

Walsall Site Allocation Document and Town Centre Area Action Plan

Regulation 22 Statement

Walsall Council is required under current planning regulations to prepare a consultation statement to accompany the submission of Walsall Site Allocation Document (SAD) and Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) to the Secretary of State.

There were four main stages of consultation undertaken in the preparation of the two plans:

- 1) Issues and Options (I&O) - 22nd April and 3rd June 2013
- 2) Preferred Options (PO) - 7th September and 2nd November 2015
- 3) Publication Stage - 7th March and 3rd May 2016
- 4) Pre-Submission Modification Consultations - 7th November and 19th December 2016.

The Council has produced three Consultation Reports to cover these consultations: one for I&O, one for PO and one covering both the Publication and Pre-Submission Modification Consultation stages. The reports detail the consultation materials and methods used, provide an overview of the level of involvement in the consultation and a summary of the consultation responses and evaluate the consultation undertaken. All three consultation reports are available to view on the Council's website at: http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/local_plans/evidence

In accordance with the requirements of Regulation 22(c) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 this statement sets out how the Council can demonstrate the consultation undertaken in the development of Walsall SAD and Walsall Town Centre AAP.

This statement sets out each of the requirements of Regulation 22 along with where the Council can evidence it has met each of the requirement. It also sets out how the Council can demonstrate it has met its Duty to Cooperate requirements.

(i) which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations under regulation 18,

- At the I&O stage there was just under 2,300 individuals and organisations on the Council's consultation database including residents, land owners, developers, environmental groups and businesses. During the PO stage this grew to 3,000 individuals. By the pre-submission modification stage this had reached 3,340 individuals.
- Appendix 5 of the PO Consultation Report sets out who was consulted at the I&O stage along with who was consulted at the PO stage. Appendix 4 of the Publication Consultation Report sets out who was consulted at the Publication and Pre-Submission Modification Stages.

(ii) how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 18,

- At each stage of the consultation all contacts on the consultation database were written to and invited to make representations. Consultation events were also used to capture feedback and encourage people to submit formal representations. Social media, press releases, leaflets and other materials were used to promote the consultation.
- The I&O Consultation Report provides details of the consultation materials and methods used to invite people to have their say on the plans.
- Section Two of the PO Consultation Report also provides an overview of the I&O consultation.
- Section Three of the PO Consultation Report sets out the consultation materials and methods used to invite representations of the plans at the PO stage.
- Appendix 2 of the PO Consultation Report provides examples of the consultation materials used.
- A summary is also provided in Section Two of the Publication Consultation Report.

(iii) a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to regulation 18,

- At I&O the Council received 194 written responses for the SAD and 37 on the AAP. For the PO stage there were 1,200 written responses to the SAD and 20 to the AAP. At the Publication stage the number of responses to the SAD considerable reduced with 106 responses being received. 20 responses where received at Publication for the AAP. Finally for the Pre-Submission Consultation 41 responses to the SAD and only 6 for the AAP were received.
- Section Two of the PO Consultation Report provides an overview of the main issues raised through the representation received at the I&O consultation.
- Section Six of the PO Consultation Report provides an overview of the main issues raised during PO consultation.
- A summary of all the consultation responses received at I&O and the PO Stage is available on the Council's website at: http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/planning_2026/consultation_representations
- Section Three of the Publication Consultation report also provides a summary of the PO consultation responses.

(iv) how any representations made pursuant to regulation 18 have been taken into account;

- At each stage of the consultation the Council published all consultation representations along with how they have or have not resulted in changes to the plans along with our justification.
- Section Two of the PO Consultation Report provides an overview of how the representations from I&O have been taken into account.
- Section Six of the PO Consultation Report sets out how the PO consultation responses has influenced the plan making process.
- A summary of all the consultation responses received at I&O and the PO Stage along with how these have been taken into account by the Council is available on the Council's website at: http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/planning_2026/consultation_representations

- Section Three of the Publication Consultation Report also provides a summary of how the PO consultation responses have been taken into account.

(v) if representations were made pursuant to regulation 20, the number of representations made and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations; and

- In response to the Publication Consultation the Council published all representations received along with whether any major or minor modifications have been proposed to address the representations.
- In response to the Pre-Submission Modification Consultation the Council published all representations received along with the Council response to the representations.
- Within the Publication Consultation Report Section Five provides the number of representation received at the publication stage and Section Six provides a summary of the consultation representations by topic. Section Nine provides the number and nature of the consultation responses to the Pre-Submission Modification Consultation.
- A summary of all the consultation responses received to the Publication Stage along with the Council's response and where appropriate how the representation influenced any proposed modifications to the plans is available on the Council's website at: http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/planning_2026/consultation_representations.
- A summary of all the consultation responses to the Pre-Submission Modifications Consultation and the Council's response to them is available on the Council's website at: http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/planning_2026/consultation_representations

(vi) if no representations were made in regulation 20, that no such representations were made;

- Not applicable.

In order to draw together all the consultation stages and provide an overview of how objections have been addressed the Council has also produced a table for each plan that sets out the policies within the plans and the objections that

have been raised at each stage of the consultation. These tables show how objections have been overcome through the plan making process and also help to identify any remaining objections. The tables are attached as **Appendix A** to this statement.

Duty to Cooperate

The Council has also produced a separate document to capture the discussions had under Duty to Cooperate throughout the preparations of the plans. This clearly captures how such parties were invited to make representations, the issues raised and how these have been addressed through the plan making process. The document covers each Duty to Cooperate body and records the involvement from I&O frontloading up to the examination. This document has been submitted as a Core Document.

Conclusions

This document provides an overview of the consultation evidence that clearly demonstrates how the Council has met the consultation requirements when preparing Walsall SAD and Walsall Town Centre AAP. To summaries these are:

- Issues and Options Consultation Report (August 2015)
- Preferred Options Consultation Report (February 2016)
- Publication and Pre-Submission Modifications Consultation Report (March 2017)
- Duty to Cooperate Overview (May 2017)
- Walsall SAD - Policy Weight at Submission Stage (May 2017) (Appendix A to this statement)
- Walsall Town Centre AAP - Policy Weight at Submission Stage (May 2017) (Appendix A to this statement)
- Consultation Representations and Council Responses for each stage of the consultation.

Walsall Council May 2017.

Appendix A

Walsall SAD – Policy Weight at Submission Stage

Walsall AAP – Policy Weight at Submission Stage

Walsall Site Allocation Document - Policy Weight at Submission Stage

The table below sets out which SAD policies were the subject of representations in response to the Preferred Options, Publication and Pre-Submission Modification stages of public consultation. The nature of the objections received impact on the level of weight emerging policies can be given when determining planning applications. If a policy has been subject to a main modification that also impacts on the weight the policy can be given.

There are three different levels of weight given to policies as the pre-submission stage.

1) Significant Weight: (shown in green)

- Policies where no objections have been received at any stage of the consultation;
- Policies where there were objections but following subsequent stages of the plan or proposed modifications the consultee has provided written confirmation that their objections have been addressed; and
- Policies that are subject to minor modifications that do not impact on the purpose or function of the policy and that are not subject to objections.

2) Some Weight: (shown in amber)

- Policies where there have been objections at the Preferred Option or Publication Stage of consultation but where the Council considers the objections to have been addressed by subsequent versions of the plan or proposed modifications. Significant weight can only be given where the consultee has confirmed in writing the objection has been satisfied (see above);
- Policies that are subject to new objections that have only been raised at the Pre-Submission Modification consultation stage. This is because the pre-submission modification consultation stage was only about the proposed modifications so new objections are not considered to carry the same influence as those made at the other stages of consultation;
- Policies that are subject to objections around the detail of the policy or a specific site the policy covers but where the overall purpose of the policy or the proposals for (other) particular sites is / are not disputed by any representations; and
- Policies that are subject to main modifications at the Pre-Submission Modification consultation but where the proposed modification has received no objections.

3) No Weight: (shown in red)

- Policies where there are outstanding significant objections; and
- Policies that are subject to modifications that there have been subject to objections.

Where policies refer to specific sites, either in a table attached to the policy or shown on the Policies Map, the list below separates representations or modifications that refer to the policy in general from those that refer to specific sites.

The policy references used are taken from the Pre-Submission Modifications version of the plan.

The table only provides a very brief summary of the policies and the representations. All of the consultation representations and the Council's responses are published at the Council's website at: http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/planning_policy/planning_2026/consultation_representations.htm

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Chapter 1 Introduction									
Sustainability Appraisal		<p>Lichfield DC: Documents are not accompanied by an SA/SEA/HRA.</p> <p>Cannock Chase DC: SA does not look at Green Belt: document needs to be more flexible in context of ongoing work with Greater Birmingham HMA.</p>	<p>SA/SEA/HRA was published on website at time of consultation on PO draft. The Publication draft contained a more detailed explanation of the SA/SEA/HRA.</p> <p>Reference to the future review of Core Strategy, including any need to review the boundaries of the Green belt, was added.</p>	<p>Lichfield DC: After the phrase “<i>projections of housing growth</i>” [in reference to BCCS review] add the phrase “<i>within our wider housing market area.</i>”</p> <p>Cannock Chase DC: Add reference to the ongoing Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area housing supply shortfall work.</p> <p>Acornford (Kensington) Ltd: There should be a commitment within the SAD for an immediate review if the BCCS policy on which it is based materially alters the planning context the SAD is seeking to deliver.</p>	<p>No Change Proposed apart from minor typing corrections and factual updates. No scoping of the issues to be addressed by the BCCS review has yet taken place, so it would be premature to suggest that the Black Country could accommodate housing growth beyond that required to meet its own needs. However, the existing wording in the SAD would not rule out this possibility, if it was deliverable.</p> <p>In respect of Acornford, the most recent evidence, from the 2016 Employment Land Review, is that there continues to be a high demand for land for industry, including local quality land such as this. The representation provides no evidence that any alternative objective assessment of need has been carried out.</p>	No representations received	No representations received	None, apart from minor typing corrections and factual updates to supporting text.	Not applicable. Chapter 1 does not contain policy.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Chapter 2 Objectives, Regeneration Corridors and Issues									
Objectives		<p>Historic England: Support inclusion of objective for historic environment. It should not only relate to built environment but also wider historic landscape including archaeology. Also recommend having separate clauses for historic environment and design.</p> <p>Natural England: Should encourage renewal energy.</p> <p>Gallagher Estates: Use of a sequential approach with brownfield sites first is not sound. SAD should be abandoned and review of Core Strategy commenced.</p>	<p>Historic England: Reference to the historic environment changed to reflect the main point made. The SAD refers to 'heritage assets' and the national definition of such assets includes landscapes.</p> <p>In respect of Natural England, the SAD seeks to locate new development in locations that can be accessed in energy-efficient ways. There has been no evidence provided to implement renewable or low carbon developments.</p> <p>In respect of Gallagher Estates, the SAD promotes sustainable development so is in accordance with NPPF. Abandoning it would result in failing to meet development needs of area.</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Gallagher Estates: A new policy should be included at the beginning of the SAD that sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay.</p> <p>Objective 1 should be redrafted to encourage rather than prioritise the delivery of PDL sites and remove reference to protecting the Green Belt from inappropriate development.</p> <p>Objective 2 should recognise the need to accommodate the housing requirements of the Borough over the lifetime of the Plan, as well as housing needs that cannot be met within neighbouring authority areas.</p>	<p>No Change Proposed in respect of Gallagher Estates. Policies in the SAD already refer to support for sustainable development.</p> <p>Objective 1 remains in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>Objective 2 already refers to providing a range of homes that meet the needs of all members of the community.</p>	No representations received	No representations received	None, apart from minor typing correction to supporting text.	Yes, except in relation to proposals that may contravene Objectives 1 or 2, i.e. development for housing or employment in the Green Belt and development of housing on employment land that is not redundant.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy RC1: The Regeneration Corridors			Policy RC1 was in chapter 1 at PO stage, but wording has not been altered.	No	None apart from minor typing corrections and factual updates to supporting text.	None	None	No	Yes
Assets and Constraints		Historic England: No reference is made to how the potential impact on the historic environment has been taken into account in allocating sites for housing and employment.	Details of Assets and Constraints for each site were added to the various tables of sites.	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Consider further flood risk assessments for housing allocations in the light of the latest guidance on climate change allowances.</p> <p>Coal Authority: Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards.</p>	<p>Change Proposed in respect of EA: Text of section 2.3.1 f) and Policy EN3 amended to refer to climate change allowance (MMSAD2 and MMSAD25).</p> <p>No Change Proposed in respect of Coal Authority. It is recognised that coal mining legacy is a potential constraint to development on many sites in Walsall, and accordingly it has been identified as an important issue to be taken into account in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 of the SAD. It has also been taken into account in the Deliverability and Viability Assessments for potential housing, industrial and waste management sites. Where coal mining legacy constraints have been identified for particular sites as part of the site evaluation process, this has been indicated in the tables of sites in the housing and employment policies.</p>	No representations received	<p>Environment Agency: Should use “FZ” to refer to flood zones rather than “F2” or “F3”.</p> <p>See also Cory Environmental Representation under policies EN3 and W2.</p>	<p>Minor changes and factual updates to table of assets and constraints.</p> <p>See also changes to individual site details in topic chapters.</p>	This section is not a policy, and assets and constraints affecting particular sites should still be checked using the relevant data sources.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
					Other minor changes to improve clarity of supporting text.				
Policy Omissions		Coal Authority: Need development management policy re unstable land. Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC): Request more detailed implementation and planning consideration policies.	In respect of Coal Authority, the SAD is not a development management document and how such issues are to be addressed is set out in existing national and saved UDP policies. However, ground stability has been taken into account in the allocation of sites, and the approach to Issues, Assets and Constraints in Chapter 2 of the plan (and in subsequent chapters) has sought to identify the sites that are likely to be affected by poor ground conditions. In respect of PCC, the purpose of the SAD is to allocate land to meet strategic needs.	Vodafone and Telefonica (O2): We consider it important that there is a specific telecommunications policy within the emerging Local Plan. We consider that the vital role that telecommunications play in both the economic and social fabric of communities merit the inclusion of a policy which refers specifically to telecommunications developments. PCC continued to make representations on the AAP and CIL consultations but made no further representations on the SAD. Objections therefore considered to be overcome.	No Change Proposed. The level of detail in the suggested telecommunications policy relates to development management matters and would not be appropriate for a site allocation document. In any case, the wording is similar to the existing saved UDP policy ENV38	No representations received.	Coal Authority: Need development management policy re unstable land.	No Change Proposed. Representation does not relate to a proposed modification. Issue was addressed in Council response to Preferred Options comments.	Not applicable. Proposals that are relevant to the representations should be considered under existing policies in other documents.
Chapter 3 Homes for Our Communities									
Policy HC1: Omitted Sites/ Housing Policy	IN52.2 and other sites	St Modwen: Policy does not draw on an up to date assessment of housing need.	No change made in relation to issues raised in objections. The question of housing need/	Several landowners/ developers: additional land should be allocated for housing, with a greater range of different sites.	No Change Proposed: The SAD, together with other housing sites identified in the SHLAA, identify developable sites for	No	No	No	Not applicable. Proposals for housing on sites that are not identified in the SAD should be assessed under

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>Cannock Chase DC: Does the housing target need to be reviewed?</p> <p>Home Builders' Federation: Need to increase number of sales outlets, with more small sites.</p> <p>Gallagher: Housing numbers are out of date.</p> <p>Various parties: Objection to non-allocation for housing of sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>CKC Properties: Site IN52.2 (Walsall Enterprise Park) should be allocated for housing.</p>	<p>numbers was addressed by the addition of text in the Introduction referring to the review of the Core Strategy. The SAD (and SHLAA) demonstrate that there are sufficient housing sites to meet the need to 2026 identified by the Core Strategy without the need to release sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>In respect of the HBF comment, the SAD proposes to allocate for housing a wide range of sizes of site, including many small ones.</p> <p>Site IN52.2 is a better than average employment site that lies adjacent to an existing high quality site and there is interest from an industrialist seeking to use it to expand.</p>	<p>Lichfield DC: A new policy should be added which identifies a zone of influence around Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. The policy should state that any new residential units and any development resulting in new visitors to Cannock Chase SAC will need to mitigate for its impact on Cannock Chase SAC. The zone of influence should be shown on the Proposals Map and Map 7.3 Natural Environment Designations.</p>	<p>housing in excess of the number required to meet housing need to at least 2026 without the need to release sites in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The potential redistribution of housing need arising from Birmingham is a matter for local authorities in the wider housing market area, so this need may not necessarily be accommodated in Walsall or elsewhere in the Black Country. However, any decision about this would be a matter for the review of the BCCS.</p> <p>With respect to Cannock Chase SAC, modification MMSAD22 is proposed to SAD Policy EN1 as a result of representations received, and discussions had with Natural England under the Duty to Cooperate. The modification emphasises the importance of nature designations beyond Walsall. OMSAD31 is also added to show the zone from which the available</p>				<p>policy HC2 and other policies in existing documents.</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
					visitor data for the Cannock Chase area is being used to support the collection of developer contributions to fund a package of mitigation measures. The housing allocations of the SAD are beyond the 8km zone from which payments are sought to mitigate the effects of recreational pressure from new residential development. The council's revised HRA and SA provide more information in relation to this issue.				
Policy HC1: Proposed Site Allocations	HO11, HO16, HO20, HO44, HO46, HO49, HO66b, HO71, HO72, HO128, HO137a, HO176, HO180, HO208, HO303 and HO305 and all other listed sites.	Historic England: There is no reference within the policy justification text to the potential impact of the proposed housing allocations on environmental considerations such as the historic environment nor is there any reference to evidence base documents that are relevant for the historic environment. Highways England: Proposals will	Historic England: Details of Assets and Constraints for each site were added to the various tables of sites. No changes made in relation to Highways England: The quantum and broad location of housing development proposed in the SAD is in accordance with that already assessed by the Core Strategy. This seeks to locate new housing	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed. HO29 (Resident): Sites does not appear to be large enough to accommodate 350 houses and a traveller site. HO58 (Parkhill Estates): Object as housing would constrain permitted	HO29: No change proposed. The Publication SAD only indicates that part of HO29 may need to include accommodation for travellers if site HO28 does not come forward. HO58: Change agree. Site has been deleted as a housing allocation and is now proposed as a retained local quality industry site (IN6.1) by main modification MMSAD10. HO66b: No Change Proposed. The site	HO29: St Francis Group support allocation for housing. No representations received in respect of the other sites.	HO11/HO16: Environment Agency “we agree with the approach taken”, but advise that “flood relief” should be added in reference to culvert. HO208: Michael Featherston-Dilke: Stated capacity of site is unrealistic. HO303: Catalyst Capital: Object to exclusion of Ward’s Pool/ SINC area (site OS4042) from site. There was a	HO208: No further change to the Council's proposed modification is considered necessary. The representation relates to the capacity of the site as stated in the Publication Document so does not relate to a proposed modification. However, the next SHLAA update may include a reduced capacity to take account of site shape and	Yes, excluding specific sites that are the subject of representations (i.e. excluding HO44, HO66b, HO71, HO72, HO180, HO305). In respect of sites HO208 and HO303, residential development can be supported in principle or on part of site.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>increase the pressure on M6 J10.</p> <p>Resident: Bentley area needs services regenerated before additional housing is built in the area.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Sites HO11, HO16, HO20, HO46, HO137a, HO176, HO303 and HO305 are at risk of flooding.</p> <p>Resident: Medical facilities and schools in the area of HO44 and HO180 are full and there is heavy traffic in the area.</p> <p>Residents: Site HO49 should be car park to serve mosque and church (note that this site was not proposed a general housing site in the SAD due to its small size, but was listed as a potential traveller site under policy HC4.</p> <p>Resident: Council do not own site HO71 and a covenant requires</p>	<p>in locations that enjoy good access by public transport, walking and cycling, in order to minimise the potential impact on the strategic road network. The M6 Junction 10 improvement is being progressed by Highways England and the Council.</p> <p>No changes made in respect of the concern about Bentley and sites HO44/HO180: service providers were consulted about the document and raised no specific concerns about capacity in the area.</p> <p>Details have been added to show which sites lie wholly or partly in flood zones.</p> <p>The proposal to allocate site HO49 as a traveller site has been deleted (although for other reasons not relating to parking).</p> <p>The title deeds and the appropriation for site HO71 do not contain any</p>	<p>brick clay working on adjacent site.</p> <p>HO66b (Barnshaws): The site was previously Walsall Iron and Steel and there are pollution and air quality issues as mentioned in the UDP and the BCCS. Site clearance has begun and there are contaminants, suggesting that housing development is an uneconomic option for the site. Would prefer to develop site for small industrial units which would provide much needed employment in the area.</p> <p>HO72 (Resident): Due to the site levels and access problems this site should be permanently returned to public open space as it is much safer for public use than the highly toxic Moxley Tip. The site is part of a wildlife corridor and is allocated as open space under UDP Policy LC1. It has been used as open space for many years.</p> <p>HO128 (Resident): Concerned about what might be built on the site. Neighbouring houses are on higher ground with living</p>	<p>is largely surrounded by existing or proposed housing. Any redevelopment for industrial use would require very restrictive conditions to prevent future activities giving rise to nuisance to the sensitive surrounding occupiers. It is probably correct that reclamation of a site for industrial use is likely to cost less than reclamation for housing. However, it is unclear if the owners have carried out any detailed investigations on this particular site that might confirm these costs. It is understood that they only acquired the site in March 2016, at which time the Site Allocation Document was in the public domain. The purchase price for the site should therefore have taken account of ground conditions and the likely cost of reclaiming for the emerging preferred use.</p> <p>HO72: No Change Proposed. The Festival Avenue area has been assessed as having</p>		<p>previous residential planning permission for the site. Note that this representation also relates to policy OS1.</p>	<p>character of surrounding area.</p>	

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>its retention as a play area.</p> <p>Resident: Site HO72 should be open space.</p> <p>Catalyst Capital: Support residential allocation for site HO303 but dwelling numbers should be reduced from 304.</p> <p>Walsall Tennis Club: Development of HO305 should include relocation of club and reduce number of dwellings. Should also address impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>evidence of restrictive covenants attached to the site.</p> <p>The council's Green Space Strategy 2012 identified site HO72 as poor quality open space with low priority for improvement.</p> <p>The stated number of dwellings for site HO303 was based on the existing planning permission but is not a required minimum provided the density is at least 35 dwellings per hectare as stated in the policy. A reduced number of dwellings on this site would be acceptable provided the density still met the requirements of the draft policy and BCCS policy HOU2. In fact, the pre-submission modifications propose to reduce the size of the site to omit the area that is a SINC.</p> <p>The area of site HO305 has been reduced at pre-submission</p>	<p>rooms facing the site so would be able to see into any new houses built on the site, also very concerned about people being able to see into the existing houses.</p> <p>HO303 and HO305 (Environment Agency): Parts of sites are within flood zones.</p>	<p>sufficient open space in other locations. Moxley Tip is allocated as open space in the existing UDP. The SAD now proposes to allocate it for high quality industry, but with an element of leisure and recreation. Any redevelopment either for buildings or open space would involve reclamation to make the site suitable for these uses. Wildlife corridors do not have precise boundaries, however the only substantial corridor in this area is the Walsall Canal.</p> <p>HO128: No Change Proposed. The design and layout of the site, including the relationship to adjoining dwellings, would be a matter for any future planning application [planning permission for 63 dwellings was in fact granted on 27/2/17]</p> <p>HO303/HO305: Site boundaries have been amended to take account of latest flood risk mapping (MMSAD4).</p> <p>Factual corrections have been made to</p>				

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
			nodifications stage to exclude the area within a flood zone. A note has also been added to the table of sites to advise that existing policies that may require justification for the loss or relocation of the existing tennis courts will continue to apply.		details of assets and constraints for some of the sites listed above together with other housing sites listed in the table under policy HC1. An additional paragraph has also been added to the supporting text in relation to infrastructure.				
Policy HC1 Design and Density		Catalyst Capital: Minimum density policy is unnecessary.y	No change proposed. Density reference is in line with Core Strategy Policy HOU2.	Catalyst Capital: policy should make specific reference to gross or net density in order to be fully effective. It seems unnecessary for Policy HC1 to introduce a minimum density requirement that appears more onerous and less flexible than the Core Strategy policy requirement, which in turn is more prescriptive than, and therefore not consistent with, the approach introduced through the NPPF.	No Change Proposed. The terms net and gross housing density are not defined in national policy, but 'gross' conventionally refers to the total site area including any areas of open space, community facilities and major roads, while 'net' excludes these areas and also excludes any existing dwellings that might be demolished as part of a site redevelopment. Policy HC1 as currently worded refers to open space, so the 35 dwelling figure is effectively the expected gross density. However, the majority of the sites identified in the SAD are small and would not include	No representations received.	No representations received.	No	None. Proposals for housing on the sites listed in policy HC1 should continue to meet the density requirements in BCCS policy HOU2.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
					<p>any open space or other facilities within the site: the net and gross densities would therefore be the same. In any case, the Policy Justification explains that the dwelling numbers stated are those for which planning permission has been granted, where such permission exists. Proposals for individual sites will not necessarily be expected to achieve these numbers.</p> <p>Policy wording reflects that in BCCS Policy HOU2. All the identified sites are in areas where a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare would reflect the character of the area.</p>				
Policy HC2: a) Site Criteria		HARP Consortium: Policy should take account of NPPF paragraph 22 that policies should avoid long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguard and protect industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The purpose of this is to ensure a balance is	Lichfield DC: See representation against policy HC1. HARP Consortium: Policy should take account of NPPF.	Lichfield DC: See representation against policy HC1. HARP Consortium: No Change Proposed. It is not necessary to replicate the wording of the NPPF in the plan.	No representations received.	No representations received.	No	Yes, except in relation to proposals for housing on employment land that is not identified in the SAD as suitable for release to other uses.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
			maintained between land for housing and land for industry and other uses.						
Policy HC2 b) Design and Density		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Policy HC3 a) Affordable housing requirement		Home Builders Federation: Viability assessment is required.	No change proposed to policies or evidence. A viability study has been carried out as part of the preparation of the SAD.	<p>Friends of the Earth: Would like to see policy tailored to meeting the specific need for housing for older people. The requirement to be close to public transport is probably less than for intensive care facilities, and we would not like to see sites come forward for housing being precluded on those grounds alone.</p> <p>Home Builders' Federation: Policy HC3 refers to a Supplementary Planning Document for affordable housing. Development management policies should not be inappropriately hidden in an SPD. The NPPF also indicates that SPDs should not add to the financial burden of development (para 154) and policies on local standards should be in the Plan (para 174). The SAD should be tested for viability.</p>	<p>FoE: No Change Proposed. While the needs identified are recognised, housing that does not involve an element of care for residents would normally fall within the general Class C3 housing class so it would not be possible to allocate specific sites.</p> <p>HBF: No change proposed. Draft Policy HC3 a) reproduces Core Strategy policy HOU3 so would not add any further burden. The purpose of an SPD would be to explain the practical working of the policy. The policy justification explains that an SPD would be easier to update to take account of current changes in national legislation and policy relating to affordable housing.</p> <p>The SAD has been subject to a viability assessment.</p>	No representations received.	Friends of the Earth: Further amendment to wording is required.	No	Yes. Notwithstanding objections, the policy reproduces BCCS Policy HOU3.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy HC3 b) Location of specialist housing		Cannock Chase DC: It cannot be concluded that Green Belt sites for affordable housing are not sustainable.	No change proposed. Development in the Green Belt has been rejected as an option as it is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. The SAD is to implement the Black Country Core Strategy. However, a change was made to the introduction of the Plan to say that the review of the Core Strategy will have to consider a review of the Green Belt.	No	No	No, but representation received from Cannock Chase DC about other policies does not refer to this policy or the proposed modifications.	No	No	None
Policy HC3 c) Public transport access to specialist housing		HARP Consortium: Extra care facilities should not be bound by such stringent requirements as most residents have serious mobility issues.	No change proposed. The supporting text for policy HC3 explains that good accessibility for specialist housing is needed not just for residents but also to enable care workers (many of whom are low paid) to get to work and to provide access for visitors.	C2 extra care development should not be bound by such a stringent criteria, which will be extremely limiting on where such developments can take place and appears to be more stringent than that being applied to general housing with no justification.	No Change Proposed. The policy justification explains that good access to public transport is needed not just for residents but also to enable care workers to get to work and to provide access for visitors.	No representation received.	No	No	None
Policy HC4 a) Proposed Site Allocations	GT1, GT3, GT5, GT6, HO11, HO27, HO28, HO29, HO41, HO44, HO49, HO61 HO62, HO180, HO306, HO313 and all other listed sites	Environment Agency: Sites GT1, GT3, GT5 and HO11 are in areas of flood risk. Residents: Oppose allocation of sites.	Environment Agency and Historic England: Details of Assets and Constraints have been added, including indication of which sites lie	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of	No Change Proposed. Paragraph 17 of the August 2015 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) is identical to paragraph 15 of the 2012 version. Both	No representations received.	HO11: See Environment Agency representation about site under Policy HC1 Resident: Still object to site GT6	No	Yes, for those sites that are still listed in the Publication Draft and excluding those that remain the subject of representations, i.e excluding sites GT5, GT6 (because

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		Historic England: There is no reference within the policy justification text to the potential impact of the proposed housing allocations on environmental considerations such as the historic environment nor is there any reference to evidence base documents that are relevant for the historic environment.	wholly or partly in flood zones. The majority of sites were dropped as potential traveller sites. This was partly because of the large amount of community opposition but also to reduce the confusion caused by “dual allocation” of sites for both general housing and traveller use. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was also reviewed to update the assessment of need.	the document are welcomed. Residents: Query proposal to allocate site GT6 as it lies in the Green Belt. Object to allocation of site HO29 for travellers.	state that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional, limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (which might be to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan-making process and not in response to a planning application. This is why the current proposals for site GT6 are being taken through the local plan. Site HO29 is no longer proposed to include a traveller site, unless Dolphin Close (site HO28) is not developable.		as proposal amounts to a change to the Green Belt boundary HO29: Residents’ objection still stands HO29: St Francis Group (landowner) comment that site should be removed from list of sites in policy HC4.		of Green Belt location), HO27, HO28 and HO29 (because of resident and/or owner objections), and GT1, GT3 and HOU11. (because of EA representations).
Policy HC4 b) Site Criteria		National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups: Expectation that sites should be suitable for general housing will result in non-delivery.	No change made. Correspondence took place with the Federation to explain that this wording was used to ensure sites were not placed in unsuitable locations such as areas affected by pollution or flooding.	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups: Query some of the data in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Revision, the total number of sites required and the estimated capacity of individual sites.	No Change Proposed except for minor change to monitoring table. The GTAA revision was intended as a draft for discussion to allow numbers to be carried forward to the end of the current Core Strategy timescale.	No	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups: Representation made at Preferred Options stage still stands.	No	None. However, the criteria (except for i and vii) are identical to those in BCCS policy HOU4.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Chapter 4 Providing for Industrial Jobs and Prosperity									
Policy IND1: Proposed Site Allocations	IN49.2, IN52.1, IN56.1, IN78.1, IN82.1, IN82.1, IN83, IN93.1, IN97, IN107.1, IN120.1	Environment Agency: Sites are in flood zones Historic England: There is no reference within the policy justification text to the potential impact of the proposed housing allocations on environmental considerations such as the historic environment nor is there any reference to evidence base documents that are relevant for the historic environment.	Environment Agency and Historic England: Details of Assets and Constraints have been added, including indication of which sites lie wholly or partly in flood zones.	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed. Environment Agency: "for purposes of flood risk, it is only relevant to look at the 'Potential High Quality Industry' and the 'New Employment Opportunities' sites" (See IND2 and IND5, below). This means there are no objections to this policy.	No	Environment Agency: "Overall, the Local Authority have worked closely with the Environment Agency to incorporate the vast majority of changes and further information suggested both in our response to the Publication Draft, and under the duty to co-operate since October 2015."	Not applicable	Site names, site sizes, assets and constraints have been updated, including those relating to flood risk. Some sites have been split to make more sense of the assets and constraints.	Yes, subject to taking account of the amended site details.
Policy IND1 Policy Wording		Harris Lamb: Policy should state that all employment land will be kept under review.	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguard and protect industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The purpose of this is to ensure a balance is maintained between land for housing and land for industry and other uses.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, notwithstanding the representation, the policy only clarifies which sites are affected by BCCS policy EMP2 and does not attempt to introduce any additional protection for these sites.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy IND2: Proposed Site Allocations	IN52.2, IN54.1, IN54.2, IN54.3, IN56.2, IN57, IN63, IN64, IN78.2, IN78.3, IN78.4, IN78.12, IN84, IN88, IN92, IN93.2, IN98.2, IN105, IN109, IN110, IN205, IN247	<p>CKC Properties: Site IN52.2 should not be allocated for employment</p> <p>Environment Agency: Sites IN54.1, IN54.2, IN54.3, IN56.2, IN57, IN63, IN64, IN78.2, IN78.3, IN78.4, IN78.12, IN84, IN88, IN92, IN93.2, IN98.1, IN98.2, IN105, IN109, IN110, IN205, IN247 are in flood zone</p> <p>Historic England: There is no reference within the policy justification text to the potential impact of the proposed housing allocations on environmental considerations such as the historic environment nor is there any reference to evidence base documents that are relevant for the historic environment</p>	<p>Site IN52.2 is a better than average employment site that lies adjacent to an existing high quality site and there is interest from an industrialist seeking to use it to expand.</p> <p>Environment Agency and Historic England: Details of Assets and Constraints have been added, including indication of which sites lie wholly or partly in flood zones.</p>	<p>CKC Properties: Site IN52.2 should not be allocated for employment.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Account needs to be taken of flood zones and / or the need for easements / no-build zones in respect of sites IN98.2, IN93.2, IN54.1, IN54.2, IN54.3, IN105, IN109, IN110, IN205, IN84, IN92, IN88, IN78.2, IN78.3</p> <p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>St Francis Group: Permitted uses on site IN98.2 should include A1, A3, A4, A5 and sui generis roadside facilities as well as industry</p> <p>Oakus Developments: More flexibility should be applied to sites IN63 and IN64 to allow leisure operations including public house and restaurant, also quasi-retail use such as car showrooms and trade</p>	<p>Assets and constraints amended for various sites, especially in relation to flood risk.</p> <p>No changes proposed in relation to the other representations.</p>	<p>Environment Agency: <i>“Overall, the Local Authority have worked closely with the Environment Agency to incorporate the vast majority of changes and further information suggested both in our response to the Publication Draft, and under the duty to co-operate since October 2015.”</i></p>	<p>St Francis Group: representation about site IN98.2 (also IN98.1) still stands</p>	<p>Site names, site sizes, assets and constraints have been updated, including those relating to flood risk. Some sites have been split to make more sense of the assets and constraints.</p>	<p>Yes, excluding specific sites that are the subject of representations (IN52.2, IN63, IN64, IN98.1, IN98.2), and subject to taking account of amended list of assets and constraints, and flood risk.</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
				counters. The evidence in the ELR is out of date.					
Policy IND2 Policy Wording		Harris Lamb: Policy should state that all employment land will be kept under review.	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguard and protect industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The purpose of this is to ensure a balance is maintained between land for housing and land for industry and other uses.	CKC Properties: Wording of policy is also far too prescriptive.	No	No	No	No	Yes, notwithstanding the representationS, the policy only clarifies which sites are affected by BCCS policy EMP2 and does not attempt to introduce any additional protection for these sites.
Policy IND3: Proposed Site Allocations	IN5.3, IN6.1, IN8, IN9.9, IN9.10, IN9.11, IN9.12, IN9.13, IN9.14, IN49.1, IN49.3, IN51.1, IN51.2, IN54.4, IN54.6, IN62, IN67, IN68.2, IN69.3, IN69.4, IN71.1, IN71.2, IN72.1, IN72.2, IN87, IN94, IN95, IN328	Phoenix Consortium: Proximity of other uses to site IN9.9 will potentially limit industry, so the site should be classed as release under policy IND4 instead. KR Hardy Estates: Sites IN9.10, IN9.11, IN9.12, IN9.13 and IN9.14 should be reclassified as consider for release.	No change proposed. Sites IN9.9 to IN9.14 have been assessed in the ELR and they do not perform poorly. They clearly form part of the critical mass of an industrial area, and the introduction of other uses, such as housing, could compromise adjoining industry and undermine regeneration. While it is acknowledged that some of these sites have difficult	Landowners/ agents opposing allocation of sites: IN5.3 (Brownhills Business Park) wish to delete or allocate for non-employment use. IN9.9 (Northgate) and IN69.4 (Clarks Lane Willenhall): wish sites to be allocated as consider for release (policy IND4). IN328 (Deeley's Castings): wish site to be allocated for housing.	No changes proposed in respect of the representations. Amendments have been made to some sites for other reasons, in particular part of IN6 (Hall Lane, Walsall Wood) and IN8 (Birch Lane, Stonnall) are now proposed as retained local industry instead of consider for release, because of their proximity to potential mineral workings. Site IN6 has been split, with IN6.1	No representations received.	IN67 (Electrium, Ashmore Lake): Hortons (agents): part of site should be allocated as consider for release. IN328: Earlier representation from St Francis Group still stands.	Site names, site sizes, assets and constraints have been updated, including those relating to flood risk. Some sites have been split to make more sense of the assets and constraints.	Yes, excluding specific sites that are the subject of representations (IN5.3, IN9.9, IN9.10, IN9.11, IN9.12, IN9.13, IN9.14, IN67, IN69.4, IN328), and subject to taking account of amended list of assets and constraints, and flood risk. Sites IN6.1 and IN8 are now listed under policy IND3, which is in accordance with the representation.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>Acornford (Kensington) Limited: Site IN69.4 should be released to other uses. Retail would be suitable for part of site.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Sites IN49.1, IN49.3, IN51.1, IN51.2, IN54.4, IN54.6, IN62, IN68.2, IN69.3, IN71.1, IN71.2, IN72.1, IN72.2, IN87, IN94, IN95 are in flood zones.</p>	<p>ground conditions, this does not necessarily preclude development for industry, such as storage, parking, and this helps meet needs for this type of development. It is understood that part of the Jobern Tip site is currently in use for storage.</p> <p>In respect of site IN69.4, there is enough capacity to meet Walsall's housing needs without recourse to this site. The objector has not provided any evidence to justify a retail allocation, particularly in relation to the Sequential Approach and the impact on centres. The land appears to be currently in use for industry. It has a reasonably good score in the ELR and the area has a good track record of industrial development and redevelopment.</p> <p>In respect of the Environment Agency, details have been added to show which</p>	<p>Environment Agency: <i>“for purposes of flood risk, it is only relevant to look at the ‘Potential High Quality Industry’ and the ‘New Employment Opportunities’ sites”</i> (See IND2 and IND5, below). This means there are no objections to this policy.</p>	<p>(west of Hall Lane) now listed under policy IND3 and IN6.2 (east of Hall Lane) listed under policy IND4. Details of the representation for IN6 and IN8 are under policy IND4.</p>				

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
			sites lie wholly or partly in flood zones.						
Policy IND3 Policy Wording		Harris Lamb: Policy should state that all employment land will be kept under review.	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguard and protect industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The purpose of this is to ensure a balance is maintained between land for housing and land for industry and other uses.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, notwithstanding the representation, the policy only clarifies which sites are affected by BCCS policy EMP3 and does not attempt to introduce any additional protection for these sites.
Policy IND4: Proposed Site Allocations	IN6, IN8, IN50.1, IN59, IN73.1, IN73.2, IN73.3, IN73.4, IN77.11, IN77.12, IN77.17, IN221, IN222, IN259, IN263	Historic England: There is no reference within the policy justification text to the potential impact of the proposed housing allocations on environmental considerations such as the historic environment nor is there any reference to evidence base documents that are relevant for the historic environment. Resident: IN6 should not be	Historic England: Details of Assets and Constraints for each site were added to the various tables of sites. Site IN6 is not very well located for industry and has been losing industry to other uses. However, the area west of Hall Lane has now been deleted as a potential housing site because of its proximity to potential mineral working.	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed. St Francis Group: Site IN16 should be allocated for housing instead of consider for release. Landowners' Agents: Sites IN9.9 and IN69.4 should be allocated as consider for release under this policy instead of as	No changes proposed in respect of the representations. Certain sites amended, in particular IN6 and IN8 (Hall Lane, Walsall Wood) and Birch Lane, Stonnall), and sites in Willenhall and Darlaston, because of mineral issues Site IN6 has been split, with IN6.1 (west of Hall Lane) now listed under policy IND3 and IN6.2 (east of Hall Lane) listed under	No representations received	No representations received	Site names, site sizes, assets and constraints have been updated, including those relating to flood risk. Some sites have been split to make more sense of the assets and constraints.	Yes, excluding sites IN6.2 and IN16 that are the subject of representations, and subject to taking account of site amendments. See under Policy IND3 for sites IN9.9 and IN69.4.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		considered for housing because of traffic, parking and flooding. Resident: IN8 should remain for industry as it provides employment and is fairly unobtrusive Environment Agency: Sites IN50.1, IN59, IN73.1, IN73.2, IN73.3, IN73.4, IN77.11, IN77.12, IN77.17, IN221, IN222, IN259, IN263 are in flood zones	Site IN8 has been deleted as a potential housing site, but this is because of its proximity to potential mineral working. In respect of the Environment Agency, details have been added to show which sites lie wholly or partly in flood zones.	retained employment land under policy IND3. Environment Agency: <i>“for purposes of flood risk, it is only relevant to look at the ‘Potential High Quality Industry’ and the ‘New Employment Opportunities’ sites”</i> (See IND2 and IND5, below). This means there are no objections to this policy.	policy IND4. Details of the representation for IN6 are under policy IND4. IN8 is now listed under policy IND3.				
Policy IND4 Policy Wording		Harris Lamb: Policy should state that all employment land will be kept under review.	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguard and protect industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The purpose of this is to ensure a balance is maintained between land for housing and land for industry and other uses.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, notwithstanding the representation, the policy only clarifies which sites are affected by BCCS policy EMP3 and does not attempt to introduce any additional protection for these sites
Policy IND5: Specific Sites	IN122, IN315, IN317, IN333, IN341	Wyrley Estates: Site of riding school at Pelsall Road should be	The site at Pelsall Road is in the Green Belt so its allocation would be	IN122 (Moxley Tip) Catalyst Capital: Concern about potential proximity of	Minor amendment to boundary of Moxley Tip (site IN122) to avoid slight overlap	Environment Agency: <i>“Overall, the Local Authority have worked closely</i>	No representations received	Details of assets, constraints and site sizes have been corrected.	Yes, subject to taking account of representations and amendments to

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>added to industrial estate.</p> <p>Site IN122 should not be required to include an element of leisure and recreation.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Sites IN122, IN315, IN317, IN333, IN341 are wholly or partly in flood zones.</p> <p>Historic England: There is no reference within the policy justification text to the potential impact of the proposed housing allocations on environmental considerations such as the historic environment nor is there any reference to evidence base documents that are relevant for the historic environment</p>	<p>inappropriate. There is also a good supply of deliverable employment sites from brownfield sources.</p> <p>In respect of site IN122, the Darlaston area has a quantitative and qualitative deficiency of accessible open space, notwithstanding the need for economic regeneration. The 2010 and 2013 planning permissions provide for open space and the proposed allocation preserves this principle. The objector has not justified why this should be overridden.</p> <p>In respect of the Environment Agency, details have been added to show which sites lie wholly or partly in flood zones.</p> <p>Historic England: Details of Assets and Constraints for each site were added to the</p>	<p>industry to housing proposed on adjacent site (HO303).</p> <p>Parkhill Estates: Contrary to statement in policy, site is not constrained by a canal, SLINC or public right of way. Also reference to provision of an element of leisure and recreation is contradictory and unnecessary.</p> <p>IN333 (Willenhall Sewage Works): Environment Agency advise that flood risk will need to be addressed.</p> <p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p>	<p>with canal towpath and SLINC.</p> <p>Boundary of site HO303 (allocated for housing under policy HC1) amended to exclude the SINC (Wards Pool) from the site. This amendment will provide a buffer between any housing development and site IN122.</p> <p>Modification proposed (MMSAD13) to emphasise the value and importance of early engagement with the Environment Agency for proposals relating to IN333.</p>	<p><i>with the Environment Agency to incorporate the vast majority of changes and further information suggested both in our response to the Publication Draft, and under the duty to co-operate since October 2015.”</i></p>			<p>sites IN122 and IN333</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
			various tables of sites.						
Policy IND5 Policy Wording		Harris Lamb: Policy should state that all employment land will be kept under review	No change proposed. The SAD industrial policies are based on the Core Strategy policies EMP1-3, which safeguard and protect industrial land redevelopment for other non-employment uses. The purpose of this is to ensure a balance is maintained between land for housing and land for industry and other uses.	No	Additional supporting text has been added in relation to delivery, and a map showing the Black Country Enterprise Zone in Darlaston.	No	No	No	Yes. The representation is not directly relevant to this policy as it only applies to land that is not currently used or previously used for employment.
Chapter 5 Strengthening Our Local Centres									
Policy SLC1 a) Allocated Local Centres	LC20	Resident: Churn Hill should be added to the list of centres Bentley (LC20) needs better facilities	No change proposed in respect of Churn Hill. There is no evidence to suggest that this is more than a row of local shops and provides a focal point for the local community. Policy looks to attract investment into local centres such as Bentley, however delivery of public sector facilities is depended on public funding.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (representation does not affect other centres)

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy SLC1 b) PolicyWording		Gallagher Estates: Policy should not preclude the delivery of additional Local Centres within new communities	Saved UDP Policy S6 and BCCS Policies CEN6 allow for the provision of new shops and services that meet needs within local communities.	Gallagher Estates: Policy should not preclude the delivery of additional Local Centres to provide day-to-day convenience shopping and service needs within new communities.	No	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes (representation does not affect other centres)
Policy SLC2 Local Centres Development Opportunities	All centres and sites	Historic England: there is no reference to how any of these sites may impact upon the historic environment or a reference to any relevant historic environment evidence base.	The site tables now include details of nearby heritage assets that could be impacted on to ensure they are considered as part of any development proposal from the start. The Local Centres Study also includes further detail of the heritage assets.	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.	Reference added in Policy Justification to Policies Map and Local Centres Study.	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes.
Chapter 6 Open Space, Leisure and Community Facilities									
Policy OS1 a) Site Allocations	OS4042, OS8009, OS9128			Caparo: Former Reedswood Golf Course (OS8009) should be added to adjacent housing site HO181.	No change proposed in relation to representation, but land at Moxley (Ward's Pool) and Stringes Lane/ St. Anne's Road, Willenhall added to open space allocations. Ward's Pool (OS4042) is a SINC whilst Stringes Lane (OS9128) is part of a linear walkway (Greenway: the Walsall-Willenhall cycle route).	No representations received	HO303 (see policy HC1): Catalyst Capital Object to exclusion of Ward's Pool/ SINC area from housing allocation and consequential allocation as open space instead (site OS4042 in Technical Appendix). There was a previous residential planning permission for the site.	Reference added to sites listed in technical appendix as open space identification numbers are not listed elsewhere although all the sites are shown on the Policies Map.	Yes, except for proposals relating to Reedswood Golf Course site, and Ward's Pool.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy OS1 b) to d) Policy Wording		<p>Sports England: Playing pitch evidence is not robust. A new pitch strategy is being prepared.</p> <p>Resident: Why is tennis not in playing field strategy?</p>	<p>Change proposed. Add reference to emerging playing pitch strategy - Sport England's response confirms Walsall MBC has committed to a new Playing Pitch Strategy. The council fully appreciate the health and well-being benefits associated with sports playing fields and have allocated more open space for protection through the SAD. The council will progress with the SAD to the publication stage, and will discuss the evidence base and its implications with Sport England during the publication consultation of the SAD/AAP and more generally.</p> <p>No change proposed. The Playing Pitch Strategy does not cover tennis following consultation with the LTA and Sport England.</p>	No	No, except for grammatical correction to text.	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes, except in relation to Ward's Pool (site OS4042): see policy HC1.
Policy OS1 Policy Justification		Local Nature Partnership: Would encourage	Reference to Dashboard has	No	No	Local Nature Partnership support modifications	None	No	Yes (although this section is not part of the policy).

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		reference to State of the Environment Dashboard.	been added to Policy Justification.						
Policy LC5 a) Specific Routes				Integrated Transport Authority: Should include reference to canal and metropolitan cycle network.	Amended to include references as requested. Amend boundary next to site IN315 (Bentley Mill Way).	No representations received	No	No	Yes
Policy LC5 b) and d) Design of Greenways		Inland Waterways Association: Would like to see additional wording about shared use of towpaths.	No change proposed. Policy already includes reference to taking account of community safety objectives.	No	No	No representations received	Canal & River Trust: The type, function and character of existing 'Greenways' such as the canal network will need to be taken into account and proposals will need to balance their multifunctional nature protecting and enhancing not only their function as 'Greenways' but also their cultural, heritage and ecological value.	Policy justification has been amended to incorporate wording recommended by C&RT	Yes, but note Inland Waterways representation seeking additional text.
Policy LC5 c) Developer Contributions		Gallagher Estates: Developers should only be expected to fund Greenways when consistent with CIL Regulations.	Policy amended to include reference to CIL Regulations.	Gallagher Estate and Catalyst Capital: Developers should only be expected to fund Greenways when consistent with CIL Regulations, and policy should be subject to viability testing.	No, policy already refers to CIL regulations.	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy LC11: Site Allocation		No	No	No	Reference added to assets and constraints.	No	No	No	Yes
Policy UW1: Development Criteria		No	No	Friends of the Earth: Amendment to wording requested.	Wording amended	No	Friends of the Earth: Further amendment requested to address amenity value of area.	No	Yes, but note that representation may require additional issue to be taken into account when assessing proposals under policy.
Chapter 7 Environmental Networks									
Policy GB1: Green Belt Boundary		No	No	Gallagher Estates: Green Belt review should be undertaken alongside work to establish the appropriate housing requirement for the borough. Other representations that sought to allocate sites in the Green Belt for housing are also relevant to this policy, although the representations do not refer to it explicitly.	No	No representation received	No representation received	No	None, but UDP Green Belt designation still stands.
Policy GB1: Policies that apply to the Green Belt		No	No	No	Yes, amendment referring to buildings of permanent and substantial construction.	No	No	No	Yes (this policy is similar to the existing UDP policy but is now in conformity with NPPF).
Policy GB2: Control of Development in the Green Belt and Countryside		Wildlife Trust: Additional wording is requested	No change proposed. Policy GB2 (b) provides criteria that are to be used to specifically assess development in terms of its impact	Friends of the Earth: Policy should address accessibility to sites.	Yes, amendment to wording re accessibility.	No representations received	Friends of the Earth: Further wording requiring footpath access to sites in the Green Belt is requested.	No	Yes, subject to requested further wording.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
			on openness and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The impact on the Natural Environment does not influence these factors, however natural environment impacts can be considered under 'any other harm' associated with development within the Green Belt, in accordance with the NPPF, and if appropriate through the application of Policy GB2 ix.						
Policy EN1: Boundaries and extents of sites		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Policy EN1 a) to d) Policy Wording		Environment Agency: Policy should be expanded to cover nature conservation specifically in rivers and other watercourses. Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: Amendments recommended to policy justification. Natural England: Support policy.	Yes, reference to Humber River Basin Management Plan and impact on waterbodies added.	Environment Agency: Should considerations alternative options or the site layout before considering mitigation. Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: No response received. Natural England: representation received but does not refer to this policy. AONB Partnership, Cannock Chase DC, Lichfield DC: Policy should refer to impact	Yes, amendments to wording to address issues raised in representations.	Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: Support modifications to policy and policy justification. Recommend correction to supporting text. Natural England: Support modifications subject to correction to map to map title and key in respect of zone of influence/ payment for Cannock Chase SAC.	Environment Agency: Reference should be made to "naturalising" watercourses as referred to in BCCS Policy ENV5. Lichfield DC: Map 7.2 and wording of policy does not reflect the 15km Zone of Influence around the Cannock Chase SAC.	Further changes to Map 7.2 and Policy EN1 are suggested to address comments from Lichfield DC and Natural England. No further change is suggested in respect of the EA representation. A change to the supporting text and table 7.1 is proposed to address the LNP/	Yes, except in relation to proposals that may impact on Cannock Chase SAC, watercourses and the possible Hatherton Branch Canal restoration.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
				on Cannock Chase SAC. Friends of the Earth: Should address impact of developments adjacent to nature conservation sites.		Cannock Chase DC; Support modifications provided Natural England are satisfied.	Inland Waterways Association: Consequential amendments are required to be consistent with the comments about MMSAD26 for policy ENV4.	Wildlife Trust representation.	
Policy EN2: Policy Wording		Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: Amendments recommended to policy justification.		Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: No response received Woodland Trust: Policy should refer to woodland creation and ancient trees as well as ancient woodland.	No changes proposed as policy is considered to be consistent with NPPF and other local plan documents provide protection for trees as well as woodland.	Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: Support modifications to policy justification. Recommend correction to supporting text.	Woodland Trust: Urban Forestry Strategy should be added to evidence base.	Omit reference to EcoRecord from evidence list, as requested by LNP and Wildlife Trust	Yes, but representation may require additional criteria to be taken into account.
Policy EN3: Policy Wording		Environment Agency: Support policy but with detailed comments.		Yes, representation from landowner (Cory Environmental) about treatment of quarry/landfill at Highfield South (site WS10 in policy W2 and site MP6 in policy M8) in relation to indication of flood zones. Also discussions with Environment Agency under Duty to Cooperate	Policy and policy justification amended to reflect discussions with Environment Agency.	No representations received	Cory Environmental: Flood risk mapping for site WS10 remains incorrect. Site should be excluded from flood zone. Environment Agency: minor change to text re culverts is requested.	Minor typing corrections only.	Yes, representations only relates to one site and minor typing change.
Policy EN4 a) Position and extent of canal network		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Policy EN4 b) Hatherton Branch Canal Restoration		Cannock Chase Council: No reference to Hatherton Branch in PO draft.	Policy amended to include this reference.	Canal & River Trust: Query need for part b) as it is duplicated by part g).	Yes, policy clause is to be retained but wording is proposed to be changed substantially to	Environment Agency: the policy wording reflects a good balance between the	Lichfield and Hatherton Canal Restoration Trust, and Inland Waterways	No	No – Outstanding objections to resolve.

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
(this section was not in the PO Draft).				<p>Inland Waterways Association: Object to reference to preventing additional boat movements along Cannock Extension Canal.</p> <p>Lichfield District Council: Support policy.</p> <p>Lichfield & Hatherton Canal Restoration Trust: Welcome support of the Council for the proposals.</p> <p>Natural England: Appropriate Assessment of restoration is required and this must take into account up to date evidence relating to water availability for the project.</p>	provide further explanation and refer to HRA requirement.	<p>potential opportunities and the present difficulties.</p> <p>Natural England: Support modifications.</p>	<p>Association: Modification MMSAD24 and MMSAD27 should be deleted. Representation from Natural England is factually incorrect. Also other detailed comments about policy</p>		
Policy ENV4 c) to g) General Policy for Canal Related Development (these sections were numbered b) to d) in the PO draft).		<p>Historic England: Recommend that wording in relation to heritage value is amended.</p> <p>Environment Agency: Development next to canal should enhance landscaping and wildlife.</p> <p>Canal & River Trust: Amendments to wording requested.</p>	<p>Minor change to incorporate Historic England representation.</p> <p>Policy already refers to enhancing ecological value in accordance with EA representation.</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policy justification could state that any development next to the canal should improve the canal corridor through sensitive design and landscape to enhance</p>	No Change Proposed except for clarifications in policy justification. The impact on viability is taken into account when CIL charging rates are set.	<p>Historic England: representation received but does not refer to this policy.</p> <p>Local Nature Partnership and Wildlife Trust: Support modifications to policy.</p>	<p>Canal & River Trust: Request further discussion about policy.</p>	<p>Minor factual changes in supporting text and table.</p>	No

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		Inland Waterways Association: Support policy. Lichfield and Hatherton Canal Restoration Trust: Support policy, but amendment to supporting text re delivery requested.		the canal's value as a wildlife corridor. Catalyst Capital: Developer contributions to canal improvements should be subject to viability.					
Policy EN5: Policy Wording		Historic England: raise issues about why policy focuses on development in conservation areas only. We would recommend the inclusion of non-designated archaeology within the list referenced. Recommend revision to the wording of the policy.	Introduction to policy amended to include reference to non-designated heritage assets.	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed. Friends of the Earth: Policy should refer to role of trees in conservation areas	Minor change to text to align with NPPF. No Change Proposed: Trees are protected under other legislation as well as existing planning policies such as "saved" UDP Policy ENV18	Friends of the Earth: representation received but does not refer to this policy	No	Minor updating of supporting text.	Yes, unless proposals affect trees
Policy EN6: Policy Wording		Historic England: if this development may have an impact upon heritage assets this should be considered at this stage to assess whether the principle of development is acceptable rather than left to the development management stage.	Wording has been amended to provide further explanation of the purpose of the policy.	Historic England: Support amended policy.	Reference added to assets and constraints that affect the site.	No	No	Minor updating of supporting text.	Yes
Policy EN7: Policy Wording		Historic England: if this development may have an	Policy has been substantially re-written to address	Yes, large number of representations, including from Historic	Yes, wording is proposed to be	No	Detailed representations from Beacon	Yes, amendments to policy and to supporting text to	No – policy has been substantially rewritten and there

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		impact upon heritage assets this should be considered at this stage to assess whether the principle of development is acceptable rather than left to the development management stage. Rambler's: Would favour a change in the wording to provide public access.	this and other issues	England who wish to meet to discuss.	changed substantially		Action Group, other residents, Historic England and Valerie Vaz MP, in particular about the policy wording for Enabling Development.	improve clarity and include suggestions from representations by Beacon Action Group and residents. No change to Enabling Development section of policy as Historic England have provided guidance on how to change it.	are still outstanding objections
Chapter 8 Sustainable Waste Management									
Policy W1: Policy Wording		Staffordshire County Council: Plan should encourage the development of additional recycling capacity for CD&EW to meet the requirements for materials arising from regeneration projects within the urban area.	No further changes proposed - realistically the scope for developing new CD&EW recycling facilities in a largely urban area such as Walsall is limited, and Black Country Core Strategy Policy WM5 already encourages developers to recycle and optimise the use of site waste.	No	No	No	No	Amendment to text of monitoring section to provide consistency with other policies.	Yes
Policy W2: Policy Wording		No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Policy W2: Specific Sites	WS10 and all other sites.	Environment Agency: sites operating under Waste Exemptions have not been	Environment Agency: Addition of a reference to the weight given to comments from the	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional	Yes, throughput figures amended for sites WS9 and WS10. Flood risk	No representations received	Cory Environmental: Flood risk mapping for site WS10 remains incorrect.	Site names, areas, assets and constraints and notes for table checked and	Yes, except in relation to site WS10

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>identified in this report or on the map - clarification should be provided as to whether these types of waste site are being considered at all within the plan.</p> <p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p>	<p>regulatory authorities on proposals at Part b) of the policy. All sites with planning permission or lawful land use for waste management operations have been identified on the SAD Policies Map.</p> <p>Details of assets and constraints, including historic environment features, that might affect or be affected by the listed waste sites have been added.</p> <p>The SA has also considered the effects of the SAD Waste Policies on the historic environment.</p> <p>The majority of the Potential New Waste Sites identified are previously-developed industrial sites</p>	<p>information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Cory Environmental: Throughput figures should be amended.</p> <p>Flood risk mapping is also incorrect.</p>	<p>details amended for site WS11.</p> <p>See also policy EN3 in respect of flood risk mapping for site WS10.</p>			<p>updated. This is to ensure that there is consistency across all of the sites tables in the document.</p>	
Policy W3: Policy Wordingr		<p>Environment Agency: Waste transfer operations pose significant fire risk so Potential Waste Sites should not be located next to major travel routes.</p>	<p>Amendments to policy and justification to provide clarification.</p>	<p>Yes, representation from EA about fire risk.</p>	<p>Yes, policy amended to address EA representation re fire risk (this amendment was omitted from the Publication Draft).</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, taking account of amendment.</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy W3: Specific Sites	WP13 and all other sites	<p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Resident: no recognition in the policy to show the increase in the number of HGVs travelling through local "B" class roads on their way to the sites identified in Aldridge.</p>	<p>Details of assets and constraints, including historic environment features, that might affect or be affected by the listed waste sites have been added.</p> <p>The majority of the Potential New Waste Sites identified are previously-developed industrial sites.</p> <p>The SA has also considered the effects of the SAD Waste Policies on the historic environment.</p> <p>No change proposed with respect to resident representation: Applications for new waste management developments are already subject to existing local plan policies that require applicants to provide information about the number of HGV movements anticipated, the types of vehicles used, and the effects this is likely to have on the road network.</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Environment Agency and St Francis Group: Site WP13 is not suitable for waste operation and landowner is unwilling to use for this purpose.</p>	<p>Yes, flood risk details added for sites WP11 and WP17, site WP13 deleted.</p>	<p>Environment Agency: welcome and support inclusion of text re fire risks and the deletion of site WP13.</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>Site names, areas, assets and constraints and notes for table checked and updated. This is to ensure that there is consistency across all of the sites tables in the document.</p>	<p>Yes, taking account of amendment</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
Policy W4: Policy Wording		Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.	Change proposed. Amendments to policy and justification to provide clarification. The potential effects of waste management development on the historic environment have been evaluated for each of the Potential New Waste Sites identified in the SAD. The majority of the Potential New Waste Sites identified are previously-developed industrial sites. The SA has also considered the effects of the SAD Waste Policies on the historic environment.	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.	No	No	No	No	Yes
Policy W4: Specific Sites	WP1, WP3 and all other sites	Resident: Aldridge and Sandown Quarries have to be filled with inert materials or turned into water based sites. If the former then a proper traffic plan should be added to the policy.	No change proposed. Although Aldridge Quarry is required to be restored by infilling with inert waste as a condition of the existing planning permission, the conditions relating to restoration of Sandown Quarry	No	Yes, timescale details for site WS10 amended.	No	No	Site names, areas, assets and constraints and notes for table checked and updated. This is to ensure that there is consistency across all of the sites tables in the document.	Yes, taking account of amendment

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
			are less explicit. As there are no approved restoration programmes for either site, the requirements that restoration programmes will be expected to address, including evaluating the effects of increased HGV movements on highway infrastructure and on local communities, are set out in the Draft SAD Minerals Policies.						
Chapter 9 Sustainable Use of Minerals									
Policy M1: Policy Wording		Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting. We are also keen to see minerals working for locally distinctive building	Amendment to justification explaining why the building stone resources present in Walsall, why they are unlikely to be worked during the plan period, and why it is sufficient to rely on existing BCCS policy to evaluate any proposals that do come forward (see BCCS Policies MIN4 and MIN5). The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed. Coal Authority: Should delete reference to prior extraction rarely being feasible. Minerals Products Association: Should identify safeguarding areas for individual minerals and add buffers for each . Further detailed	Yes, Coal Authority representation addressed by modifying policy text and providing additional justification. MPA representation addressed by including cross-reference to MSAs in the BCCS. In response to the Staffs CC representation, the mineral safeguarding area has ben drawn to include buffers.	Coal Authority: changes mean policy meets the requirements of the NPPF. Sttaffs CC: support modification (with reference to wording referring to close proximity to Areas of Search). Also, made factual comments in respect of the supporting text.	Coal Authority: there should be a policy on unstable land.	No	Yes, taking account of amendment. The outstanding issue for the Cioal Authority concerns the omission of a policy rather than a comment on policy that has ben set out. HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs	
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications			
		<p>material and stone that can contribute to wider objectives of local distinctiveness and place making.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p> <p>Minerals Product Association: there should be separate MSAs for each mineral even if they overlap, rather than one amorphous area for all minerals.</p> <p>Policy has been overly influenced by principle of prior extraction and has not adequately considered proximal sterilisation. Thresholds for mineral assessment and prior extraction should be removed. There is no mention of any assessment of</p>	<p>environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>EA: See policy M4.</p> <p>No change proposed in respect of MSA: The proposed MSA is in conformity with the Black Country Core Strategy 2011, which identifies a single MSA on the Minerals Key Diagram. It is not possible to show separate MSAs for each mineral commodity on the SAD Policies Map.</p> <p>Changes proposed in respect of prior extraction to address MPA and Coal Authority representations.</p> <p>Staffs CC: Amendment</p>	<p>comments also provided.</p> <p>Staffordshire County Council: Should add buffers around sites.</p>						<p>POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>mineral potential for the proposed housing and employment allocation</p> <p>Coal Authority consider statement that prior extraction is rarely feasible is not justified.</p> <p>Staffordshire County Council: suggest that the policy also recognises the need to safeguard permitted mineral sites and allocations proposed in the Plan.</p>	<p>proposed to make it clear that non-mineral developments proposed near Permitted Minerals Sites and in Areas of Search must demonstrate that future mineral working will not be compromised.</p>						
Policy M2: Policy Wording		<p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential</p>	<p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>EA: See policy M4.</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Yes, Staffs County Council suggest adding buffers around identified sites.</p>	<p>No (but amendments to Policies Map are proposed).</p>	<p>Birmingham and Black Country Local Nature partnership, and Birmingham and Black Country: support the policy.</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, taking account of amendments.</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.							
Policy M2: Specific Sites		No	No	No	No	No	No	Details of assets and constraints for individual sites have been corrected.	Yes HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT
Policy M3: Policy Wording		Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.	The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.	No	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p> <p>Minerals Product Association: Policy should not ask whether arisings or demand have changed since BCCS was adopted but what is likely change to arisings if ambitious growth agenda of BCCS succeeds? Risk of under-providing for necessary infrastructure.</p>	<p>requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>EA: See Policy M4.</p> <p>No change proposed in respect of MPA: the updating refers to evidence, including the Draft Local Aggregates Assessment (November 2015) prepared by the metropolitan authorities.</p>						
Policy M4: Policy Wording	MXA1, MP1	<p>Lichfield DC: Where mineral development is located near Lichfield border consideration should be given to impacts on residents beyond the Walsall Boundary, particularly impact of transport and amenity and</p>	<p>Yes: wording amended to address representation from Lichfield DC (note that site MXA1 was referred to in policy M5 in PO SAD).</p> <p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Landowner: Site MP1 (Birch Lane, former Aldridge Quarry) has</p>	<p>No (but amendments to Policies Map are proposed)</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, taking account of amendments</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>suitable mitigation should be secured.</p> <p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p>	<p>environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to include references to the issues identified by the EA, where they were not already addressed in the Draft SAD.</p> <p>EA: See Policy M4</p>	winnable sand and gravel resources					<p>POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>
Policy M5: Policy Wording	MXA2	Lichfield DC: Where mineral development is located near Lichfield border consideration should be given to impacts on residents beyond the Walsall	Yes: wording amended to address representation from Lichfield DC (note that site MXA1 was referred to in policy M5 in PO SAD).	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.	No (but amendments to Policies Map are proposed).	No representations received	No representations received	Minor typing correction	<p>Yes, taking account of amendments</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>Boundary, particularly impact of transport and amenity and suitable mitigation should be secured.</p> <p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p> <p>Mineral Product Association: Policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for new sites to come</p>	<p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to include references to the issues identified by the EA, where they were not already addressed in the Draft SAD.</p> <p>No change proposed in respect of MPA representation: the supporting text is to be updated to refer to available evidence, including the Draft West Midlands Local Aggregate Assessment (November 2015). The SAD & AAP Minerals Study</p>						<p>IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		forward to meet mineral need as required, but Local Aggregates Assessment should be available and scrutinised by the time the plan is submitted.	(2015) did not identify additional areas with realistic potential to be worked for sand and gravel. If proposals for sand and gravel extraction do come forward outside of the Areas of Search then BCCS Policy MIN2 provides the basis for such proposals to be evaluated.						
Policy M6		<p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should</p>	<p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>EA: See Policy M5.</p> <p>Ramblers: Change proposed. It is proposed to amend policy on MP7: Sandown Quarry has been</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Yes, Staffs County Council advise that clay imports should be monitored.</p>	No (but amendments to Policies Map are proposed).	No representations received	No representations received	Minor typing correction.	<p>Yes, taking account of amendments</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		address impact on water and other detailed issues. Walsall Group of The Ramblers: ges over the years from extraction to restoration via infilling with waste products. We would seek to obtain guarantees from the Council that wherever possible nearby local Rights of Way remain open and viable throughout all stages in the development.	amended to include a reference to the need for the restored site to link to the public footpath network including Public Right of Way Ald1. Otherwise, the minerals policies have already identified the Public Rights of Way that could be affected by future mineral extraction, or could help to link open spaces created on restored sites. There is no need for the SAD to go into any further detail, because arrangements are already in place to consult the Walsall Group of the Ramblers and the Local Access Forum on planning applications affecting Public Rights of Way, including applications for mineral extraction.						
Policy M7	MXA3, MP2, MP7, MXP3	Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or	The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.	No change in respect of FoE representations but changes are proposed in respect of Natural England. Additional maps are also proposed.	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes, taking account of representations HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs	
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications			
		<p>what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p> <p>EA and Natural England: MP2: Atlas Quarry - (d) iv. Should make reference to Stubbers Green Bog SSSI and Swan Pool & the Swag SSSI.</p>	<p>(2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to include references to the issues identified by the EA, where they were not already addressed in the Draft SAD.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the policies for Atlas Quarry and the Recordon Land to make references to both SSSIs.</p>	<p>Friends of the Earth express concern about impact on Stubbers Green designated sites.</p> <p>Natural England seek clarity about aspects of the policy for these sites.</p>						<p>IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>
Policy M8	MP6, MP9	<p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to</p>	<p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Yes, detailed comments in respect</p>	<p>Changes proposed in respect of Natural England representation but not in respect of the others.</p>	<p>No representations received</p>	<p>Parkhill Estates: Detailed comments on clash between existing minerals planning permission and SSSI designation for site MP9.</p> <p>Natural England: "note" the existence of the</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes, taking account of amendments</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED</p>	

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Natural England: understands that permitted reserves of clay are remaining at site MP6 and, therefore, questions why this is not being pursued ahead of fresh reserves at Area of Search MXA9 'New land North of A461'.</p> <p>Site MP9 (Highfields North): plan identifies a significant proportion of land located within Jockey Fields Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) as appropriate for mineral extraction, subject to criteria. Natural England understands proposed policies M6 and M8 to be contrary to the requirements of paragraphs 110 and 118 of the NPPF. We ask whether your authority is confident that you have fully</p>	<p>Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to include references to the issues identified by the EA, where they were not already addressed in the Draft SAD.</p> <p>No change proposed in respect of MP6.</p> <p>There is an approved restoration programme for this site (07/0046/WA/E1), which already includes proposals to enhance the wildlife corridors and does not permit any further mineral extraction.</p> <p>Changes proposed in respect of MP9: the dormant mineral permission at Highfields North is still in effect, and a local plan such as the SAD cannot override an existing planning permission and it is</p>	<p>of site MP9 (Jockeys Fields area) from Friends of the Earth, Natural England, and Parkhill Estates.</p>			<p>dormant minerals permission and the SSSI designation for site MP9.</p>		<p>ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>investigated the potential for alternatives and had the appropriate strategic discussions with neighbouring authorities in respect of mineral planning. We advise the Council to remove land within Jockey Fields SSSI from proposed SAD Policies MA6 and MA8.</p> <p>Environment Agency raise similar concerns about this site.</p> <p>Otherwise, the policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p> <p>Holford Farm Group and Environment Agency : Proposal to highlight an indicative Area of Search MXA9 (Land North of A461) within Policy</p>	<p>not possible to remove the SSSI from the site boundary or from the SAD policy . However, it is proposed to amend this policy to mitigate the effects of working within the permitted area on the SSSI as far as possible.</p> <p>In respect of Holford representation, the Area of Search designation has been removed from the SAD and replaced with a more general policy statement on further brick clay extraction proposals outside the Highfields North permitted site.</p>						

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		M7 is not accepted.							
Policy M9	MP5 (Brownhills Common) and Yorks Bridge	<p>Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p>	<p>The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study (2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to include references to the issues identified by the EA, where they were not already addressed in the Draft SAD.</p>	<p>Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.</p> <p>Friends of the Earth: Proposals for Brownhills Common should be refused unless designated site issues are addressed.</p> <p>Potters' Clay and Coal Company: York's Bridge should be retained as an area of search for fireclay.</p> <p>Natural England: HRA of policy is required.</p>	Yes, policy wording amended, but not in respect of FoE representation.	Natural England: support the approach to HRA, setting out that it should be done at project level. Staffordshire County Council: factual comment that the Staffordshire Minerals Local Plan	No representations received	No. Minor updates to supporting text, including in respect of the Staffordshire Minerals Local Plan.	<p>Yes, taking account of amendments</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>
M10: Policy Wording Energy Minerals - Unconventional Hydrocarbons		Historic England: There is minimal information available about the potential impact that new waste and minerals sites may have on the historic environment or	The effects of potential mineral extraction sites and areas on the historic environment have been evaluated, including through the SAD & AAP Minerals Study	Historic England: The positive amendments in relation to the historic environment, and additional information on site constraints, within this publication iteration of the document are welcomed.	No	No representations received	No representations received	No. minor updating to supporting text in respect of evidence.	<p>Yes</p> <p>HOWEVER, THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF MOST MINERAL PROPOSALS THAT INVOLVE THESE POLICIES IS LIKELY TO BE</p>

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		<p>what assessment has been undertaken to assess what impact there may be on the significance of heritage assets and their setting.</p> <p>Environment Agency: policies recognise most potential environmental issues. Wish to highlight that any future planning application for new or extended quarry activities should address impact on water and other detailed issues.</p>	<p>(2015) published on the Evidence page of the Council website. Where potential effects on heritage assets have been identified appropriate requirements have been included in the policies.</p> <p>EA: See Policy M9</p>						<p>SUCH THAT A DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF EMERGING POLICIES WILL BE REQUIRED REGARDLESS OF POLICY WEIGHT</p>
Chapter 10 Transport and Infrastructure									
Policy T2: Bus Services		No	No	WMITA: Policy should refer to bus network development plan.	Amendment is proposed to address representation	No representations received	No representations received	Minor typing correction	Yes, taking account of amendments
Policy T3: The Rail Network		WMITA wishes that proposed new stations at James Bridge and Willenhall and any associated park and ride facilities are referenced and protected in the SAD.	No change Proposed. Park and Ride is allocated at Bradley Lane due to the advanced nature of the proposal. Elsewhere, the precise locations for park and ride will be dealt with through planning applications at the appropriate time.	WMITA: Policy should refer to Black Country Rapid Transit Review Study.	Amendment is proposed to address representation.	No representations received	No representations received	No	Yes, taking account of amendments
Policy T4: The Highway Network		Highways England: needs access to land adjacent to	Reference to 25m buffer has been	Friends of the Earth: Should refer to NPPF	Amendment is proposed to reflect NPPF reference to	Highways England: Welcome proposed	Friends of the Earth: Still no reference to NPPF	Minor typing correction	Yes, taking account of amendments

Policy or Issue	Site Reference(s)	Preferred Option Stage		Publication Stage		Pre-Submission Modifications		Further Proposed Modifications if they affect Policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications, taking into account FPMs
		Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Publication Stage?	Objection(s)?	Has policy been amended for Pre-Submission Modifications Stage?	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Objection Remains despite Modifications		
		carriageway of Strategic Highways Network for maintenance or improvement works and suggest a 25m buffer adjacent to the highway is protected.	added to policy justification.	requirement for travel plans	sustainable transport modes	modifications to policy.	requirement for travel plans.		
Policy T5: Highway Improvement		No	No	WMITA: Policy should add reference to making an efficient use of the road network.	Amendment is proposed to address representation.	Highways England: Welcome specific commitment to support the improvement of M6 Junction 10.	No representations received	Minor typing correction.	Yes

Walsall Town Centre Area Action Plan - Policy Weight at Submission Stage

The table below sets out which AAP policies were the subject of representations in response to the Preferred Options, Publication and Pre-Submission Modification stages of public consultation. The nature of the objections received impact on the level of weight emerging policies can be given when determining planning applications. If a policy has been subject to a main modification that also impacts on the weight the policy can be given.

There are three different levels of weight given to policies as the pre-submission stage.

1) Significant Weight: (shown in green)

- Policies where no objections have been received at any stage of the consultation;
- Policies where there were objections but following subsequent stages of the plan or proposed modifications the consultee has provided written confirmation that their objections have been addressed; and
- Policies that are subject to minor modifications that do not impact on the purpose or function of the policy and that are not subject to objections.

2) Some Weight: (shown in amber)

- Policies where there have been objections at the Preferred Option or Publication Stage of consultation but where the Council considers the objections to have been addressed by subsequent versions of the plan or proposed modifications. Significant weight can only be given where the consultee has confirmed in writing the objection has been satisfied (see above);
- Policies that are subject to new objections that have only been raised at the Pre-Submission Modification consultation stage. This is because the pre-submission modification consultation stage was only about the proposed modifications so new objections are not considered to carry the same influence as those made at the other stages of consultation;
- Policies that are subject to objections around the detail of the policy or a specific site the policy covers but where the overall purpose of the policy or the proposals for (other) particular sites is /are not disputed by any representations; and
- Policies that are subject to main modifications at the Pre-Submission Modification consultation but where the proposed modification has received no objections.

3) No Weight: (shown in red)

- Policies where there are outstanding significant objections; and
- Policies that are subject to modifications that there have been subject to objections.

Where policies refer to specific sites, either in a table attached to the policy or shown on the Policies Map, the list below separates representations or modifications that refer to the policy in general from those that refer to specific sites.

The policy references used are taken from the Pre-Submission Modification version of the plan.

All of the consultation representations and the Council's responses are published at the Council's website at:

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

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Chapter 1: Walsall Town Centre									
The Vision		No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
The Objectives		Request for additional objective on safety from PCCWM (1285). Requests for additional wording around heritage and environmental sustainability (HE 2149 and NE 2274).	PCCWM (1285) withdrawn objections as they do not impact on soundness – Objection overcome. NE 2274 and HE 2149 support the amendments to the objective - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes objections overcome.
Policy AAP1: Walsall Town Centre Boundary	General	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Allocation on Policies Map	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part a)	Suggestion for reference to the historic environment (HE 2149).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
Chapter 3: A Place for Shopping									
Policy AAPS1: Primary Shopping Area (PSA)	General approach of policy	See below for objections on the boundary.	N/A	See below for objections on the boundary.	No	N/A	See below for objections on the boundary.	No	No – outstanding significant objections that go to the heart of the policy.
	Allocation on Policies Map	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115) Requests a “PSA	No amendments made to the PSA boundary.	(Norton and Proffitt 115) Maintained objection requesting	No	N/A	A new objection has been raised in respect of the PSA	No amendments made to the PSA boundary.	No– outstanding significant objections..

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
		<i>Expansion Area</i> ”. (AEW UK 1259) Request changes to the PSA to include their site.		<i>“PSA Expansion Area”</i> . (AEW UK 1259) Maintained requests for changes to the PSA to include their site. (Zurich Assurance 18) Suggested reducing PSA.			boundary (Topland 2228). Previous objections considered to be maintained.		
	Part a)	See above.	No	See above	No	N/A	N/A	No	No– outstanding significant objections.
	Part b)	Yes (AEW UK 1259) Requests amendments to wording.	Plan amended to reflect representation. No response from AEW UK (1259) on this change to the plan. Objection considered to be overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Some – the objection is considered to be overcome but this has not been confirmed by consultee.
	Part c)	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115) Requests a <i>“PSA Expansion Area”</i> .	No amendments made to the PSA boundary.	(Norton and Proffitt 115) Maintained objection requesting <i>“PSA Expansion Area”</i> .	No	N/A	A new objection has been raised in regards to the PSA boundary (Topland 2228). Previous objections considered to be maintained.	No	No– outstanding significant objections
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPS2: New Retail Development	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	No – the objection from HE is overcome but there are outstanding significant objections that go to the heart of the policy.
	Part a)	Yes (1259 AEW UK) suggests the retail targets are not	No amendments made to the retail figures.	AEW UK (1259) Objections maintained.	No	N/A	A new objection has been raised questioning the	No	No – outstanding significant objections.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
		ambitious enough and seeks changes to the PSA.		Yes (Zurich Assurance 18, Walsall Bescot Pradera Limited 2608, Ropemaker Properties Limited 3556, Norton and Proffitt 115a) Requests for changes to the Primary Shopping Area. Yes (Zurich Assurance 18) objected to the reference to a 3 storey development.			retail figures and requesting a stronger approach to resisting out-of-centre developments (Topland 2228). Previous objections considered to be maintained.		
	Part b)	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115 and AEW UK 1259) objects to the order of sequential sites	No amendments made to list	(Norton and Proffitt 115a and AEW UK 1259) Maintained objection over the order of sequential sites. (Zurich Assurance 18, Walsall Bescot Pradera Limited 2608 and Ropemaker Properties Limited 3556) Objections to the identification of sequential sites. (Zurich Assurance 18) Suggests that the wording around Crown Wharf needs to be strengthened.	No	N/A	See above Previous objections considered to be maintained.	No	No– outstanding significant objections.
	Part c)	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115) suggested amendments to wording.	Norton and Proffitt 115 supports revised wording - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– Objections overcome.
	Part d)	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115) suggested amendments to wording.	Norton and Proffitt 115 supports revised wording - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– Objections overcome.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Policy AAP3: The New Walsall Market	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment. Suggestion (EA 2658) that watercourse which runs under the site should be restored.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome. EA (2658) support modifications to plan and withdrawn previous comments about opening up watercourses – Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome and no objections that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Allocation on Policies Map	No	N/A	Yes (Zurich Assurance 18, Rigby 1860, Brown 1840) Object to location and the possibility that the market will impact on other developments.	No	N/A	N/A	No	Some – the Market has planning permission and the consultees have provided no evidence to support objection.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	A new objection on the timeframe set out for delivering the new market (Topland 2228).	No	Yes - as objection is about the supporting information and not the policy approach.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Chapter 4: A Place for Business									
Policy AAPB1: Office Development	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
		impact on the historic environment.	overcome.						
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received
Policy AAPB2: Social Enterprise Zone	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No	Yes - no objections received that question the role or purpose of the policy
	Part a)	(Vine Trust 1510) Suggested amendments to the boundary of the zone.	Boundary amended to reflect some of the suggestion but not all. No further consultation response received from 1510. Objection considered to be overcome.	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115a) Site TC25 residential conversion should be allowed.	Yes – wording proposed to make policy more flexible.	No response received. Objection considered to be overcome by proposed modification.	No response received	No	Some – the objections are considered to be overcome but this has not been confirmed by consultees.
	Part b)	Yes (HE 2149) suggested a reference to the use of historic buildings.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes- Objections overcome.
Policy AAPB3: Town Centre Employment Land	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome and no objections received that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	Yes (J Hayward 2606) – seeks as wide a range of uses as possible for site TC47.	Yes proposed modification for clarification but not to change the possible uses of site.	No J Hayward (2606) objection maintained.	Yes (J Hayward 2606) maintains objection on the policy not being flexible enough.	No	Some – the policy approach is supported but there is an objection to the approach towards a specific site. Policy cannot be given

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
									weight in respect of the site subject to the objection (TC47).see also pages 10 and 18
Chapter 5: A Place for Leisure									
Policy AAPLE1: New Leisure Developments	General approach of policy	Yes (1285 PCCWM) requests references to safety.	PCCWM 1285 support the revisions made to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	No	No	Yes - Objections overcome and no objection received that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part f)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part g)	No	N/A	N/A New part	Yes – new part of policy to ensure leisure uses are integrated.	No response received.	No response received.	No	Some – a new part of the policy was proposed as a Main Modification. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
Policy AAPLE2: Sport and Cultural Facilities	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part f)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLE3: Hotel, Conference and Banqueting Provision	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received
Policy AAPLE4: Walsall Canal	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested more detail on the historic character of the canal.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome and no objections received that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	(Canal & River Trust 2613) suggested additional wording on moorings.	Canal & River Trust (2613) support the amendments to the plan – objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objection overcome.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
									received.
	Part e)	Yes (EA 2658) requested further references to green infrastructure.		Yes (EA 2658) – suggested further additions to wording.	Yes – proposed wording to incorporate suggestions.	EA (2658) confirmed they now support the policy – objection overcome.	Request for additional wording to cover protecting the canals natural environment (Canal & River Trust 3539).	Yes minor modification to Policy Justification.	Some - the objections are considered overcome and the proposed change is to the policy justification only.
Chapter 6: A Place for Living									
Policy AAPLV1: Residential Developments	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV2: Education	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment. Request of addition wording around safety (PCCWM 1285).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome. PCCWM (1285) support the revisions made to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome and no objections received that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	No	N/A	Yes (J Hayward 2606) allocation of site TC46	No	N/A	Yes (J Hayward 2606) objection	No	Some – Objection to detailed allocation of

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
				for education purposes under Policy AAPLV2 is too restrictive. (Walsall College 1466) Site TC47 should be allocated for education.			maintained - allocation of site TC46 for education purposes under Policy AAPLV2 is too restrictive.		a site but not to the overall approach of the policy. Policy cannot be given weight in respect of the sites that are subject to the objections (TC46 and TC47). See also pages 7 and 18
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part C)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV3: Health Care Provision	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part a)			No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV4: Community Facilities	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV5: Protecting and Enhancing Historic	General approach of policy	Suggestions of additional wording (HE 2149).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Character and Local Distinctiveness		Detailed requests for additional wording on security (PCCWM 1285).	PCCWM (1285) support the revisions made to the plan - Objection overcome. Where additions have not been made 285 have withdrawn objections as they do not impact on soundness – Objection overcome.						
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV6: Securing Good Design	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received that that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	Questioned the justification for 4 storeys (HE 2149).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.						Yes - Objections overcome.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV7: Enhancing the	General approach of policy	Suggestions of additional wording	HE (2149) support the amendments to	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections Overcome.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Public Realm		on historic environment (HE 2149). Requests for inclusion of green infrastructure (EA 2658).	the plan - Objection overcome. EA (2658) Support amendments to the plan – objection overcome.						
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPLV8: Environmental Infrastructure	General approach of policy	(NE 2274) requested references to local scale renewable energy.	NE (2274) supports the amendments to the plan – Objection Overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part f)	Should be expanded to include opening up of watercourses	EA (2658) support modifications to plan and redact	No	No	EA 2658 confirmed they now support the policy – objection	N/A	No	Yes- Objections overcome.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
		and further detail on floodrisk (EA 2658). Further details should be added on the benefits of green infrastructure (EA 2658).	previous comments about opening up watercourses – Objections overcome.			overcome.			
	Part g)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
Chapter 7: Transport, Movement and Accessibility									
Policy AAPT1: Pedestrian Movement, Access and Linkages	General approach of policy	Request for strengthening of wording (WMITA 2275).	No	WMITA (2275) Requests for further wording.	No – but linkages to public transport has been addressed through the modification proposed to AAPT3 new part e).	N/A	No response was received from WMITA (2275) – objections considered overcome.		Some – Objections considered overcome but no response from consultee to confirm.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part b)	Request for additional wording on safety (PCCWM 1285).	PCCWM (1285) support the revisions made to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.
Policy AAPT2: Cycling	General approach of policy	Request for additional wording on safety (PCCWM 1285).	PCCWM 1285 support the revisions made to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome and no objections raised that that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part b)	Yes (AEW UK 1259) Object to cycle path in retail park area.		Maintained (AEW UK 1259) objection to cycle path.	No	No	Yes (AEW UK 1259) Objection maintained.	No	No - outstanding objections.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Policy AAPT3: Public Transport	General approach of policy	Request for additional wording on safety (PCCWM 1285).	PCCWM 1285 support the revisions made to the plan. - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes –no objections that question the role or purpose of the policy.
	Part a)	Yes (AEW UK 1259) Object to loss of retail park space.		AEW UK (1259) maintained objection to loss of retail park space.	No	No	Yes (AEW UK 1259) Objection maintained.	No	No - outstanding significant objections.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	Yes – additional text on St Pauls bus station.	N/A	N/A	No	Some – policy was subject to a Main Modification. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
	Part c)	No	N/A	Yes (WMITA 2275) Further development under Policy AATP3, Point C, regarding SPRINT.	No	No response was received from WMITA 2275 – objections considered overcome.	No response was received from WMITA 2275 – objections considered overcome.	No	Some – Objections considered overcome but no response from consultee to confirm.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e) – new part	No – n/a as a new part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage.	No – n/a as a new part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage.	No – n/a as a new part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage.	Yes - additional part of policy to cover linkages between different forms of public transport.	No response received.	No response received.	No	Some – new part of the policy proposed as a Main Modification. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
	Part f) was part e before Pre-Submission Modification stage.	No	N/A	No	No – was part e)	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
Policy AAPT4: Road Improvements	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment. Request for reference to	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome. PCCWM (1285) support the revisions	No	Yes – the modifications proposed alter the way the policy is implemented	No response received	No response received	No	Some – policy was subject to a Main Modification that impacts on how the policy would be implemented. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
		consulting with the PCCWM (1285).	made to the plan - Objection overcome.						
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	Yes – additional text to cover developer contributions to all developments that could create traffic on the ring road.	No response received.	No response received.	No	Some – policy was subject to a Main Modification that impacts on how the policy would be implemented. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
	Part b)	Request for wording around bus capacity (WMITA 2275).	No	Request for further wording around bus capacity (WMITA 2275).	Yes – additional text to cover improvements needed to the roads for public transport.	No response was received from WMITA 2275 – objections considered overcome.	No response was received from WMITA 2275 – objections considered overcome.	No	Some policy was subject to a Main Modification that impacts on how the policy would be implemented. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – No objections received.
Policy AAPT5: Car Parking	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment. Request for additional wording on safety (PCCWM 1285).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome. PCCWM (1285) support the revisions made to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	Yes – removal of reference to short stay parking only.	No response received.	No response received.	No	Some – policy was subject to a Main Modification. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Chapter 8: A Place for Investment									
Policy AAPINV1: Regeneration Strategy	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPINV2: St Matthew's Quarter	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic environment.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome. But check weight for policies crossed referenced.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	Yes (Norton and Proffitt 115a) allocation should allow for all types of retailing.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
									site for specific types of retail as it is subject to the objection (TC26).
Policy AAPINV3: Walsall Gigaport	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic character. Request for further consideration of floodrisk (EA 2658).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome. EA (2658) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome
	Part a)	No	N/A	Not to policy overall – but objection to site TC46 (J Hayward 2606) allocation for education purposes under Policy AAPLV2 is too restrictive.	No	N/A	N/A	No	Some - Objection to detailed allocation of a site but not the overall approach of the policy. Policy cannot be given weight in respect of the site subject to the objection (TC46).See also pages (see also page 7 and 10)
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	Yes (Brown 1840) - only build on car park unless a multi storey car park is provided first.	No	N/A	N/A	No	Some – The approach in the car parking policy will maintain the right level of car parking to meet the centres needs before allowing any car parks are developed (TC50).
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - no objections received.
	Part e)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - no objections received.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
Policy AAPINV4: Walsall Waterfront	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic character.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	Yes (Millington 3530) Request a marina.	No	N/A	N/A	No	Some – the objector did not provide any evidence to support objection so the objection is not considered significant.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	Yes – amendments to correct site information.	N/A	N/A	No	Some - policy was subject to a Main Modification. This has received no objections so can be given some weight.
	Part e)	Further references needed for the protection and enhancement of the canal (EA 2658).		Further references needed for the protection and enhancement of the canal (EA 2658).	Yes – additional text on canal.	Yes – EA 2658 support the modifications made in respect of canals	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.
	Part f)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part g)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPINV5: Park Street Shopping Core	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic character.	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPINV6: Secondary Development Sites	General approach of policy	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic character. Request for further consideration of floodrisk (EA 2658).	HE (2149) supports the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome. EA (2658) supports the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – Objections overcome.
	Part a)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part b)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part c)	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
Policy AAPINV7: Addressing Potential Site Constraints	General approach of policy	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – No overall objections and a; objections to parts of policy overcome.
	Part a) Flood Risk	No	N/A	No	No		New objection to the wording in Policy Justification around the risk of flooding (EA 2658).	Yes – minor proposed modification to Policy Justification text	Yes – objection to detailed wording in policy justification and not the policy approach. Also changes agreed with the consultee (EA

Policy	Allocation or Part of Policy	Subject to Objection at Preferred Option Stage	Amendments to Plan Supported as Overcoming Objections	Subject to Objection at Publication Stage	Subject to Main Modification	Modification Supported as Overcoming Objection	Subject to Objection at Modification stage / Modification Subject to Objection	Further Proposed Modification – if it affects the policy	Weight to be given when determining planning applications
									2658).
	Part b) Water Quality	Request for additional wording (EA 2658).	EA (2658) supports amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– Objections overcome
	Part c) Air Quality	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes– no objections received.
	Part d) Noise Pollution	No	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes – no objections received.
	Part e) Ground Contamination	Request (681 Coal Authority) for additional wording. Requests for additional wording (EA 2658).	Coal Authority (681) supports the amendments to the plan – Objections overcome EA (2658) supports amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.		No	N/A	N/A	No	Yes - Objections overcome.
	Part f) Minerals	Yes (HE 2149) requested greater consideration of the impact on the historic character. Objection to the wording used (Coal Authority 681).	HE (2149) support the amendments to the plan - Objection overcome.	Maintained objection (Coal Authority 681).	Yes – revised wording to address Coal Authorities comments.	Yes – Coal Authority 281 support the modification Objection overcome.	No No	No No	Yes – Objections Overcome.
	Part g) Nature Conservation	N/A New Part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage.	N/A New Part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage.	N/A New Part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage.	Yes – Main Modification proposing new part of policy.	No	No	No	Some – new part of policy added at Pre-Submission Modification stage. but not subject to any objections.

N.B Vodafone and Telefonica (O2) argued at the Publication stage that plan is missing a Telecommunications Policy.