

Independent Examination of Black Country Core Strategy

FINAL PROGRAMME

Matter number is shown in []

DAY 1 – TUESDAY 13 JULY

1000	OPENING ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS	NP
-------------	---	-----------

1030	1] STRATEGY/VISION AND [2] SUSTAINABILITY	NP
-------------	--	-----------

Attendees:

1. AWM (21)
2. Paul White Associates (7) /Quadrant Land Partnership (8)
3. RPS (65) / Persimmon Homes West Midlands (66)
4. Westfield (67)
5. GOWM (80)
6. Peel Holdings (91)
7. Natural England (83)
8. West Midlands Leaders Board (51)
9. Environment Agency (76)
10. CPRE (30)
11. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) Does the JCS provide an appropriate spatial vision for the future of the sub region over the plan period, consistent with national guidance in PPS 12 and the Sustainable Community Strategy [SCS]?

ii) Will the strategy satisfactorily and sustainably deliver the new development needed to meet the sub region's growth in the West Midlands, including through the allocation of a number of regeneration corridors or, if not, why not and what needs to be changed?

iii) Are there any objectives, policies or proposals not consistent with national guidance and, if so, is there a local justification supported by a robust and credible evidence base?

iv) Is there a clear "audit trail" demonstrating how and why the preferred strategy was selected, including in terms of consultation with the public, representative bodies, service and infrastructure providers and other interested parties?

v) Has the JCS been the subject of suitably comprehensive and satisfactory sustainability appraisal [SA], strategic environmental assessment [SEA] and an appropriate assessment [AA] and if not, what else needs to be done?

1230	Lunch
-------------	--------------

1330

[3] ECONOMY/EMPLOYMENT

NP

Attendees:

1. AWM (21)
2. Ashtenne Industrial Fund (59)
3. University of Wolverhampton (52)
4. Skelton Group (2)
5. RPS (65) / Persimmon Homes West Midlands (66)
6. CPRE (30)
7. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) Are the policies and proposals concerning the local economy and employment consistent with national guidance [including new PPS 4]?

ii) Will they deliver the levels of new employment sought or, if not, what else needs to be done and/or should more [or less] land be identified, for example by allocating new greenfield sites or removing areas from the GB?

iii) Is it appropriate in principle and reasonable in practice to seek to safeguard so many employment areas and/or should more flexible criteria [such as in relation to economic viability] be used to help make the most effective use of previously developed land?

iv) Are the definitions of a High Quality Strategic Employment Area (EMP2) and “readily available land” (EMP4) appropriate and realistic in all the relevant local circumstances?

v) How will future employment land be brought forward into the portfolio of sites if and when required?

vi) Are the targets for office accommodation within the four strategic centres realistically deliverable and, if not, does the JCS provide sufficient flexibility to consider other uses that might be appropriate? Is it appropriate to state in the JCS that offices should *not be classed as an employment use* (p63)?

vii) Does the JCS give appropriate consideration to the role of the University of Wolverhampton and other tertiary level education providers in supporting Spatial Objective 2 (a restructured sub-regional economy) and other JCS initiatives around the economy, employment and centres?

1730

Close

DAY 2 – WEDNESDAY 14 JULY

0930

[4] HOUSING [GENERAL]

NP

Attendees:

1. Paul White Associates (7) / Quadrant Land Partnership (8) / Bovale Ltd (70) / First Investments Ltd (69)
2. Mintworth Transport Ltd (64) / Persimmon Homes West Midlands (66) / London and Cambridge Properties (39)
3. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

- i) Is the overall number and phasing of new housing realistically deliverable within the plan period, taking into account the evidence in the SHLAA and the opportunities identified within the sub region, including the strategic centres and regeneration corridors?
- ii) Has it been demonstrated that there will be a five year supply of developable new housing land, a six to ten year supply on specific sites and an 11 – 15 year supply in broad locations, in accordance with PPS 3?
- iii) Is it clear that all suitable previously developable land [PDL] sites have been included and, if not, why not?
- iv) Will the intended management of new housing delivery prove adequate to ensure that the strategic aims of the JCS are met. If not, what else needs to be done and why?
- v) Should the JCS contain a housing trajectory and/or contingencies in the event that completions do not come forward as expected?

1330

Lunch

1430

[5] HOUSING [POLICIES]

NP

Attendees:

1. Paul White Associates (7) / Quadrant Land Partnership (8) / Bovale Ltd (70) / First Investments Ltd (69)
2. Mintworth Transport Ltd (64) / Persimmon Homes West Midlands (66) / London & Cambridge Properties (39)
3. Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (13)
4. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) Is the threshold and percentage for affordable housing justified by up-to-date local evidence of housing needs and economic viability and does the policy provide sufficient flexibility if viability is an issue for a particular scheme?

ii) Are the policies consistent with national guidance in PPS 3 and appropriate to meet local needs and/or should there be references to minimum [or maximum] densities, including potentially in particular areas, such as strategic centres, according to public transport accessibility levels?

iii) Does Policy HOU4 establish unreasonably stringent criteria against the requirements of Circular 01/2006? Specifically, should sites be required to meet the highest access standards as set out in HOU2 and what are the potential implications for pitch delivery if land values are higher on such sites? How does the requirement for transit pitches to be located adjacent to the Principal and Trunk Road Network sit with Government guidance on site design (Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites, Good Practice Guide, CLG (2008))?

iv) The Gypsy and Traveller Area Assessment (GTAA) identifies a need for 103 pitches to the year 2018 whereas Policy HOU4 requires 98 pitches; the five missing pitches appear from the GTAA to relate to an unauthorised encampment which moves around the JCS area. Although the group have not identified an area in which their needs should be met, what is the justification for not including an equivalent pitch requirement to provide accommodation?

v) Are the relevant monitoring indicators and targets for new housing delivery clear and appropriate for the task?

1730

Close

0930

[11] CENTRES/RETAIL (GENERAL)

VM

Attendees:

1. Westfield (67)
2. Peel Holdings (91)
3. Martineau Galleries Ltd Partnership (MGLP) (97)
4. London and Cambridge Properties Ltd (55) (Steve Carlin)

Issues:

- i) Does the JCS plan appropriately for the management and growth of centres over the plan period, focusing on higher level centres to provide a strategic framework and support initiatives to enhance economic regeneration?
- ii) Are the JCS policies for the centres able to respond to changing economic circumstances and encourage, where appropriate, high-density development accessible by public transport, walking and cycling? Is it both reasonable and appropriate to set maximum quanta and phasing for proposed comparison and convenience shopping and office targets within the various centres?
- iii) Does the JCS define a network and hierarchy of centres resilient to anticipated future economic changes, to meet the needs of their catchments?
- iv) Does the JCS define realistic primary and secondary frontages in designated centres and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations?
- v) Does the JCS set suitable and appropriate floorspace thresholds for the scale of edge-of-centre and out-of-centre development?
- vi) Will the JCS proactively promote competitive town centre environments through leisure and other attractions? Should it make provision to manage the evening/ night time economy within the various strategic, town and other centres?
- vii) Is the strong presumption against out of centre development in CEN7 consistent with national policy in PPS 4?
- viii) Is it appropriate to mention charging policy for long stay parking in centres?

1300

Lunch

DAY 3 – THURSDAY 15 JULY (PM)

1400

[6] ENVIRONMENT

VM

Attendees:

1. Staffordshire County Council (74)
2. Cannock Chase District Council (89)
3. Natural England (83)
4. Environment Agency (76)
5. British Waterways (78)
6. West Midlands Metropolitan Area Canals Partnership (31)
7. Inland Waterways Assoc (101 / 114)
8. The Wildlife Trust for Birmingham and the Black Country (93)
9. West Midlands Friends of the Earth (95)
10. Westfield (67)

Issues:

i) Does the JCS strike the right balance between protecting the Black Country's nature conservation resource and facilitating other strategic development?

ii) Does ENV4 make sufficient provision for the promotion and improvement of the network/ use of canal for waste transfer/ promotion of moorings?

iii) Are the targets for renewable energy set out in Policy ENV7 appropriate and reasonable in the light of national policy? Should the policy be specific on aspects of energy from waste?

iv) Does Policy ENV8 unnecessarily restrict development across the Black Country? Does the JCS provide an adequate response to the need to protect air quality?

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

v) Does the JCS take sufficient account of the area's proximity to the Cannock Chase SAC?

1730

Close

DAY 4 – FRIDAY 16 JULY

0930

[7] TRANSPORT

NP

Attendees:

1. Highways Agency (90)
2. RPS (65)
3. Hagley Parish Council (102)
4. Centro (60)
5. West Midlands Campaign for Better Transport (110)
6. Stephen H Spencer (17)
7. Inland Waterways Assoc (114 / 101)
8. British Waterways (78)
9. AWM (21)
10. CPRE (30)
11. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

- i) Is the overall transport strategy consistent with PPG 13 and the Local Transport Plan and, if not, what needs to be changed and why?
- ii) Are the policies suitable and appropriate to deliver the necessary improvements, including in terms of rail and bus services, park and ride and cycling/walking and, if not, what else needs to be done and why?
- iii) Is there a robust and credible evidence base to demonstrate that the proposals can be delivered over the plan period? This includes in terms of priorities, such as metro improvements and park and ride sites, for new infrastructure, and the availability of funding and phasing, as well as contingencies/alternatives if major items, including improvements to the main road network e.g. at the M5 and M6 junctions and schemes in adjoining areas, do not come forward as expected?
- iv) Are the policies suitable and appropriate to encourage increased use of the inland waterways network for both freight and leisure and, if not, what needs to be changed?

1300

Close

DAY 5 – TUESDAY 20 JULY

0930	[12] DUDLEY MBC SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS AND OTHER SUBMISSIONS AFFECTING REGENERATION CORRIDORS 10, 11, 14 & 16	VM
------	---	----

Attendees:

1. Westfield (67)
2. New Heritage Regeneration Ltd
3. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Strategic centre and other centre related submissions

Issues:

- i) How are sites for additional housing, comparison and convenience retail and office accommodation identified in Brierley Hill in SC1 (refer Appendix 2)?
- ii) Is the proposed phasing of different sorts of new development within Brierley Hill strategic centre appropriate?
- iii) What are the specific local challenges around providing a *mix of dwelling types and tenures at a variety of densities suitable to a Town Centre to accommodate a balanced population*?
- iv) How would services associated with new inward population be provided within Brierley Hill strategic centre, including education, leisure, health care and other community facilities?
- v) What role will other service providers play in delivering a *vibrant, inclusive and accessible strategic town centre*?
- vi) Is it appropriate that Dudley should be a town centre rather than a strategic centre? What is the justification for the thresholds for retail and office development within Dudley town centre relative to other centres? How will the plans for Brierley Hill impact on Dudley?
- vii) Should Charterfield shopping centre be re-categorised as a small district centre?
- viii) What amount of convenience shopping proposed for Lye (CEN5) and what is the logic for this quantum of floorspace, relative to other district and local centres?

1300 **Lunch**

DAY 5 – TUESDAY 20 JULY (PM)

Attendees:

1. Heathens Speedway Supporters Club (14)
2. CRASH (36)

Issue:

i) Does the JCS make sufficient provision in the south of the JCS area for recreational activity including speedway racing to support Spatial Objectives 5 and 8? [EMP6/ ENV6]

Attendees:

1. Paul White Associates (7)/ Quadrant Land Partnership (8)
2. London and Cambridge Properties (39) / Persimmon Homes West Midlands (66)
3. Skelton Group (2)
4. Lapal Canal Trust (61)
5. CRASH (36)
6. New Heritage Regeneration Ltd
7. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) In each corridor, is there a robust and realistic evidence base to justify the nature and extent of the designation?

ii) Can the JCS proposals, including the necessary services and facilities to accompany new development, be delivered within the plan period; for example are there any significant physical, environmental and/or infrastructure constraints?

iii) In the light of the above, has the supply of PDL sites for redevelopment been thoroughly considered or, if not, have potential areas been omitted without good reason[s]?

iv) What level of precision should be included within each RC on individual sites, their capacity to accommodate residential or employment uses, having regard to Appendix 2 to the JCS? Is it appropriate that the JCS make adjustments to, for example, Green Belt boundaries?

v) Is it appropriate that the JCS identify phased targeting for specific forms of development in particular corridors if other land could be released earlier than indicated?

vi) Are the implementation and monitoring mechanisms for delivery in the RCs reasonable and realistic, including in terms of funding and phasing?

DAY 6 – WEDNESDAY 21 JULY

0930	[14] CITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS AND OTHER SUBMISSIONS AFFECTING REGENERATION CORRIDORS 1,2,3 & 4	VM
------	--	----

Attendees:

1. Peel Holdings (91)
2. London and Cambridge Properties Ltd (55) (Turley Associates)
3. Wolverhampton Development Company
4. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Strategic centre and other centre related submissions

Issues:

- i) How are sites for additional housing, retail and office accommodation identified in Wolverhampton strategic centre in SC4 (refer Appendix 2)? What constraints are there in releasing land for development within the city centre (e.g. in the Canalside Quarter)?
- ii) Is the proposed phasing of different sorts of new development within Wolverhampton strategic centre appropriate?
- iii) Will the targets for additional retail development affect other local centres, most notably Bilston and Wednesfield?
- iv) How would services associated with new inward population be provided within Wolverhampton strategic centre?
- v) What role should the University of Wolverhampton and other education providers play in the regeneration of Wolverhampton strategic centre?
- vi) What role will other service providers play in delivering the creation of a *confident City Centre*?
- vii) Is it appropriate that the JCS set fixed boundaries for its various strategic, town and other town centres?
- viii) Is it appropriate that the Wednesfield town centre boundary incorporate the Sainsbury supermarket?

1300 Lunch

1400

[15] REGENERATION CORRIDOR 1, 2, 3 & 4 SUBMISSIONS

NP

Attendees:

1. Bovale Ltd (70)
2. Peel Holdings (91)
3. Wolverhampton Development Company
4. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) In each corridor, is there a robust and realistic evidence base to justify the nature and extent of the designation?

ii) Can the JCS proposals, including the necessary services and facilities to accompany new development, be delivered within the plan period; for example are there any significant physical, environmental and/or infrastructure constraints?

iii) In the light of the above, has the supply of PDL sites for redevelopment been thoroughly considered or, if not, have potential areas been omitted without good reason[s]?

iv) What level of precision should be included within each RC on individual sites, their capacity to accommodate residential or employment uses, having regard to Appendix 2 to the JCS? Is it appropriate that the JCS make adjustments to, for example, Green Belt boundaries?

v) Is it appropriate that the JCS identify phased targeting for specific forms of development in particular corridors if other land could be released earlier than indicated?

v) Are the implementation and monitoring mechanisms for delivery in the RCs reasonable and realistic, including in terms of funding and phasing?

1730

Close

1030	[16] WALSALL MBC SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS AND OTHER SUBMISSIONS AFFECTING REGENERATION CORRIDORS 5,6,7 & 15	VM
------	---	----

CHANGE TO SCHEDULED TIME

THIS SESSION WILL NOW START AT 1030 (INSTEAD OF 0930)

Attendees:

1. Walsall Regeneration Company
2. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Strategic centre and other centre related submissions

Issues:

- (i) How are sites for additional housing, retail and office accommodation identified in Walsall strategic centre in SC3 (refer Appendix 2)?
- (ii) How would services associated with new inward population be provided within Walsall strategic centre?
- (iii) Is the proposed phasing of different sorts of new development within Walsall strategic centre appropriate?
- (iv) How are the plans to regenerate Walsall strategic centre with mixed residential and business use consistent with commitments to keep waste management facilities (eg. at Town Wharf Business Park) and mineral safeguarding requirements?
- (v) What role will other service providers play in the regeneration of Walsall strategic centre?

1300 Lunch

DAY 7 – THURSDAY 22 JULY (PM)

1400

[17] REGENERATION CORRIDOR 5, 6, 7 & 15 SUBMISSIONS

NP

Attendees:

1. Ashtenne Industrial Fund (59)
2. Mabey Group (86)
3. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) In each corridor, is there a robust and realistic evidence base to justify the nature and extent of the designation?

ii) Can the JCS proposals, including the necessary services and facilities to accompany new development, be delivered within the plan period; for example are there any significant physical, environmental and/or infrastructure constraints?

iii) In the light of the above, has the supply of PDL sites for redevelopment been thoroughly considered or, if not, have potential areas been omitted without good reason[s]?

iv) What level of precision should be included within each RC on individual sites, their capacity to accommodate residential or employment uses, having regard to Appendix 2 to the JCS? Is it appropriate that the JCS make adjustments to, for example, Green Belt boundaries?

v) Is it appropriate that the JCS identify phased targeting for specific forms of development in particular corridors if other land could be released earlier than indicated?

vi) Are the implementation and monitoring mechanisms for delivery in the RCs reasonable and realistic, including in terms of funding and phasing?

1730

Close

0930

[18] SANDWELL MBC
SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS AND OTHER SUBMISSIONS AFFECTING
REGENERATION CORRIDORS 8, 9, 12 & 13

VM

CHANGE TO SCHEDULED TIME

BOTH MATTERS 18 & 19 WILL NOW BE DEALT WITH IN THE MORNING SESSION.

Attendees:

1. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Strategic centre and other centre related submissions

Issues:

(i) Does the map accompanying SC2 (refer Appendix 2) clarify where the relevant precincts in the strategic centre where regeneration activity is proposed (e.g the Eastern Gateway, Lyng/ Carter's Green and Greets Green)?

(ii) How are sites for additional housing, retail and office accommodation identified in West Bromwich strategic centre in SC2 (refer Appendix 2)?

(iii) Is the proposed phasing of different sorts of new development within West Bromwich strategic centre appropriate?

(iv) How would services associated with new inward population be provided within West Bromwich strategic centre?

(v) How are the plans to regenerate West Bromwich strategic centre with mixed residential and business use consistent with commitments to keep waste management facilities and mineral safeguarding requirements?

(vi) What role will other service providers play in the regeneration of West Bromwich strategic centre?

CHANGE TO SCHEDULED TIME

BOTH MATTERS 18 & 19 WILL NOW BE DEALT WITH IN THE MORNING SESSION.

Attendees:

1. Paul White Associates (7) / First Investments (69)
2. J Rigg Construction & Developments Ltd (103)
3. Mintworth Transport (64)
4. CRASH (36)
5. Black Country Consortium Ltd

Issues:

i) In each corridor, is there a robust and realistic evidence base to justify the nature and extent of the designation?

ii) Can the JCS proposals, including the necessary services and facilities to accompany new development, be delivered within the plan period; for example are there any significant physical, environmental and/or infrastructure constraints?

iii) In the light of the above, has the supply of PDL sites for redevelopment been thoroughly considered or, if not, have potential areas been omitted without good reason[s]?

iv) What level of precision should be included within each RC on individual sites, their capacity to accommodate residential or employment uses, having regard to Appendix 2 to the JCS? Is it appropriate that the JCS make adjustments to, for example, Green Belt boundaries?

v) Is it appropriate that the JCS identify phased targeting for specific forms of development in particular corridors if other land could be released earlier than indicated?

vi) Are the implementation and monitoring mechanisms for delivery in the RCs reasonable and realistic, including in terms of funding and phasing?

1400

Close

DAY 9 – TUESDAY 27 JULY

0930

[8] MINERALS AND [9] WASTE

VM

Attendees:

1. Environment Agency (76)
2. Staffordshire County Council (74)
3. The Wyrley Estate (84)
4. Potters Clay and Coal Co. (96)
5. West Midlands Friends of the Earth (95)
6. West Midlands Regional Aggregate Working Party

0930

[8] MINERALS

Issues:

- i) How does the JCS implement relevant national policies and meet the requirements for mineral and aggregates production including brick clay, sand and gravel?
- ii) Does the JCS address all relevant minerals including the legacy of coal mining?
- iii) Does it identify levels of provision and maintain appropriate landbanks over the plan period?
- iv) How are sites for future mineral working identified? What are the basic criteria for making subsequent site allocations and considering planning applications?
- v) What is the policy for dealing with restoration and after-care of mineral working sites and encouraging the use of recycled/secondary aggregates?

1130

[9] WASTE

Issues:

- i) Does the JCS provide a spatial portrait of the area in terms of waste management, the vision of how it will be and the strategy for getting there, setting out the issues faced, options considered, key decisions and proposed solutions to deliver the strategy? Does the JCS cover all waste streams?
- ii) Will the JCS achieve sustainable waste management, enabling sufficient opportunities for provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations, including waste recovery, recycling and disposal, focusing on delivering the key planning objectives in PPS10, including the movement of waste up the hierarchy?
- iii) Does the JCS explain how sites and areas suitable for new/enhanced waste management facilities will be identified, including the criteria that will guide actual allocations and the broad locations where these will be sought?

1330

Lunch

DAY 9 – TUESDAY 27 JULY (PM)

1430 [20] INFRASTRUCTURE/[21] FLEXIBILITY/[22] DELIVERY/[23] MONITORING AND [24] OTHER MATTERS ARISING **NP**

Attendees:

1. AWM (21)
2. Highways Agency (90)
3. GOWM (80)
4. Homes and Community Agency
5. Black Country Consortium Ltd
6. West Midlands Friends of the Earth (95)

Issues:

i) Infrastructure Delivery – Bearing in mind the phasing and funding required, is the overall strategy economically viable and practically achievable in the timescales envisaged and in the form proposed and, if not, what should be changed to enhance the prospects for delivery?

ii) Flexibility – Is the JCS reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances and, if not, what changes/contingencies would improve the ability to respond to new issues arising during the plan period, such as a lack of investment in major projects?

iii) Monitoring - Will the monitoring proposed throughout the JCS, including in individual policies and section 9, be sufficiently comprehensive and informative to achieve its objectives and if not, why not, and what needs to be changed?

iv) Implementation – Are the implementation mechanisms identified sufficient and suitable to achieve their objectives, for example in relation to gypsy and traveller pitches, and, if not, why not, and what needs to be changed?

1600

v) Mop-up session

1800 **Close**

DAYS 10 - 12 WEDNESDAY 28 TO FRIDAY 30 JULY

SITE VISITS