

## **Annex 1:**

### **Draft Walsall Waterfront SPD September 2005; All Representations**

Sam Ramaiah

R1581/48/U

Walsall Teaching Primary Care Trust

#### **General: General**

#### **Representation**

Referring to the wording of policy WA12 (b), the PCT would be concerned if the development at Waterfront consisted of more junk food outlets, more pubs and clubs, or any "adult" entertainment venues. The PCT would also want safety issues to be properly addressed and the area to be maintained and litter.

#### **Proposed Change**

None

#### **Response**

Noted

Whilst acknowledged, this again refers to the detail of policy WA12, which is beyond the scope of this SPD consultation process.

---

Amanda Smith

R86/29/U

English Heritage (The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)

#### **General: General**

#### **Representation**

Too much reliance in the document on terms such as "aspirational" and "iconic".

#### **Proposed Change**

As above - terms such as aspirational and iconic should be defined more clearly.

#### **Response**

Noted

---

Andrew Tyrer  
British Waterways  
**General: General**

R877/30/U

**Representation**

BW is generally supportive of the principles and vision outlined in the SPD. However, it does propose that the SPD could go further to provide more detailed guidance in a number of areas.

**Proposed Change**

As above, more detailed guidance could be provided with reference to the Black Country Canals Tourism Strategy 2004, the re-instatement of disused canal arms, the use and improvement of towpaths, "Access for All", the provision of moorings, the design and siting of new development adjacent to the canal, and the use of planning obligations. These should be incorporated at relevant points in the SPD.

**Response**

Partly agree

It is considered that there is sufficient reference to most of the points raised throughout the SPD. However, specific reference will be made to the SPD regarding the "Access for All" document (paragraph 9.1.11) and the Black Country tourism offer (paragraph 4.2.5).

---

Keith Stanley  
Walsall Chamber of Commerce & Industry

R169/1/S

**General: General**

**Representation**

Enthusiastically welcome the proposals contained within the SPD.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Welcome support

---

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Staffordshire)

**General: General**

**Representation**

Applaud the strong intention of the report to secure high quality design, but unsure if a unifying theme exists which will enable individual buildings to compose to more than the sum of their parts. See potential conflict between aspirations for "world class architecture" and relating positively to surrounding areas.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

---

Kevin Harvey

R956/37/O

Highways Agency

**General: General**

**Representation**

There is a concern that major development in Walsall town centre will impact upon junction 10 of the M6 and the motorway itself. The use of the motorway as a local access to Waterfront should be minimised.

**Proposed Change**

Reference should be made in the SPD to the need to minimise traffic generation through junction 10 and along the M6.

**Response**

Disagree

Such a requirement is beyond the scope of a site specific SPD, especially as the site is located within the town centre, ie the most sustainable location in the Borough, which will help to minimise traffic generation. Furthermore, the UDP already provides for a major mixed use development, and this SPD has no bearing on the amount of traffic generated. Nonetheless, UDP policy T4(f) requires transport assessments and major developments are expected to make provision for Green Travel Plans. Similarly, the Highways Agency will be able to comment on individual planning applications as they come forward.

---

**General: General****Representation**

Concerned about the future of Kirkpatrick's in Frederick Street which will be affected by the development.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

The wording of policy WA12 can not be changed through the SPD consultation process. However, to quote from policy WA12(d), if "existing industrial uses to the south of the canal remain, they will be able to develop and enhance their existing properties - provided that this would not have any greater adverse impact on the development of leisure and other town centre uses around the canal".

Such uses will however have to be weighed against paragraph 5.2 of the UDP which stresses that the "prime concern will be to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town, district and local centres, and to assist these centres to meet the needs of residents of residents, workers and visitors". Policy WA12 and the SPD support this aim, and can not deflect the Council from its general objectives.

---

Anna Maloney

R958/17/U

Commission for Architecture & Built Environment

**General: General****Representation**

No comments - insufficient resources to consider the SPD.

**Proposed Change****Response**

Noted

---

Vaughan Welch

R1397/45/S

Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch)

**General: General****Representation**

In summary, IWA supports the appropriate development of Waterfront, but commends the need to link this with the regeneration and upgrading of the adjoining canal system.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

The general support is welcomed, but although this project will make an important contribution, the overall regeneration of the adjoining canal system is beyond the scope of the SPD consultation process.

Amanda Smith

R86/25/S

English Heritage (The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)

**General: General**

**Representation**

Firm support for, and sharing the objectives of, the Council and WRC for the site.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Welcome support

---

Sam Ramaiah

R1581/47/U

Walsall Teaching Primary Care Trust

**General: General**

**Representation**

Referring to the wording of policy WA12 (b), the PCT would also welcome a health and fitness centre, a performing arts centre, the opening of the canal for water based activity, and a major architectural or public art feature.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

Whilst acknowledged, amendments to the actual wording of policy WA12 in the UDP can not be considered as part of this consultation process. However, it is possible that such uses will come forward through the development of the site.

---

Sellers Chartered Surveyors

**General: General****Representation**

The proposals in the SPD do not consider how the existing facilities of Kirkpatrick Limited, or any other businesses, can be retained. No alternatives, save the suggestion of being allowed to develop on site, have been proposed.

**Proposed Change**

As above - proposals should be put forward for the retention of existing businesses.

**Response**

Disagree

The wording of policy WA12 can not be changed through the SPD consultation process. However, to quote from policy WA12(d), if "existing industrial uses to the south of the canal remain, they will be able to develop and enhance their existing properties - provided that this would not have any greater adverse impact on the development of leisure and other town centre uses around the canal".

Such uses will however have to be weighed against paragraph 5.2 of the UDP which stresses that the "prime concern will be to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town, district and local centres, and to assist these centres to meet the needs of residents of residents, workers and visitors". Policy WA12 and the SPD support this aim, and can not deflect the Council from its general objectives.

---

Richard Booth

R2/49/S

Centro

**General: General****Representation**

Centro has no objection in principle to the document and supports its intentions. However, they would like to see improved accessibility to the southwest of the site for bus services, safe and secure pedestrian routes to the railway station, and that the development should not prejudice the future implementation of the 5W's route.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

The above comments are noted and will be taken into account by the Council when considering planning applications for Waterfront and its environs, particularly through the submission of transport assessments.

---

**General: General**

**Representation**

How is the development maintained in the future?

**Proposed Change**

Make reference to above in text.

**Response**

Noted

This will be adequately covered in the planning obligations element of the SPD.

**General: General**

**Representation**

Various comments were received relating to the canal, including the need for towpath improvements, new bridges, the use of public art, canal arms, the use of lighting, the re-opening of old basins, and the encouragement of canal traffic with safe moorings.

**Proposed Change**

Detailed as above.

**Response**

Agree

However, all these issues are adequately covered throughout the text of the SPD.

**General: General**

**Representation**

The local procurement of jobs should be fully considered.

**Proposed Change**

Issue should be addressed in the document.

**Response**

Disagree

This is beyond the scope of the SPD. However, the Council is promoting the issue through other forums.

**General: General****Representation**

The impact on existing businesses has not been considered.

**Proposed Change**

Amend text to rectify above.

**Response**

Disagree

The wording of policy WA12 can not be changed through the SPD consultation process. However, to quote from policy WA12(d), if "existing industrial uses to the south of the canal remain, they will be able to develop and enhance their existing properties - provided that this would not have any greater adverse impact on the development of leisure and other town centre uses around the canal".

Such uses will however have to be weighed against paragraph 5.2 of the UDP which stresses that the "prime concern will be to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town, district and local centres, and to assist these centres to meet the needs of residents of residents, workers and visitors". Policy WA12 and the SPD support this aim, and can not deflect the Council from its general objectives.

---

Sam Ramaiah

R1581/46/S

Walsall Teaching Primary Care Trust

**General: General****Representation**

The TPCT recognises Waterfront as an exciting project with the potential to make a positive contribution to improving the quality of life and the health and well-being of the residents of Walsall. Particularly welcome maintaining the character of the waterway, the emphasis on family orientated leisure, the promotion of pedestrian and cycle routes, provision of gateway/landmark features, and the inclusion of car parking. There is adequate primary health care locations close to the site to meet the needs of any increase in resident population.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

However, in the intervening period, subsequent work by the TPCT has suggested that the scale of development at this site and elsewhere in the Borough has resulted in the preparation of a Healthcare SPD. this will be offered for consultation shortly.

---



Maggie Taylor

R19/7/S

Sport England

**General: General**

**Representation**

Strongly support the SPD as it recognises the importance of maximising pedestrian and cycle movement.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Welcome support

---

Paul Gethins

R224/68/U

Environment Agency

**General: General**

**Representation**

Recommend that as the site is larger than 1 hectare that a Flood Risk Assessment should be carried out to assess the risks posed by surface water run-off. The Agency would prefer to see a strategic flood risk assessment for the entire area rather than individual assessments for each application within the site.

**Proposed Change**

As above

**Response**

Partly agree

The SPD will be changed in section 11 to reflect the need for flood risk assessments for individual developments. However, it would be difficult to carry out a flood risk assessment for the entire site at this time because we can not predict the scale and density of developments which will come forward, and the type of drainage treatments which they will pursue. Nonetheless, when considering detailed design, developments will make reference to PPS25 and policy ENV40 in the UDP regarding water resources.

---

**General: General****Representation**

Comments were received concerning surrounding manufacturing uses, including uncertainty over whether there will be a need to relocate existing uses, that development will increase land values, that there is a need to be mindful about manufacturing activity, and that businesses need to be protected and integrated.

**Proposed Change**

As reflected above.

**Response**

Noted

This is beyond the scope of the SPD, but the future development or enhancement of manufacturing properties is referred to in policy WA12(d). Manufacturing interests situated outside of the SPD area, but adjacent to it, will have their planning applications considered in the usual way.

---

Amanda Smith

R86/28/O

English Heritage (The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)

**2.4: Development of this SPD****Representation**

The legislation is surely the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, not "Planning and Compulsory Act"

**Proposed Change**

Amend to read "Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act"

**Response**

Agree

Amend as above.

---

Andrew Tyrer

R877/31/O

British Waterways

**3.3: The Site****Representation**

Final sentence of para 3.3 should be amended as below.

**Proposed Change**

Amend para 3.3 to read "BW offers advice on design, planning and technical issues, and reference should be made to the BW document "Engineering Code of Practice" for works affecting British Waterways, and the "British Waterways and Development Plans" document".

**Response**

Agree

Amend paragraph 3.3 as above.

Maggie Taylor

R19/8/S

Sport England

#### **4.2: The Vision for Waterfront**

##### **Representation**

Support for paras 4.2.2. - 4.2.4

##### **Proposed Change**

None

##### **Response**

Welcome support.

---

Andrew Tyrer

R877/32/O

British Waterways

#### **4.2.5: The Vision for Waterfront**

##### **Representation**

Para 4.2.5 could be enhanced further to ensure greater use of the canal.

##### **Proposed Change**

As above - add "especially for visiting boaters" to para 4.2.5

##### **Response**

Agree

Amend as proposed.

---

PJD Goode

R1721/22/U

Campaign to Protect Rural England (Staffordshire)

#### **4.2.6: The Vision for Waterfront**

##### **Representation**

Suggest that it will be the whole scheme which constitutes public art, and hope that any outdoor art will be designed in relation to its surroundings, not as discordant episodes in the environment.

##### **Proposed Change**

None

##### **Response**

Noted

---

**5: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

Need to separate different uses, especially from residential use.

**Proposed Change**

As above - amend text accordingly.

**Response**

Disagree

The key to the successful development of Waterfront will be an appropriate mix of uses that provides an active and vibrant quarter, which may include residential uses alongside leisure, office and other uses. Good sustainable design will be able to overcome any amenity issues or crime and safety problems.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/51/U

**5: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

The site could accommodate the Grange Theatre, library, museum and cinema, using the Gallery as a focus for creating a cultural quarter. Safe and mature leisure opportunities should be provided, including distinctive restaurants and a 24/7 culture.

**Proposed Change**

As above.

**Response**

Noted

No specific changes are proposed to the SPD as these uses are generally covered in the text of the document (see section 5) and the wording of policy WA12.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/52/U

**5: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

Residential accommodation should be provided which is aimed at young people, and live-work opportunities developed.

**Proposed Change**

As above.

**Response**

Noted

No changes proposed - the text of the document refers to a appropriate mix of residential units (see section 5), and seeks reference to the Affordable Housing SPD and policy H4 of the UDP.

**5: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

Is there sufficient demand for offices, and can they be accommodated alongside residential uses?

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

National planning policy promotes mixed use schemes in town centres, and Waterfront has the potential to offer such uses. The exact end uses, for example the mix of residential and office schemes will be put forward by the private sector, and considered by the Council through the planning process in the usual way.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/54/U

**5: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

Community space should be provided.

**Proposed Change**

As above.

**Response**

Noted

The provision of adequate public space is an important element of the SPD and will be integral to all planning applications at Waterfront (see paragraph 9.1.9).

---

David Jordan

R1797/23/U

**5: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

It should be an aspiration to attract a venue suitable for theatre performances and concerts to Waterfront, whilst there should only be moderate encouragement of bars.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

The Council does have aspirations to attract leisure uses to serve all sections of the community. This may include a cinema, family entertainment centre or other uses such as a theatre.

---

**5.2: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

SPD should recognise potential opportunities for other forms of recreation other than general movement/access through walking/cycling.

**Proposed Change**

Could open/play space be included in the project area, or canoeing on the canal, to provide for other forms of physical activity? This would be consistent with UDP policy LC9.

**Response**

Disagree

All residential schemes will be expected to make a commitment towards open space provision through the Urban Open Space SPD. Canoeing on the canal may become a feature, but is unlikely to be actively promoted through the development of the site.

---

Andrew Tyrer

R877/33/O

British Waterways

**5.2.7: Appropriate Land Uses****Representation**

Suggest amendment of para 5.2.7

**Proposed Change**

Above should read as: "Waterspace - the potential for waterborne activity, including visitor facilities, moorings and other essential boaters' facilities and services should be included in proposals."

**Response**

Agree partly

Exact change not incorporated into SPD, but reference to other essential boaters' facilities and services will be added to paragraph 5.2.7

---

Vaughan Welch

R1397/41/S

Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch)

**6: Prime Gateway Opportunities****Representation**

IWA support the desire for high quality design which will create landmark buildings. However, if these buildings are high rise (particularly on the south of the canal) it is important that sunlight still reaches the canal and tow-path by stepping buildings back.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

When considering the detailed design of individual schemes, such considerations will be taken into account. Furthermore, the Council is developing a design based SPD which will cover this and many other design issues. The IWA will be consulted on this draft document at the appropriate time.

---

**7.7: The Character of the Area****Representation**

Support - could open/play/recreation spaces also be referred to here?

**Proposed Change**

As above - suggest reference to open/play/recreation space.

**Response**

Disagree

It is likely that there will be significant public realm provision on the site as befitting a town centre location. Open play space will not be appropriate here, but residential schemes will be expected to make contributions through the Urban Open Space SPD.

---

Amanda Smith

R86/26/S

English Heritage (The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)

**7.8: The Character of the Area****Representation**

English Heritage support the designation of the Leather Heritage Conservation Area, as previously indicated.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

---

John French

R1796/18/U

**Plan 3: Walsall Locks Conservation Area****Representation**

Concerned about the number of buildings which may be affected by the Waterfront development - particularly the canal side chimney, the one next to the Holiday hyper-market, Homer Pressings Building and the Towes building.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

The UDP contains policies to protect the built heritage, and therefore there is no need for further specific reference in the SPD to reflect this.

---

## 8: Access and Public Transport

### Representation

There is a concern that the need for a 100% car parking ratio on certain sites in the SPD area is at conflict with the desire for active frontages, pedestrian safety and good urban design.

### Proposed Change

Request that the proposals for 100% parking ratios are reviewed and that support in the SPD for active ground floor uses prevail.

### Response

Disagree

The SPD recognises the need for active frontages where possible, good urban design and pedestrian permeability. Whilst these are important elements, the SPD has to adhere to UDP's parking standards and it would be inappropriate to amend the general rule within the SPD for 100% parking in favour of these elements.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/57/U

## 8: Access and Public Transport

### Representation

Public and private transport links should be provided, creating a fully integrated transport system. There should also be attention made to links to other centres.

### Proposed Change

As above.

### Response

Noted

Reference is already made in the SPD to the proximity of readily accessible public transport links, for example bus and rail links, and the proposed Metro link. Furthermore, consideration is also given in the document to access by road and the provision of car parking.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/59/U

## 8: Access and Public Transport

### Representation

Secure parking should be provided for all residential properties.

### Proposed Change

### Response

Noted

The Council will seek secure by design solutions to town centre residential parking through the planning application process.

---



**8: Access and Public Transport****Representation**

Increased population in the area will choke the infrastructure and increased congestion will have a negative impact on Walsall's image.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

If there is an increased town centre residential population, this will stimulate the development of the supporting infrastructure, for example, shops and restaurants. Similarly, residential developers will be asked to make contributions towards education, healthcare and transport provision so that "social" infrastructure can support any increases in population.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/55/O

**8: Access and Public Transport****Representation**

There is a concern over the impact of parking on surrounding business.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

All schemes at Waterfront will be expected to adhere to the Council's existing parking standards expressed in the UDP. Adherence to these standards, when allied to the site's central sustainable location, should minimise the impact of parking on surrounding businesses.

---

Consultation Event

R3000/56/O

**8: Access and Public Transport****Representation**

Object to the provision of multi-storey car parking.

**Proposed Change**

As above - remove statement.

**Response**

Disagree

Multi-storey parking is the best solution to the provision of parking in town centres, and if well-designed can add to the overall quality of the environment.

**8: Access and Public Transport****Representation**

The document should address the provision of links to transport improvements along the ring road, the improving A454 corridor and links to education and health facilities. The issue of accessibility planning should also be considered.

**Proposed Change****Response**

Noted

Developers at Waterfront will be expected to make contributions towards education and health provision, highway and public transport improvements. Such requirements are adequately covered in the planning obligations section of the SPD and in the UDP.

---

Maggie Taylor

R19/11/S

Sport England

**8.2: Access and Public Transport****Representation**

Support, but enhancement of pedestrian and cyclist permeability would add value.

**Proposed Change**

As above - also add in cyclist permeability.

**Response**

Agree

Paragraph 8.2 amended accordingly.

---

Andrew Tyrer

R877/34/O

British Waterways

**8.6: Access and Public Transport****Representation**

Para 8.6 should be amended.

**Proposed Change**

As above, should include reference to adequate public space adjacent to the waterspace.

**Response**

Agree

Reference made to this in paragraph 8.7.

---

**Figure 1: Aspirational image****Representation**

Feel that the buildings in the artist's impression loom oppressively over the canalside, and a feeling of open space should be offered.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

The artist's impression is just that - any submitted planning applications will include sufficient elements of open space, as referred to in paragraph 9.1.9 and elsewhere in the SPD.

---

Maggie Taylor

R19/12/O

Sport England

**9: Urban Design Principles****Representation**

Should refer to the principles of design in PPS1 to increase the opportunities for physical activity.

**Proposed Change**

As above - should make reference to opportunities for physical activities.

**Response**

Disagree

Specific reference to PPS1 is not required in Chapter 9 - it is considered that changes to paragraph 9.1.8 to reflect pedestrian and cycle access to the site is sufficient (see representation 13).

---

Consultation Event

R3000/60/U

**9: Urban Design Principles****Representation**

Innovative, high quality, and progressive architecture is important. The development should include variations in building types and styles, use bridge links that stress canal side activity, have clean public realm, be sustainable, include high quality public art, integrate old and new, use secure by design standards, seek to retain character and heritage, and provide active frontages.

**Proposed Change**

As above - make changes to text where necessary.

**Response**

Agree

However, most if not all of these points are referred to elsewhere in the SPD and changes or further emphasis is not necessary.

---

Maggie Taylor

R19/13/O

Sport England

#### **9.1.8: Urban Design Principles**

##### **Representation**

Could this also refer to cycle access.

##### **Proposed Change**

Should also refer to cycle access.

##### **Response**

Agree

Paragraph 9.1.8 amended accordingly.

---

Maggie Taylor

R19/14/O

Sport England

#### **9.1.9: Urban Design Principles**

##### **Representation**

Could reference to public spaces be broadened to include open/play/recreation spaces?

##### **Proposed Change**

Should refer to open/play/recreational spaces.

##### **Response**

Disagree

Due to the town centre location of this site, it would be difficult to provide open play space in the project area. However, all residential schemes will be expected to make a commitment towards open space provision through the Urban Open Space SPD, and proposals for an indoor family activity or similar facility would be supported on planning policy grounds.

---

Vaughan Welch

R1397/44/S

Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch)

#### **9.1.11: Urban Design Principles**

##### **Representation**

Support reference to the canal as an integral unifying element in the development site and the reference to Policy LC9 in the UDP.

##### **Proposed Change**

None

##### **Response**

Noted

---

**10.8: Massing and Layout Principles****Representation**

Support the policy for secure pedestrian linkages related to the rest of the town centre and public access to both sides of the canal (also in WA12f). Bridges should be located to gain maximum linkages and be of the permanent/fixed variety, rather than of the lifting or swinging variety.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

---

Maggie Taylor

R19/15/O

Sport England

**10.10: Massing and Layout Principles****Representation**

Should make reference to cycling and include open/play/recreation spaces.

**Proposed Change**

As above - should make reference to cycling and include open/play/recreation spaces.

**Response**

Agree partly

Reference will be made in paragraph 10.10 to reflect cycling accessibility. However, as with representation 14, no reference will be made to open play space due to the town centre location of the site, though residential developments will be expected to make reference to the Council's Urban Open Space SPD and the emerging Greenspace Strategy.

---

Graham Walker

R128/5/O

English Nature

**11: Environmental Issues / Ground Conditions****Representation**

The SPD should acknowledge and address Policy QE4 of RPG11, particularly regarding the benefit of accessible natural greenspace.

**Proposed Change**

As above - incorporated into the SPD.

**Response**

Agree

The SPD has been changed to reflect the Council's Urban Open Space SPD (section 14), and it is this document and the emerging Greenspace Strategy which will provide the relevant framework.

---

### 11.1: Environmental Issues / Ground Conditions

#### Representation

Any planning application should be accompanied by a site investigation report. This should include a desk study of historical land uses that may have led to potential ground contamination, and soil investigation studies. If the site investigation report identifies contamination, a remediation scheme must be agreed and implemented for the site. If any material is excavated to provide for a new canal arm, it should be analysed and disposed of at an appropriately licensed waste disposal site.

#### Proposed Change

None

#### Response

Noted

These issues will be covered through the development control process.

---

Graham Walker  
English Nature

R128/3/S

### 11.3: Environmental Issues / Ground Conditions

#### Representation

Welcome the recognition given to taking protected species fully into account.

#### Proposed Change

None

#### Response

Noted

---

Graham Walker  
English Nature

R128/4/S

### 11.5: Environmental Issues / Ground Conditions

#### Representation

Support the objective on enhancing water quality.

#### Proposed Change

None

#### Response

Welcome support

---

**12: Heritage Issues**

**Representation**

Support the proposals for an archaeological assessment of the site, though care must be taken to ensure that new development (particularly during the construction phase) does not prejudice the canal infrastructure or its operation.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

**12: Heritage Issues**

**Representation**

Need to emphasise the importance of maintaining and strengthening the remaining links with the history of the Town Arm and the Walsall Canal. In particular, the Wharfinger's Cottage and surrounding area needs careful consideration and a compatible use to ensure its long term conservation.

**Proposed Change**

As above.

**Response**

Disagree

These sentiments are already well versed in the SPD, and there is no need to emphasise the points. For example, the Town Arm is recognised as the unifying element in the SPD area throughout the document, and full consideration is given to the character and heritage value of the area in sections 7 and 12 respectively.

Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch)

### 12.2: Heritage Issues

#### Representation

Support the desire to open canal basins - this will help to increase boat activity, which is itself a major incentive in encouraging visitors to use waterways locations. The presence of boats will be ensured by the provision of long and short term moorings.

#### Proposed Change

None

#### Response

Welcome support

---

Amanda Smith

R86/27/S

English Heritage (The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)

### 12.3: Heritage Issues

#### Representation

Referring to "additional buildings may be added if appropriate" in para 12.3, English Heritage supports the statement, and recommends that a characterisation and evaluation of the built environment of the area be undertaken to inform this process.

#### Proposed Change

None

#### Response

Noted

Developments in the SPD area will be expected to respect the existing townscape and the Walsall Locks Conservation Area. The quality of existing buildings is constantly under review and further buildings may be locally listed in the future.

---

Andrew Tyrer

R877/35/O

British Waterways

### 14: Planning Obligations

#### Representation

Would like to see reference in this chapter to contributions to ensure that the future management and maintenance of the waterspace and the towpath continue at a high standard.

#### Proposed Change

As above - add planning obligations reference for contributions towards the management and maintenance of the waterspace and towpath.

#### Response

Disagree

This is already adequately covered by paragraph 14.2.2 which refers to examples of canal-side works which may be covered through planning obligations. British Waterways will of course be involved in negotiations with individual developers for such planning obligations.



### 14.2.3: Planning Obligations

#### Representation

Support, though clarification is sought on meaning of leisure space.

#### Proposed Change

Leisure space should be clarified or include open, play or recreation space.

#### Response

Agree

An amendment will be made to section 14 to reflect the need to refer to the Council's Urban Open Space SPD, which deals in more detail with play and recreation space.

---

Graham Walker

R128/6/O

English Nature

### SA: Sustainability Appraisal

#### Representation

Suggest additional sustainability indicators to be added to the SA in para 4.6.5

#### Proposed Change

As above, suggesting that additional indicators should include populations of protected species maintained and enhanced, extent of accessible natural greenspace when compared to EN's standards, and water quality of the canals.

#### Response

Partly agree

It is appropriate to add the protected species and water quality indicators to the Sustainability Appraisal report. However, the accessible natural greenspace indicator will not be added because the Urban Open Space SPD emphasises improving existing provision rather than providing new natural greenspace.

---

Paul Gethins

R224/70/S

Environment Agency

### SEA: SEA Screening Statement

#### Representation

The Agency supports the Council's view that a SEA is not required to accompany the SPD.

#### Proposed Change

None

#### Response

Noted

---

Amanda Smith

R86/24/S

English Heritage (The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England)

**SEA: SEA Screening Statement**

**Representation**

The Screening Statement makes a convincing case that a SEA will not be required in this case.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

---

Graham Walker

R128/2/O

English Nature

**SEA: SEA Screening Statement**

**Representation**

Disagree with the Council's conclusion that an SEA is not required to accompany the SPD.

**Proposed Change**

Recommend that the need for a SEA is re-evaluated.

**Response**

Agree

SEA to be undertaken to address English Nature's concerns. However, it should be noted that the other three environmental consultatin bodies agreed that a SEA was not required.

---

Andrew Canning-Trigg

R30/50/S

Countryside Agency

**SEA: SEA Screening Statement**

**Representation**

The Countryside Agency does not require the production of an SEA to meet its environmental interests.

**Proposed Change**

None

**Response**

Noted

---