

## Brereton Michael

---

**From:** Ball Neville  
**Sent:** 10 December 2013 14:17  
**To:** Ball Neville  
**Subject:** FW: SAD Document Area IN89

---

**From:** Ball Neville  
**Sent:** 24 April 2013 18:03  
**To:** David Galt  
**Subject:** RE: SAD Document Area IN89

Thank you for your enquiry,

The current formal planning status of the land is that Walsall's existing adopted development plan (the Unitary Development Plan - UDP) which was adopted in 2005 allocates the land as a proposed new employment site (site E10 under Proposal JP1). This designation dates back to proposals of the Black Country Development Corporation in the 1990's and I can advise that no person has put the land forward for development since then. The UDP allocation is the only reason that it is included in the list of employment land in chapter 4 of the SAD Issues and Options Report.

However, one of the objectives of the Issues and Options Report is to review all existing development plan designations to consider whether or not they are still appropriate. As part of this review, we have carried out or commissioned various studies, including ones of Land for Industry (the Employment Land Review – ELR) and Open Space (the Playing Pitch Strategy). These studies can be viewed from the Evidence page of our web site at [http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_development\\_framework/evidence.htm](http://cms.walsall.gov.uk/index/environment/planning/planning_policy/local_development_framework/evidence.htm)

The Playing Pitch Strategy observed that the land is used as a sports field. As you have noted, the Employment Land Review suggested that the existing allocation of the land in the UDP as employment land should be retained (ELR). This suggestion was made prior to the publication by the Government of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, amongst other matters, places greater importance on protecting existing playing fields: the NPPF overrides the UDP allocation in this respect. In Chapter 4 of the Issues and Options Report, as shown on Map 4.1, we therefore recommend that the current allocation as a new employment site is removed (which would release it from the supply of potential employment land). This recommendation is reflected in Chapter 6 and Map 6.1 which show the land as proposed open space for allocation.

In Chapter 6, the land, together with the area to the north-east next to the Black Country Route roundabout, is numbered site OS4060. On the ward map for Bentley and Darlaston North, the Open Space proposal (shown in green) over-rides any land for industry proposal (which would be shown in purple).

You will also be interested in a decision of the Council in 2012 concerning the adoption of the Local Development Order to support the Black Country Enterprise Zone. The report to Council can be viewed at <http://www2.walsall.gov.uk/CMISWebPublic/Binary.ashx?Document=11550>, in particular paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12. The decision means that the Council excluded your family's land from the area for which the Local Development Order grants planning permission for industrial and other development.

The Site Allocation Document has to pass through several stages before it can be adopted by the Council. However, if the current proposals in the Issues and Options Report are retained in the final version of the document, I can confirm that they would result in the UDP being replaced by the allocation of the site as Open Space. This would resolve the long-standing conflict between the development plan allocation and the current use of the site.

I note your support for this proposal and I hope the above explanation addresses your concerns.

Neville Ball  
Planning Policy Team  
Regeneration Directorate  
Walsall Council  
Civic Centre  
Darwall Street  
Walsall  
WS1 1DG

Telephone (01922) 658025

"The information in this message should be regarded as confidential and is intended for the addressee only unless explicitly stated. If you have received this message in error it must be deleted and the sender notified. The views expressed in this message are personal and not necessarily those of Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council unless explicitly stated. Please be aware that e-mails sent to or received from Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council may be intercepted and read by the Council, and may be provided to third parties under the Freedom of Information Act. Interception will only occur to ensure compliance with Council policies or procedures or regulatory obligations, to prevent or deter crime, or for the purposes of essential maintenance or support of the e-mail system".



## Walsall Planning 2026: Have Your Say

Consultation 22/04/2013 to 03/06/2013

Find out more at [www.walsall.gov.uk/planning](http://www.walsall.gov.uk/planning)



---

**From:** David Galt [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 April 2013 16:25  
**To:** [LDF@walsall.gov.uk](mailto:LDF@walsall.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** SAD Document Area IN89

Dear Sirs,

I have recently been looking at your Site Allocation Document published on the internet. It appears that one piece of land IN89 has been proposed as industrial land. This land is owned within my family, and its proposal for industrial use has caused much alarm.

Firstly, under the freedom of information act, can I request the name of the person or organization that has put the land forward for consideration?

Secondly, the land in question has been termed "Black Country Route Junction 1 site B". I feel that this is not a clear enough description of the land. "Bentley Youth sports fields and pavilion" or the "Old Garringtons sports field" may be truer representations of the plot of land. This in turn would give the land a fairer response from the assessment procedure.

Chapter 4 – Land for industry map 4.1 classifies the land as "Release" Can you tell me what this classification means?

For the record, it is the families' position that the land is not for sale, and the current use of land as a sports field is the preferred one. There is no intention to change the use of land to industrial.

Appendix 4a – Land for industry site summary table correctly identifies the land as “sports Pitches”, but in the evidence base column, it states that ELR states the site should be retained. Can you clarify who or what the ELR are? Have they got any authority over the council? If the council state that their preferred use is to “allocate for open space”, then is it not just a matter of reclassifying the land?

The family have been under the threat of having this land compulsory purchased since the early stages of the black country route by one body or another. I firmly believe that this is because it has some classification somewhere for possible development. It is the families wish to get this land removed from all possible development plans, and to classify it as open space.

I would ask the council to assist in this matter, and make that change.

The land itself is of extreme benefit to the families of what is a very deprived area, giving the children a focus, and a facility which is much lacking in the are.

I look forward to receiving your answers in due course.

David Galt

On behalf of Mary Galt (Landowner)