potential constraints due to ground condition

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
How will we turn local employment into high quality jobs and industry?
### Table 3

**Opportunities**
- Potential for residential development site adjacent to the Metro stop west of Oxford Street
- Accessibility via Black Country New Road

**Constraints**
- Restructuring of employment will take time following development of new infrastructure
- Marketing/labelling - the Black Country has the wrong image
- Administrative boundaries can be a constraint between housing commitments and employment sites

**Option Chosen** - None

**Additional Comments**
No real differences between the two options
## Corridor 6
Darlaston - Willenhall - Wednesfield

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Option Chosen</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve public transport / relieve congestion on J10</td>
<td>• Lot of contamination on potential development sites</td>
<td>- No preference</td>
<td>Infrastructure supporting development needs to be planned in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor access (DSDA) / congestion / rail link very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open space/park facilities need to be provided (not just in this corridor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not clear how changes to the rail network etc. will impact on Birmingham New Street Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Option Chosen</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Regenerate Darlaston T.C</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve housing around smaller centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willenhall’s historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments
N/A
Table 3

Opportunities
• Ashmore lake - potential boundaries for housing
• Industrial land north of Willenhall presents an opportunity to raise the profile of residential development in the area
• Darlaston Green - has there been any developer interest in this area?

Constraints
• Need for road access improvements in Darlaston Green

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
This table supported employment sites but there is a need to improve access to them (transport links)
Businesses need opportunity to re-locate
### Table 1

**Opportunities**
- Housing could follow canal rather than railway

**Constraints**
- The Fryes Road waste transfer station/Household Recycling Centre under option 2 may require a replacement facility for Walsall’s main Municipal Solid Waste facility, unless they can co-exist
- Noise issue for housing near railway lines

**Option Chosen** - Neither

**Additional Comments**
Should take care to locate housing away from railway lines/need buffer
Question over quality/type of housing delivered
### Table 2

#### Opportunities
- Potential to electrify line - put more trains on
- Potential for new stations on existing rail line - B’ham to Stafford
- Canal side housing
- Good infrastructure
- Lot of potential for radical change and environmental transformation
- Relocate Bloxwich station closer to new housing areas
- Public sector housing regeneration
- Focus on canal side activities - encourage use
- Canal currently attractive

#### Constraints
- Walsall - Wolves rail line under threat - viability
- Council want to retain it - also an issue for corridor 6
- Where to relocate displaced industries
- Biodiversity issues on canal side development

#### Option Chosen - Can’t choose

#### Additional Comments
Some group members would like to see industry around the J10
Difficult to choose option in isolation
If an area is successful - i.e option 1 - why change it?
Table 3

**Opportunities**
- Bloxwich Lane - Dudley Fields area considered and investment opportunity
- Area Action Plan for the north of the corridor to delivery

**Constraints**
- TK Maxx site
- Multiple land ownerships constrain development without consolidation
- Area to the north, potentially for residential development - is comprehensive assembly deliverable?

**Option Chosen** - None

**Additional Comments**
Question - what is happening to the Bloxwich Lane industrial area?
Mix of residential and employment sites suggested
Corridor 8
Hill Top

Table 4

Opportunities
- Waste transfer cluster station
- Local workforce - new metro line would help
- For canal freight - to move short distances along a lock free section of canal

Constraints
- Relocation of existing business is expensive
- Medium term rather than short
- Transport issues
- Retention of local workforce
- Lack of opportunities for existing businesses to expand
- Railheads cause more road freight - congestion, unless going to a specific industry
- Brownfield land issues
- Parking for lorries - especially as more vehicles are coming from abroad, vehicles park in residential areas - social problems

Option Chosen - Option 1

Additional Comments
Key area for existing industrial business
### Table 5 & 6

#### Opportunities
- Potential high quality employment
- Black Country new road
- Access to M6
- Potential for affordable housing

#### Constraints
- A41 route - needs improvement
- No metro stop to serve new employment
- Heavy pollution
- Wouldn’t provide A/B Housing
- Need to modernise older existing features
- Does supporting infrastructure exist? (schools/leisure/services)

#### Option Chosen - None

#### Additional Comments
Need mix of housing to help bring investment to area.
Strong industry
Table 4

Opportunities
- Metro - long term
- Lower land values - means more larger homes
- High land values - lead to more smaller dwellings
- Increase housing choice (existing population & incomes)
- Creation of attractive area and locations
- Demonstrate links to areas outside housing
- How to get the private sector involved
- Need larger sites

Constraints
- Traffic congestion
- Will people want to move to the area?
- Not attracting skilled people to bring the area up
- Attract the right type of business to attract the right type of people
- Stigma of area, may stop people from moving in - also schools
- Smaller households do not mean 1 bed flats
- Avoid infill development
- Better planning briefs

Option Chosen - Mix of 1 and 2

Additional Comments
Housing led regeneration is way forward in this area.
Look at development in holistic manner, mix of densities
### Table 5 & 6

**Opportunities**
- Potential new metro link
- Operating train line
- Strong area for housing
- Canal network
- Proposed Owen Street/Burnt Tree land area - improvements
- Already housing
- Move main line form Oldbury to Dudley Port? Would help sustainability and to build image of centre
- Strong existing communities to build upon

**Constraints**
- Roads terrible
- Schools are constrained
- Need new District Centre? (Dudley Port Station)

**Option Chosen** - 2

**Additional Comments**  
Need to invest in roads
### Table 1

**Opportunities**
- N/A

**Constraints**
- [Guaranteeing] supply of clay to brickworks

**Option Chosen** - None

**Additional Comments**
Links to adjoining areas?

### Table 4

**Opportunities**
- Increasing housing density (council encouraging this)

**Constraints**
- Heavy contamination on some sites
- Poor access and road network - considered key to the future
- A491 has been 'lost' as a key route and needs maintenance

**Option Chosen** - Either/or

**Additional Comments**
Transport considerations are important, whichever options is chosen
Table 5 & 6

Opportunities
• Strong local employer
• Successful development
• Potential housing has A/B attraction - good access to Himley and Wolverhampton

Constraints
• Motorway is a bit far away
• Accessibility
• Quarry area - needs new road infrastructure to grow Pensnett.
• Is there a need for Mineral Extension or is the quarry coming to end of its life (2015?)

Option Chosen - 2

Additional Comments
Without commitment to infrastructure to grow Pensnett - housing is best.
Dudley - Brierley Hill - Stourbridge

Table 4

Opportunities
• Encourage housing development along railway lines
• Metro line - though Phase 1 is possibly 10 years away

Constraints
• Traffic from Merry Hill shopping
• Difficulty in accessing employment land to the north of Brierley Hill, which requires development
• Need to ensure affordable housing is not identified purely in high density developments, a choice is required
• The four boroughs require a coordinated car parking strategy

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
Some apply to both options - so no great choice between them

Table 5 & 6

Opportunities
• Good area for housing
• Focus on good employment and improve it
• Less dense housing achievable - 3 bed and up.

Constraints
• Lots of low quality land which should go
• Is high density needed here?

Option Chosen - 2

Additional Comments
Strongest housing area we have seen
**Corridor 12**

Oldbury - West Bromwich - Smethwick

---

**Table 4**

**Opportunities**
- New hospital area has potential for additional uses, such as key worker housing
- Extend corridor further - this has to be a comprehensive approach
- Metro presents a fantastic opportunity to develop the area
- Oldbury - main line stop
- Local rail lines - need greater use and can help improve the environment [emissions]
- Make better use of existing facilities

**Constraints**
- Relocation strategy of hospital area
- Junctions 1 and 2 have limited capacity - a joined up strategy with the Highways Agency is required
- Highways Agency - take HGVs off the roads in high winds (find alternative routes)

**Option Chosen** - None (the same)

**Additional Comments**
Option 1 and 2 are the same
Table 5 & 6

Opportunities
- Lots of potential
- Many AAPs - which will set out development
- Strong infrastructure
- Strong housing investment
- Good option

Constraints
- None discussed

Option Chosen - 1

Additional Comments
Only option 1 looks good
Corridor 13
Rowley Regis - Jewellery Line

Table 4

Opportunities
- Look for park and ride at stations
- Choice of housing mix

Constraints
- Whole industrial sites for housing - relocation issues

Option Chosen - 1

Additional Comments
Retain local employment

Table 5 & 6

Opportunities
- Strong number of stations
- Options are similar in both cases, strong - issue is only housing density

Constraints
- Rail line needs strengthening

Option Chosen - 2

Additional Comments
Issue is density - hard to determine as issues around strengthening central training and centres.
Table 4

Opportunities
- Log term parking on underused estates takes cars off roads and helps the morning congestion

Constraints
- Concerned about vehicle access and parking

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
None

Table - 5 & 6

Opportunities
- Strong employment area
- Near to M5
- Coombswood
- Good potential

Constraints
- Need to improve transport
- Link from M5 to Halesowen Roundabout on Hagley Road

Option Chosen - None

Additional Comments
No choice

Corridor 14
Coombs Wood - Halesowen
## Appendix 2: Sign in sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Agiliti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Borriy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Brash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolande</td>
<td>Bowater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Bowis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Bubbe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Bushell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>Byford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elle</td>
<td>Cess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Chirnocks Business Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie</td>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Cornfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Crowton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Cullen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Denning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Deverson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Dinnelly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.G.</td>
<td>Durrant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Ettor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Fasson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Gaffagh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.G.</td>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Heiss</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>Hymelod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Hickman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Hollands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Horrod</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Lomas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Nimmo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Nzani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Pippin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rendles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Rhead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Rimmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Rimbanks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Shoad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>Willis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Woodcock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Zastrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Attending: 46