

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2017 11:17
To: Blackcountrycorestra
Subject: Issues and Options Consultation Representations
Attachments: Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 1.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 2.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 3.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 4.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 5.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 6.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 7.pdf; Black Country Core Strategy Response Form 8.pdf

Sirs

I have been attempting to submit representations on the Core Strategy Issues and Options Report.

I have managed to submit a document relating to the 'call for sites' (acknowledgment received) but appear to have been unsuccessful with my representations.

Having completed the forms on line I attempted to save them prior to submission and lost everything. I completed the forms again and thought I had successfully submitted them on Friday but today, on re-opening the document found that they were still retained in draft form only, and of course the site has now closed. (I know – there's a lesson here – don't leave things to the last day!)

Following a conversation with your [REDACTED] this morning I have therefor transferred my representations to the alternative 'Response Form' and have attached them for your attention.

I trust you will still feel able to accept the representations.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter 3 / Page 26 / Question 6 / Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
It does appear that Key Issue 5 Environmental Considerations are concentrating on national or international designations (eg SACs and SPAs). This should also take account of more 'local' designations.

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter4 / Page35 / Question8 / Paragraph 4.6
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>Objective 10 represents a particular difficulty for this Company.</p> <p>'Dormant' Planning permission exists for the extraction of Brick Clay on the Highfields North Site in Walsall Wood, and this is acknowledged in Walsall's submitted Site Allocations Document.</p> <p>This accords with National planning policy which recognises that minerals are a finite natural resource which can only be worked where they are found, and it is necessary to make best use of these resources, to ensure there will continue to be sufficient supplies remaining for future generations. Mineral planning authorities are therefore required adopt policies to prevent other development from needlessly compromising (sterilising) future exploitation of these resources. This is emphasised as the Walsall Plan recognises the need to maintain brick clay supplies to local brickworks and the potential shortfall which is likely to occur.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that this particular site offers various challenges, not least of which is the designation of much of the site as an SSSI with the remainder being included within a SLINC. Any application for modern working conditions for this site will be expected to include a significant level of supporting information including Ecological Assessment and a strategy for minimising loss of the SSSI's special features, together with permanent retention of a proportion of the SSSI's special features throughout the working phases of the site (now set out in Walsall's submitted Site Allocations Document). Laudable as this requirement is, it must be recognised that the imposition of severe restrictions on working the site could seriously impact upon the viability of the site. As the planning permission pre-dates the SSSI designation the policies ought to acknowledge the potential implications of the viability/loss of value which may result. The conflict which arises - need for the mineral versus retention of valuable ecological features - will make this objective particularly difficult to achieve.</p>

Summary

This Company owns a site which has the benefit of planning permission for clay extraction. Much of the land is also designated SSSI. Extraction of the clays will totally destroy the area of the SSSI. Even if it were possible to recreate the features of interest on restoration, which has to be doubtful, this would be many years away, following an extended period of extraction and backfill.

In this instance the two elements of Objective 10 are incompatible

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter4 / Page43 / Question 12a / Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>This would appear to offer the most flexible approach. Specifying rigid criteria may not be the most appropriate way to achieve this - as every situation will be different and ought to be treated on its merits. The need to ensure that defensible boundaries remain is nonetheless considered to be of significant importance.</p>

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter4 / Page44 / Question 12b / Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>The permitted clay extraction site at Highfields North (referred to elsewhere) can only be worked at the expense of an SSSI. Protection of the SSSI could render the operation of the site not viable to the serious commercial detriment of this Company.</p> <p>There is the prospect of securing built development on that part of the permitted clay extraction site which falls outside the SSSI as an alternative to the extraction operations. Land immediately adjoining was included in the Walsall Local Plan SAD as a housing site but was removed from the submission document because of the potential conflict with extraction. It is therefore clearly considered an appropriate location for housing in other respects.</p> <p>Such development of this land as an alternative to extraction would secure the SSSI and the remainder of the local Green Belt designations for the future.</p>

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter 4/ Page 46/ Question 15a/ Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Agree
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>Subject to the availability of suitable sites, reasonable access to employment and continued inter-relationship with the Black Country</p>

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter4 / Page 46/ Question 15b/ Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>Telford and Wrekin District. Telford was established as a New Town with the very intention of taking 'overspill' from the Black Country. It has never achieved the targets originally envisaged in terms of population and households. Significant areas of potential development land exist within the Authority area and excellent communications already exist between the two authorities in the form of rail and the M54.</p>

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter 6/ Page /98 Question 96/ Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>The apparent overriding need to protect and enhance biodiversity doesn't address the conflict which can occur when two incompatible aspirations apply to a single site, as at Highfields North in Walsall.</p> <p>Here, an SSSI has been designated on land already with the benefit of planning permission (dormant) for brick clay extraction. Any application for modern working conditions for this site will be expected to include a significant level of supporting information including Ecological Assessment and a strategy for minimising loss of the SSSI's special features, together with permanent retention of a proportion of the SSSI's special features throughout the working phases of the site (now set out in Walsall's submitted Site Allocations Document). Laudable as this requirement is, it must be recognised that the imposition of severe restrictions on working the site could seriously impact upon the viability of the site. As the planning permission pre-dates the SSSI designation the policies ought to acknowledge the potential implications of the viability/loss of value which may result.</p>

Please state clearly the section of the Issues and Options document you are commenting on and include question numbers and chapter titles where relevant. This will help us to fully take your comments into account.

Chapter 6/ Page 109/ Question 112a/ Paragraph
Do you agree or disagree with the approach set out in the relevant section and / or question?
Comments (continue on a separate sheet if necessary)
<p>There is potential for change at the Highfields North Site in Walsall. There are challenges relating to its future operation – in addition to those set out elsewhere relating to the SSSI. The passage of time since the original permission has introduced other concerns with increased development in the area and associated increased traffic movements (not insurmountable). The balance between conflicting aspirations needs to be considered here and this may be a site which can offer a more appropriate form of development than that currently permitted.</p>